

5-2023

## Staff Turnover in Child Welfare

Maleena Flores

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Flores, Maleena, "Staff Turnover in Child Welfare" (2023). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 1745.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/1745>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

# STAFF TURNOVER IN CHILD WELFARE

---

A Project  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Social Work

---

by  
Maleena Flores

May 2023

# STAFF TURNOVER IN CHILD WELFARE

---

A Project  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

by

Maleena Flores

May 2023

Approved by:

Caroline Lim, Faculty Supervisor, Social Work

Yawen Li, M.S.W. Research Coordinator

© 2023 Maleena Flores

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** The turnover rate amongst child welfare workers is an ongoing problem that has yet to find a durable solution. Past studies have examined factors that contribute to workers' intention to leave and factors that may impact that decision. **Purpose:** This study explored this issue from the perspective of present and former child welfare workers in southern California counties by examining the relationship between turnover intention and psychological safety. **Methods:** This observational study used a cross sectional design to gather quantitative data via self-report through an online survey. Pearson product-moment correlation analyses were performed to examine the relationships between psychological safety and turnover intention. **Results:** The study sample featured previous or current child welfare workers at a county agency; assigned to the front-end or back-end programs. The study also featured the participants length of employment, length of employment in program, highest level of education, licensure status, participation in therapeutic services, and asked if the participant was a Title IV-E recipient. The sample size of  $n=13$  showed a significant finding between the relationship of individual safety and turnover intention. This finding demonstrated the higher perception of individual safety led to lower intentions to leave the county agency. **Conclusion:** This study shows partial support in the hypothesis and suggests turnover intention can be decreased with focus in individual safety.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER ONE PROBLEM FORMULATION .....	1
Child Welfare .....	1
Turnover in Child Welfare .....	1
Contributors of Turnover .....	2
Retention of Child Welfare Workers .....	2
Impact of High Turnover .....	3
Solutions .....	4
Conclusion .....	5
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
Staff Turnover in Child Welfare .....	6
Effects of High Turnover .....	6
Factors Associated with High Turnover Rate .....	7
Workers' Demographic .....	7
Organization Characteristics .....	7
Title IV-E .....	8
Solutions to High Turnover .....	8
Gap in Knowledge .....	9
Aim of Study .....	9
Significance of Study .....	9
Possible Theories .....	9

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY .....	11
Study Design .....	11
Participants.....	11
Recruitment .....	11
Study Procedure.....	12
Measures.....	12
Demographics. ....	12
Turnover Intention. ....	13
Statistical Analysis.....	14
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS.....	15
Demographic Characteristics.....	15
Employment Characteristics .....	15
Psychological Safety .....	16
Turnover Intention .....	16
Relationships among Variables .....	16
Turnover Intention and Individual Safety. ....	16
Turnover Intention and Team Respect. ....	17
Turnover Intention and Team Learning. ....	17
Turnover Intention and Psychological Safety .....	17
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION .....	20
Main Findings .....	20
Limitations .....	21
APPENDIX A.....	22
APPENDIX B.....	29

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Demographic and Employment Characteristics.....	18
--	----



## CHAPTER ONE

### PROBLEM FORMULATION

#### Child Welfare

Child welfare workers investigate child abuse and neglect, and they work with families that are typically stuck in a cycle of generational abuse, due to the lack of resources. There were approximately 9,864 child welfare workers in the United States (Zippia, 2022). Zippia (2022), also showed there to be 7,011 child welfare caseworkers to be employed in the United States as of 2022. There were no discernable differences mentioned between the professions of child welfare worker and child welfare caseworker. Child welfare workers typically hold a bachelor's degree in Sociology, Psychology, Criminal Justice, and Social Work (Zippia 2022). Child welfare workers are in constant demand with a need for effective social workers consistently falling short.

#### Turnover in Child Welfare

Despite the important role that child welfare workers play, an issue that has plagued child welfare agencies is the high turnover rate of child welfare workers. The turnover rate for child welfare workers is among the highest among the various professions (Casey Foundation, 2017). It is reported that the turnover rates range from 30 to 60% in a typical year (Mor et al., 2001). The high turnover rate for child welfare workers is an ongoing issue that has yet to stabilize.

### Contributors of Turnover

Mor et al. (2001) suggested some factors that contributed to the high turnover rate. Curry and colleagues (2005) suggested lack of training led and transfer of learning to high child welfare worker turnover

According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation (2019), the top four contributors to the high turnover rate include, stress, emotional exhaustion, low job satisfaction, and the negative perception of the organization's commitment to employees.

In 2016, a grand jury investigation of the San Bernardino County Children and Family Services revealed several issues in the organization. The issues highlighted were inadequate training, poor documentation writing, and high caseloads. The investigation revealed that the turnover rate was due to workers leaving to higher-paying counties which lead to the high caseloads. (Nelson, 2016)

### Retention of Child Welfare Workers

Research has explored factors that influence retention among child welfare workers. For example, Curry and colleagues (2005) found that more training, higher levels of support in transitioning out of training, demographic variables such as but not limited to experience, age, and education, and lower caseload size increased the likelihood of retention with workers. In a separate study, Katz et al. (2021) explored the impact of perceived leadership and how it affected the turnover of frontline workers in a large northeastern city. The study found that agencies with workers who had a positive perception of leadership appeared to have more intention of staying with the agency (Katz et al., 2021).

De Guzman et al. (2019) investigated two studies that examined retention strategies and supports for child welfare workers. The first study examined the intention of newly hired child welfare workers to remain with the agency. The second study examined predictors of a child welfare worker remaining with the agency. The second study found that support by peers and the organization, supervision, and self-efficacy were key predictors of worker remaining with the agency.

Findings from this body of research studies show the effect that the work environment can have on the retention of child welfare workers. A supported worker with a positive perception of leadership allows a worker to feel confident in such a high-stress environment. Despite the inconsistent nature of child welfare, consistency in support leads to a positive environment, which in turn suggests office morale plays a part in retention/turnover as well.

### Impact of High Turnover

Turnover among child welfare workers is an issue because it affects the agency in terms of costs, social workers in terms of caseloads, and families and children in terms of permanency (Casey Foundation, 2017). The Casey Foundation (2017) suggested that the turnover increases caseloads in child welfare workers that remain with the agency, which in turn causes high stress, emotional exhaustion, and low job satisfaction. The costs incurred is through hiring and training new staff and paying overtime to child welfare workers that remain with the

agency. The turnover rate also leads to costs in time for children in the foster care system and child abuse/neglect investigations. (The Casey Foundation, 2017).

### Solutions

Research has been conducted to explore the solutions to address the issue of high turnover among child welfare workers. For example, Willis et al. (2016) examined the common interventions that have been used in Texas. The researchers described a stipend initiative that was introduced to the investigative workers of the Texas Public Welfare system in 2008. The stipend was shown to have little to no effect considering the turnover rate among investigative workers remained at approximately 33% in 2009 from 31% in 2005 (Willis et al., 2016). The study also described other interventions such as but not limited to a mentoring program, a reward system, and an Employee Exit Survey to better understand the turnover rate. Willis et al. (2016) concluded that there had been no significant decline in the turnover rate regardless of the interventions.

San Bernardino County Children' and Family Services articles highlighted several interventions such as, but not limited to: hiring experienced staff and also partnering with the California Social Work Education Center (CaISWEC) and the Public Child Welfare Training Academy (PCWT). What was hoped was that hiring experienced staff would fill the vacancies left by previous staff. Also, the partnerships with CaISWEC and PCWT would alleviate the concerns that San Bernardino County social workers were not trained enough. Despite the

implementation of these interventions, there is little to no evidence to support the trainings effectiveness thus far (Nelson, 2016).

### Conclusion

The idea that child welfare worker turnover is consistently high and negatively affects the agency and served populations continues (Griffiths et al., 2020). The families and children served are at a disservice and the turnover rate remain high throughout the years due to an emotionally overworked individual. There are suggestions and recommendations of methods to retain child welfare workers, but how can these methods be implemented more effectively throughout the system?

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Staff Turnover in Child Welfare

The high turnover rate among child welfare agency workers has been examined from multiple aspects but has yet to be alleviated. The issue has been described as a “serious and well-documented problem” (Curry et al., 2019). Kim and Kao (2014) stated the “severity and prevalence” of child welfare turnover pushes the need of further investigation. This chapter summarizes the research findings on turnover in child welfare agencies, which include the effects and contributing factors.

#### Effects of High Turnover

Some perspectives that were considered when investigating the child welfare turnover were that of a youth in the foster care system (Curry, 2019) and administration (Griffiths, 2020). Curry (2019) investigated the effects of the child welfare turnover and how it impacts youth in the foster care system. What was found was that the child welfare worker turnover negatively affected the youth due to the abrupt transition. It was described that the workers’ exit was considered to be another traumatic loss to a youth that could be struggling with ongoing feelings of abandonment.

## Factors Associated with High Turnover Rate

Summarized here are the factors that have been examined to be associated with child welfare workers' turnover. Turnover has been measured in two ways, intention to leave or remain employed.

Workers' Demographic. Characteristics Some studies mentioned differences in demographics, but it has been well-documented that demographics do not affect turnover intention. In contrast, workers' demographics had the weakest effect on workers' intention to turnover (Kim & Kao, 2014).

Organization Characteristics. Key factors of turnover intention mentioned throughout the literature were the worker's perception of the work environment, perception of support, perception of leadership, and other job factors (Kim & Kao, 2014; Kruzich et al, 2014; Griffiths et al, 2020). Kim and Kao (2014) conducted a meta-analysis of 26 studies to identify the predictors of turnover intention among front-line public child welfare workers in the United States. Results revealed that intention of turnover was most strongly linked to workers' attitudes and perceptions of organizational culture, professionalism, and fair pay (Kim & Kao, 2014). In another study, Kruzich et al. (2014) examined 1,040 public child welfare workers' team psychological safety and perception of organization and supervisory support and their effect on the intention to stay. The study noted a significant and positive association between a worker's positive perception of supervisory and administrative support associated with the worker's intention to stay with the agency (Kruzich et al, 2014). In a qualitative study conducted by Griffiths et al (2020), the researchers sought to

explore themes of how to improve child welfare worker retention. The researchers found overarching themes related to ways to improve retention. These were “compensation, decreased workload, organizational culture, job factors, professional development, frontline supervision, performance management, leverage external partners, and competent and engage leadership” (Griffiths et al, 2020).

Title IV-E. Another factor that has been examined is the impact of the Title IV-E program on child welfare turnover (Barbee et al., 2017 & Wilke et al., 2017). The Title IV-E program encourages employment longevity by incentivizing education with equal employment obligation and has had a positive impact in the field of social work. A study conducted by Barbee et al (2017) looked at the effects of a state intervention through the implementation of the Title IV-E program on child welfare workers’ intention to exit the job. The study found that not only did more Title IV-E graduates remain employed with the agency, but they also left at a slower rate (Barbee et al., 2017). The study conducted by Wilke et al. (2017) suggested participation in the Title IV-E program was a “consistent predictor of longer employment tenure”.

#### Solutions to High Turnover

Research has also examined how to address the ongoing and serious issue of high turnover rate among child welfare workers. These studies have primarily interviewed administrators and supervisory staff. Griffiths et al (2020), pointed out that those in administration were the middle management that worked close enough to frontline workers to identify some changes that can be taken. In the qualitative study by Griffith



et al (2020), the researchers found that receiving suggestions from administration could close the gap between macro and micro practices.

### Gap in Knowledge

Although research has investigated the factors that affect high turnover rate, less is known about the steps that need to be taken to combat factors found to be linked to higher child welfare turnover.

### Aim of Study

The purpose of this study will be to explore this issue from the perspective of present and former child welfare workers in southern California counties. Given that research has found an association between psychological safety and intention to stay, this study will examine solutions to increase psychological safety.

### Significance of Study

Findings from this study will provide suggestions to reduce child welfare worker turnover.

### Possible Theories

There are two theories that can help provide insight into factors behind child welfare worker turnover. The first being the Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 2020) and the second being the Multidimensional Theory of Burnout (Cooper, 1998).

In 1986, Robert Eisenberger et al. developed the Organizational Support Theory or the Perceived Organizational Support Theory. This theory aimed to explain how

employees will obtain a general perception of the workplace based on how much the organization cares for the employee's contribution. (Eisenberger et al., 2020)

In 1982, Christina Maslach came up with the Multidimensional Theory of Burnout which breaks down burnout into three components of: "emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment" (Cooper, 1998). The component of emotional exhaustion is defined as a person's individual stress dimension. The component of depersonalization is defined as a person's loss of idealism which leads to cynical and overall negative responses. The last component of reduced personal accomplishment is described as the individual's self-evaluation dimension. The theory goes on to describe burnout as "an individual stress experience ..., that involves the person's conception of self and others" (Cooper, 1998). The idea of burnout essentially reduces to the idea of a person getting mentally tired and slowly detaching from their life. (Cooper, 1998)

Both theories give some insight as to intrinsic factors that can affect a child welfare worker's decision to move on from the field therefore affecting the turnover rate. Other factors that may be included are secondary trauma or compassion fatigue.

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODOLOGY

#### Study Design

This observational study used cross-sectional design to gather quantitative data to examine the relationship between psychological safety and turnover intention among current and former child welfare social workers.

#### Participants

Eligible participants were at least 18-years of age or older; have previous or current experience as a child welfare worker at a county agency; assigned to the front-end or back-end programs. Child welfare workers in specialized programs such as adoptions, extended youth services under AB-12, and court services were excluded from this study.

#### Recruitment

Participants were recruited using nonprobability sampling, specifically convenience and snowball sampling methods. The research flyer contained a brief description of the study and invited eligible individuals to participate, was posted on the Co-PI's personal Facebook and Instagram pages. The flyer was also widely shared with the Co-PI's social network (the email script is attached). Individuals who received the research flyer and met the study's eligibility criteria were able to self-enroll by scanning the QR code or clicking on the link provided on the recruitment flyer. Doing so directed them to the online survey. Before completing the survey, prospective participants were invited to complete a screening

questionnaire to determine their eligibility before being directed to the informed consent document and the survey. Once their eligibility had been established, prospective participants were invited to read the informed consent. Prospective participants were provided consent to participate by checking a box at the bottom of the informed consent document that read, "I have read and understood the consent document and agree to participate in your study".

### Study Procedure

Quantitative data was gathered using self-report validated questionnaires posted online. Participants were asked a few demographic questions, followed by questions about their psychological safety, and concluding with questions about their intention to leave the county agency. Completing the survey was estimated to take approximately 15-20 minutes, and participants did not receive monetary compensation. Participants were invited to complete a survey only once. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the University Institutional Review Board (IRB).

### Measures

Demographics. The following demographic characteristics data were gathered: participants' age at the time of research participation, gender (male, female, non-binary, prefer not to say), race/ethnicity (white, black or African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latinx), employment status (current child welfare worker, previous child welfare worker), name of county agency employment program (front-

end/investigations, back-end/reunification), duration in position, promotion status (none, lead unit worker, supervisor, manager), the highest level of education (Bachelor's, Master's, Doctorate), licensure status (pursuing licensure, not pursuing licensure, licensure obtained), title IV-E recipient (yes, no), and recipient of therapeutic services due to working in child welfare (none, some, yes).

Psychological Safety. The Psychological Safety Survey (Edmondson, 1999) was used to determine participants' comfort in the work environment. This survey has three subsections: Individual Safety, Team Respect, and Team Learning. Some example items include "I won't receive retaliation or criticism if I admit to an error or mistake", "members of this team could easily describe the value of other's contributions," and "we take time to find new ways to improve our team's work process." The survey statements are rated on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is *strongly disagree*, 3 is *neutral*, and 5 is *strongly agree*. The 11-item survey is a self-report measure where the response options were summed and then divided by the number of items in the scale to find an average score.

Turnover Intention. The Turnover Intention Scale (Roodt, 2004) is a 15-item scale that measures intention to leave an organization. The scale asks questions such as: "how satisfying is your job in fulfilling your personal needs" and "how often do you look forward to another day at work." The participants were asked to rate their agreement to the statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with responses ranging from never/always, very satisfying/totally dissatisfying, highly unlikely/highly likely, to no extent/to a very large extent, and never/all of the time. The questionnaire is a

self-report measure. The response options were summed and then divided by the number of items in the scale to find an average score, with three questions being reverse scored (“to what extent do responsibilities prevent you from quitting your job”, “to what extent do the benefits associated with your current job prevent you from quitting your job”, and “to what extent does the ‘fear of the unknown’, prevent you from quitting”).

### Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analyses were performed to yield summary statistics of participants' demographics, level of psychological safety, and level of turnover intention. Pearson product-moment correlation analyses were performed to examine the relationship between psychological safety and turnover intention. Statistical significance will be determined at  $p\text{-value} < .05$ . Analyses will be performed with SPSS using data from participants with complete information.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

#### Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 displays the sample's demographic characteristics. The study sample consisted of all females ( $n=13$ , 100%) who identified as current child welfare workers. Most of the study sample identified as White/Caucasian ( $n=5$ , 38.46%) and identified the county of San Bernardino as their county agency of employment ( $n=7$ , 53.85%). The average age for the participant in this study was 40.7 years ( $SD=9.9$ , range=27—58). The standard deviation suggests child welfare social workers come from a wide variability of ages. Most participants reported having a Master's degree ( $n=10$ , 76.92%) and being recipients of Title IV-E ( $n=10$ , 76.92%). The majority of participants did not appear to pursue licensure ( $n=7$ , 53.85%), but were employed with the county agency for an average of 6.7 years ( $SD=4.38$ , range 1.6-17).

#### Employment Characteristics

Table 1 displays the sample's employment demographic characteristics. Participants mostly identified with working in the back-end or reunification services of child welfare ( $n=10$ , 76.92%) for an average of 4.7 years ( $SD=4.35$ , range=0.5-16). With regards to promotions throughout their career as a child welfare worker, most participants did not report a promotion ( $n=8$ , 61.54%). This could suggest a limited need for promotion by the worker or limited opportunities for promotions amongst child welfare workers within county agencies. Most

participants reported they had not received therapeutic services due to their work in child welfare ( $n=7$ , 53.8%).

### Psychological Safety

The average for the Psychological Safety tool was 3.46 ( $SD=.69$ , range=2.18-4.27). The average score of the tool suggests that the participants neither strongly agreed nor strongly disagreed that they felt their work environment was psychologically safe. The subsection "Individual Safety" had an average of 3.48 ( $SD=.72$ , range=2.25-4.50), the subsection of "Team Respect" showed an average score of 3.59 ( $SD=.88$ , range= 2.00-4.33), while the subsection "Team Learning" had an average score of 3.33 ( $SD=.79$ , range=1.75-4.25).

### Turnover Intention

The average for the Turnover Intention tool was 2.91 ( $SD=.52$ , range= 2.20-4.13). The average score of the tool suggests that the participants neither had high intentions to leave their employment in child welfare, nor did they have low intentions to leave their employment.

### Relationships among Variables

Turnover Intention and Individual Safety. The finding from the correlation analysis indicates a strong negative correlation between turnover intention and individual safety,  $r = -.58$ ,  $n = 13$ ,  $p < .036$ , with higher levels of individual safety associated with lower levels of turnover intention. The correlation coefficient is statistically significant.



Turnover Intention and Team Respect. The finding from the correlation analysis indicates a weak negative correlation between turnover intention and team respect,  $r = -.14$ ,  $n = 13$ ,  $p < .647$ , with higher levels of team respect associated with lower levels of turnover intention. The correlation coefficient is statistically insignificant.

Turnover Intention and Team Learning. The finding from the correlation analysis indicates a weak positive correlation between turnover intention and team learning,  $r = .13$ ,  $n = 13$ ,  $p < .676$ , with higher levels of team learning associated with higher levels of turnover intention. The correlation coefficient is statistically insignificant.

Turnover Intention and Psychological Safety. The finding from the correlation analysis indicates a weak negative correlation between turnover intention and individual safety,  $r = -.22$ ,  $n = 13$ ,  $p < .478$ , with higher levels of individual safety associated with lower levels of turnover intention. The correlation coefficient is statistically insignificant.

Table 1.

***Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Demographic and Employment Characteristics (N = 13)***

Variables	<i>n</i> (%)
Age, <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	40.7 (10.0)
Gender	13 (100)
Ethnicity	
White / Caucasian	5(38.5)
Hispanic	4(30.8)
Black / African American	3(23.1)
Other	1(7.7)
Education	
Master's	10(76.9)
Bachelor's	3(23.1)
Title-IV E Recipient	10(76.9)
Licensing Status	
Not pursuing	7(53.8)
Pursuing	4(30.8)
Obtained	2(15.4)
Length of Employment at Child Welfare Agency, <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	6.7(4.4)
County	
San Bernardino	7(53.8)
Riverside	5(38.5)
Los Angeles	1(7.7)
Program	
Back-End/Reunification Services	10(76.9)
Front-End/Investigations	3(23.1)
Length Spent in Program <sup>a</sup> , <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	4.7(4.3)
Promotion	
None	8(61.5)
Supervisor	3(23.1)
Lead Unit Worker	2(15.4)
Therapy Received <sup>b</sup>	
No	7(53.8)
Yes	5(38.5)
Some	1(7.7)
Psychological Safety, <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	3.5(.69)
Team Learning	3.3(7.9)

Team Respect	3.6(.88)
Individual Safety	3.5(.72)
Turnover Intention, <i>M</i> , ( <i>SD</i> )	2.9(.52)

---

<sup>a</sup>Length spent in investigation or reunification services

<sup>b</sup>Therapy received due to employment at child welfare agency

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION

#### Main Findings

This study explored the relationship between psychological safety within a child welfare agency and turnover intention amongst currently employed child welfare social workers. The aims of this study were to better understand the relationship in an attempt to suggest steps to take in order to reduce turnover intention. Participants showed a significant finding in the relationship between turnover intention and individual safety. This finding suggests when workers feel safe in the workplace, there is a lower chance that they want to leave the agency. Feeling safe in the workplace would include feelings of acknowledgement when in a team setting and experiencing no fear of retaliation or criticism. Findings from this study somewhat supported the hypothesis.

Three of four correlation analyses (turnover intention and individual safety, turnover intention and team respect, and turnover intention and psychological safety) supported the hypothesis in showing a negative correlation between turnover intention and aspects of psychological safety. However, the findings except for team respect, team learning, and psychological safety were not statistically significant, likely due to the small sample size. The correlation between turnover intention and team learning showed a positive correlation which does not support the hypothesis. Further exploration into these variables is needed to better understand its impact.

A finding of a statistically significant negative correlation between individual safety and turnover intention is consistent with past studies (Boyas et al., 2013 and Griffiths et al., 2020). For example, Boyas et al. (2013) examined the relationship between social capital and factors that influenced turnover intention among child welfare workers. The study found that support within the agency is important for reducing a child welfare worker's intention to leave the agency (Boyas et al, 2013). The study defined social capital as trust/cooperation, social relationships with coworkers and supervisors, organizational commitment, communication, influence, and fairness (Boyas et al, 2013), which overlaps with the current's study definition of individual safety that include trust/ cooperation and social relationships with coworkers.

#### Limitations

This study was unable to gather enough information to determine whether there is a significant relationship between psychological safety turnover intention. The sample was able to suggest, thus far, that neutral psychological safety may have little to no relationship with turnover intention. The limited number participants from diverse county agencies also restricts the generalizability of the study across southern California.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION TOOL WITH IRB APPROVED INFORMED CONSENT

Screener Questions\*

At least 18 years of age

Current Child Welfare Worker

Informed Consent:

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate the effects of support on the turnover rate in child welfare social workers. This study is being conducted by Maleena Flores under the supervision of Dr. Caroline Lim, Assistant Professor of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between your experience of support at your county agency and any intention to leave the county agency.

**DESCRIPTION:** If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to provide information on yourself such as gender, race/ethnicity, age range, county of employment (past or present), position (front-end or back-end), highest level of education, licensure status, if you were a Title IV-E recipient, and your turnover intention (past or present) along with your experience of support.

**PARTICIPATION:** Your participation is completely voluntary. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. You may skip or not answer any questions. You can also freely withdraw from participation at any time. To do so, simply exit the survey. The alternative to participation is not to participate.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** We will be gathering anonymous data. This means we will not collect any information that will identify you (e.g., your name, social security number, contact information, video recording). We will present findings from this study in group format only so that no results will be connected to a participant. We will protect the data against inappropriate access by restricting data access to authorized study personnel. We will store the data on computers or laptops secured with individual ID plus password protection. Additionally, the folder containing the data will be protected with a password known to authorized study personnel. We will destroy the data three years after the project has ended.

**DURATION:** Your participation in the study will last approximately 15 to 20 minutes or less. You will be asked to complete the survey only once.

**RISKS:** Some of the questions may make you feel uneasy or embarrassed. You may also provide sensitive and personal information. You can choose to skip or stop answering any questions that make you uncomfortable. You can also withdraw from participation at any time with no consequences.

**BENEFITS:** There are no direct benefits to the research participants. However, findings from this study have the potential to advance knowledge on turnover intention and psychological safety.

**CONTACT:** If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please contact Dr. Caroline Lim [caroline.lim@csusb.edu](mailto:caroline.lim@csusb.edu) or 909-537-5584. You can also contact the California State University, San Bernardino, Institutional Review Board at 909-537-7588.

**RESULTS:** After the completion and publication of the study, results can be found at California State University, San Bernardino, John M. Pfau Library (5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407; 909-537-5090/5091).

Your answer

**Confirmation Statement\***

- I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

Gender Identification

Female

Male

Non-binary

Prefer not to say

Ethnicity/Race: Mark all that apply

White/Caucasian

Black/African-American

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Asian

Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Hispanic/Latine

Other:

Age

Your answer

How long have you been employed with a child welfare county agency?



Your answer

Name of County Agency

Your answer

Employment Program

Front-End/Investigations

Back-End/Reunification Services

Length of time Employed in Program

Your answer

Promotion Status

Lead Unit Worker

Supervisor

Manager

None

Highest Level of Education

Bachelor's

Master's

Doctorate

Licensure Status

Pursuing Licensure

Not Pursuing Licensure

Licensure Obtained

Title IV-E Recipient

Yes

No

Have you received therapeutic services due to your employment with child welfare?

Yes

Some

No

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "In this team, it is easy to discuss difficult issues and problems."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "I won't receive retaliation or criticism if I admit to an error or mistake."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "It is easy to ask a member of this team for help."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "I feel safe offering new ideas, even if they aren't fully-formed plans."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "In this team, people are accepted for being different."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "My teammates welcome my ideas and give them time and attention."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "Members of this team could easily describe the value of other's contributions."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "In this team, people talk about mistakes and ways to improve and learn from them."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "We take time to find new ways to improve our team's work processes."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "Members of this team raise concerns they have about team plans or decisions."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "We try to discover our underlying assumptions and seek counter-arguments about issues under discussion."

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "How often have you considered leaving your job?"

Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How frequently do you scan the newspapers in search of alternative job opportunities?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 All of the time

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How satisfying is your job in fulfilling your personal needs?"  
Very Satisfying 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Dissatisfying

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How often are your personal values at work compromised?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?"  
Highly Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Likely

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How often do you look forward to another day at work?"  
Always 1 2 3 4 5 Never

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How often do you think about starting your own business?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " To what extent do responsibilities prevent you from quitting your job?"  
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " To what extent do the benefits associated with your current job prevent you from quitting your job?"  
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " How frequently are you emotionally agitated when arriving home after work?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 All of the time

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " To what extent does your current job have a negative effect on your personal well-being?"  
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: " To what extent does the "fear of the unknown", prevent you from quitting?"  
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Please rate your agreement of the following statement using the scale below: "How frequently do you scan the internet in search of alternative job opportunities?"  
Never 1 2 3 4 5 All of the time

APPENDIX B  
IRB APPROVAL LETTER



December 12, 2022

**CSUSB INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

Administrative/Exempt Review Determination

Status: Determined Exempt

IRB-FY2023-163

Caroline Lim Maleena Flores  
CSBS - Social Work  
California State University, San Bernardino  
5500 University Parkway  
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Caroline Lim Maleena Flores:

Your application to use human subjects, titled “Effect of Support on Turnover Rate in Chile Welfare Workers” has been reviewed and determined exempt by the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of CSU, San Bernardino. An exempt determination means your study had met the federal requirements for exempt status under 45 CFR 46.104. The CSUSB IRB has weighed the risks and benefits of the study to ensure the protection of human participants.

This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional campus approvals which may be required including access to CSUSB campus facilities and affiliate campuses. Investigators should consider the changing COVID-19 circumstances based on current CDC, California Department of Public Health, and campus guidance and submit appropriate protocol modifications to the IRB as needed. CSUSB campus and affiliate health screenings should be completed for all campus human research related activities. Human research activities conducted at off-campus sites should follow CDC, California Department of Public Health, and local guidance. See CSUSB's [COVID-19 Prevention Plan](#) for more information regarding campus requirements.

You are required to notify the IRB of the following as mandated by the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) federal regulations 45 CFR 46 and CSUSB IRB policy. The forms (modification, renewal, unanticipated/adverse event, study closure) are located in the Cayuse IRB System with instructions provided on the IRB Applications, Forms, and Submission webpage. Failure to notify the IRB of the following requirements may result in disciplinary action. The Cayuse IRB system will notify you when your protocol is due for renewal. Ensure

you file your protocol renewal and continuing review form through the Cayuse IRB system to keep your protocol current and active unless you have completed your study.

- **Ensure your CITI Human Subjects Training is kept up-to-date and current throughout the study.**
- **Submit a protocol modification (change) if any changes (no matter how minor) are proposed in your study for review and approval by the IRB before being implemented in your study.**
- **Notify the IRB within 5 days of any unanticipated or adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research.**
- **Submit a study closure through the Cayuse IRB submission system once your study has ended.**

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, the Research Compliance Officer. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at [mgillesp@csusb.edu](mailto:mgillesp@csusb.edu). Please include your application approval number IRB-FY2023-163 in all correspondence. Any complaints you receive from participants and/or others related to your research may be directed to Mr. Gillespie.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

*King-To Yeung*

King-To Yeung, Ph.D., IRB Chair  
CSUSB Institutional Review Board

KY/MG

## REFERENCES

- Barbee, A.; Rice, C.; Antle, B.F; Henry, K.; & Cunningham, M.R. (2017). Factors affecting turnover rates of public child welfare front line workers: Comparing cohorts of title IV-E program graduates with regularly hired and trained staff. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*. 12:3. p.354-379. *Children and youth services review*. 99. p.374-385.
- Boyas, J. F.; Wind, L. H.; & Ruiz, E. (2013). Organizational tenure among child welfare workers, burnout, stress, and intent to leave: Does employment-based social capital make a difference?. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 35(10). p1657-1669.
- Curry, A. (2019). If you can't be with this client for some years, don't do it: Exploring the emotional and relational effects of turnover on youth in the child welfare system.
- Curry, D., McCarragher, T., & Dellmann-Jenkins, M. (2005). Training, transfer, and turnover: Exploring the relationship among transfer of learning factors and staff retention in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 27 (8). p. 931-948. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2004.12.008>
- Cooper, C. (1998) *A multidimensional theory of burnout*. Theories of organizational stress. Oxford University Press. p.68-85
- de Guzman, A., Carver-Roberts, T., Leake, R., & Rienks, S. (2020) Retention of child welfare workers: staying strategies and supports. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*. 14 (1). p.60-79.



- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 44(2). p350-383.
- Eisenberger, R.; Shanock, L. R., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. (7). p.101-124
- Griffiths, A.; Collins-Camargo, C.; Horace, A.; Gabbard, J; & Royse, D. (2020). A new perspective: Administrator recommendations for reducing child welfare turnover. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*. 44:5. p.417-433.
- Katz, C. C.; Julien-Chinn, F. J. & Wall, E. (2021) Perceptions of agency leadership and intent to stay: an examination of turnover in the child welfare workforce. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*.16(3). p.302- 320.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2021.1876808>
- Kim, H. & Kao, D. (2014) A meta-analysis of turnover intention predictors among U.S. child welfare workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 44. p.214-223.
- Kruzich, J.M.; Mienko, J.A.; & Courtney, M.E. (2014). Individual and work group influences on turnover intention among public child welfare workers: The effects of work group psychological safety. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 42. p.20-27.
- Mor Barak, M. E., Nissly, J. A., & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service

- employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and metanalysis. *Social Service Review*, 75(4), p. 625–661. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323166>
- Nelson, J. (2016). San Bernardino County responds to grand jury findings on Children and Family Services. *The Sun*.
- Roodt, R. (2004). Turnover intention scale.
- The Annie Casey Foundation. (2019). Top causes of staff turnover at child welfare agencies — And what to do about it. <https://www.aecf.org/blog/top-causes-of-staff-turnover-at-child-welfare-agencies-and-what-to-do-about>.
- The Annie Casey Foundation. (2017). How does turnover affect outcomes and what can be done to address retention?. <https://www.casey.org/turnover-costs-and-retentionstrategies/#:~:text=Turnover%20rates&text=Even%20higher%20average%20rates%20of,trainees%3A%2046%E2%80%9354%20percent>.
- Wilke, D.J; Radey, M.; King, E.; Spinelli, C.; Rakes, S.; & Nolan, C.R. (2017) A multi-level conceptual model to examine child welfare worker turnover and retention decisions. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*. 12:2. p. 204-231.
- Willis, N., Chavkin, N., & Leung, P. (2016). Finding “health” and “meaning” in Texas-sized turnover: Application of seminal management principles for administration and research in U.S. public child welfare agencies. *Authors*. 17(2). DOI: 10.18060/20856.
- Zippia (2022) Child welfare caseworker demographics and statistics in the US. <https://www.zippia.com/child-welfare-caseworker-jobs/demographics/>

Zippia (2022) Child welfare worker demographics and statistics in the US.

<https://www.zippia.com/child-welfare-worker-jobs/demographics/>