

INTENTION

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership and Governance on 15 Mar 2021 (published online), available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/23303131.2021.1898072>.

Title Page

The title of the article

The impact of collective psychological ownership on turnover intention among social service workers

Authors

1st author and corresponding author

Xuebing SU, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong

Email: sabrinax@hku.hk

ORCID: 0000-0001-6224-5829

Address: Room 528, Jockey Club Tower, Centennial Campus, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China.

2nd author:

Kun LIANG, PhD, Associate Professor, East China University of Science and Technology, China

E-mail: liangkun@ecust.edu.cn

ORCID: 0000-0003-1936-9230

Address: Department of Social Work, East China University of Science and Technology, 130 Meilong Rd., Shanghai 200237, China.

3rd author:

Victor WONG, PhD, Professor, Department of Social Work, Hong Kong Baptist University

Email: vicwong@hkbu.edu.hk

ORCID: 0000-0001-5359-8147

Address: AAB1028, Academic and administration building, Department of Social Work, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong

Authorship

Xuebing Su: designed and implemented the study, conducted data collection and data analysis, drafted the article, and revised the manuscript according to reviewers' comments

Kun Liang: supported the data collection and data analysis and drafted the article

Victor Wong: revised the manuscript based on reviewers' comments

Correspondence

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Dr. Xuebing Su, Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.

E-mail: sabrinax@hku.hk; Tel.: (852) 3910 2465

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

We have sought advice from the following scholar regarding the concept of CPO. To avoid any conflict of interest, we suggest not inviting him to be a reviewer for this study:

Professor Jon Pierce, Ph.D.

Morse-Alumni Distinguished Professor of Organization & Management;

Faculty of Organizational Behavior, University of Minnesota Duluth

Email: jpierce@d.umn.edu

Funding acknowledgement

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethics approval statement & consent form

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Hong Kong and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. All participants were well informed about the objectives of the research and signed a consent form before joining the research.

Data availability statement

The dataset used for this manuscript belongs to the first author.

The Impact of Collective Psychological Ownership on Turnover Intention among Social Service Workers

Abstract

The aim of this study is to incorporate collective psychological ownership (CPO) as psychological resources into the job demands-resources (JD-R) model and investigate the impact of CPO on turnover intention among social service workers. Using snowball and convenience sampling methods, the study conducted an online self-report survey among a total of 761 full-time social service workers in Guangdong, China. Controlling for psychosocial correlates of turnover intention in the JD-R model (i.e. job demands, job resources, burnout, and work engagement) as revealed by prior studies, multinomial logistic regression analyses indicated that CPO was negatively associated with turnover intention. The effects of CPO to turnover intention may inspire more discussion on incorporating psychological resources into the JD-R model for explaining turnover intention in organizational contexts and have important implications for retaining manpower in value-driven human-helping professions in particular. (135 words)

Keywords: collective psychological ownership, turnover intention, job demands, job resources, work burnout, work engagement

The issue of turnover intention of social service workers including social workers is particularly pronounced (Kim et al., 2012; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Mor Barak et al., 2001). Social service workers who stay at the organizations but with strong intention to leave may show counter-productive behaviors, such as frequent absence, frequent sick leave, and poor job performance (Farquharson et al., 2012), and turnover intention is also taken as a strong predictor of the actual act of turnover and most often the last stage preceding actual turnover (Shields & Ward, 2001). In contrast to most prior studies focusing on various sparse predictors such as demographic factors (e.g., gender, age, and educational attainment), job-related factors (e.g., organizational size, job position, and monthly income), the job demands-resources (JD-R) model has been perceived as one of the most overarching and widely used models to explain turnover intention of social workers (Bakker et al., 2004; Bakker & Demerouti, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). However, merely emphasizing the impact of contextual and organizational demands and resources on social workers' turnover intention, extant research on the JD-R model opts to overlook the effect of psychological resources enjoyed by social workers on their turnover intention. Thus, the present study aimed to incorporate collective psychological ownership (CPO), an emerging psychological concept, into the JD-R model and examine its effect on social workers' turnover intention.

The job demands-resources model and turnover intention of social workers.

Recent studies on turnover intention informed by the JD-R mode have revealed that, in addition to socio-demographic and job-related factors, some psychosocial correlates such as job demands, job resources, work burnout and work engagement, may influence employees' turnover intention (Chen & Chen, 2012; Gabel Shemueli et al., 2016; Jourdain & Chênevert, 2010). Job demands and job resources are two overarching constructs which comprise various work conditions (Crawford et al., 2010; Trépanier et al., 2014). Job demands refer to those physical,

social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain psychological costs (e.g. burnout) and include aspects such as workload, time pressure, and difficult physical environments (Crawford et al., 2010). Job resources refer to those aspects of the job that are functional in achieving work goals, stimulate personal growth and development, and reduce job demands and their associated physiological and psychological costs including aspects such as job control, opportunities for development, participation in decision making, task variety, feedback, and organizational/collegial support (Crawford et al., 2010). According to the JD-R model, most of the sparse organizational factors that demand efforts of social workers and thus lead to their turnover intention and those that support social workers with opportunities and resources will motivate them to stay in their job are included into job demands and job resources, respectively (Demerouti et al., 2000; Bothma & Roodt, 2013).

Other than emphasizing the positive impact of job demands and the negative impact of job resources on turnover intention, studies informed by the JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006; Chen & Chen, 2012; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) also highlighted two mediators through which job demands or job resources influence turnover intention: work burnout and work engagement. Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity (Maslach, 1996). Burnout as a positive predictor of turnover intention has been widely acknowledged (Chong & Monroe, 2015; Leunissen et al., 2018). Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind, which is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker, 2011). The rise of the concept of work engagement or simply engagement in the past decades leads to more discussion about the tangled relationship between work burnout

and engagement and their effects on turnover intention in the JD-R model (Antoinette Bargagliotti, 2012; Bakker et al., 2008). With the support of empirical evidence in the past decade, the JD-R model highlighted two processes which elaborated how work burnout and engagement mediate the impact of job demands and job resources on turnover intention: in the energetic process, workers suffering from higher level of job demands are more likely to burn out and thus more likely to report turnover intention, and in the motivation process, workers enjoying more job resources are more engaged at work and are thus less likely to report turnover intention (Chen et al., 2012; Korunka et al., 2009; Schaufeli & Taris, 2013). Despite of the strengths of the JD-R model, it mostly places an emphasis on contextual and organizational resources and demands and, to a lesser extent, on personal agency or psychological resources (Bothma et al., 2013; Fernet et al., 2013; Schaufeli & Taris, 2013). There is therefore a need to incorporate psychological resources, such as collective psychological ownership (CPO), into the JD-R model.

Collective psychological ownership (CPO) and turnover intention of social workers

Some recent studies (Ng & Su, 2019; Su, 2020) suggest that CPO, an emerging psychological construct in industrial and organizational psychology, may have the potential to influence turnover intention of social workers, and thus can be incorporated into the JD-R model. There exist two streams of the conceptualization of the concept: territorial and non-territorial notions of CPO. Adopting a territorial stream of conceptualization, Pierce and Jussila (2010; 2011) defined CPO as the sense or feeling held by groupmates that the target is theirs. Territorial CPO highlights the collective sense of possessiveness held by group mates within a group in an entitlement sense without addressing the importance of non-exclusionary sharedness (Schmid et al., 2013) and reflexive learning. Informed by a growing awareness of the negative outcomes of territorial CPO such as avoidance to positive changes and groupthink (Pierce & Jussila, 2010;

Pierce et al., 2018), Su and colleagues (2018) re-defined CPO as the collective sense shared by the coworkers that they jointly own the organization and emphasized two specific factors to reveal the non-exclusionary sharedness of the concept, namely shared decision-making and shared hardship endurance. The core question asked by nonterritorial CPO in organizational context is: “How much do we feel that we jointly own the organization?” The two specific factors provide important operational indicators to answer this question. A few empirical studies has revealed the impact of CPO understood in a non-territorial notion on job attitudes and organizational behaviors (Ng & Su, 2019; Su & Ng, 2018, 2019; Su et al., 2020).

According to the conceptualization of Su & Ng (2018), CPO is a value-driven phenomenon. That is, shared values in a group of people will arouse their shared sense of ownership towards the group. In other words, people embrace the shared values in an organization are more likely to report a higher level of CPO towards their organization. In view that social work profession in the midst of other human-helping professions is a value-driven profession, CPO may play an important role in influencing social workers’ decision-making and their turnover intention. As a type of psychological resources shared by colleagues, CPO emphasizes the reported willingness of workers to participate in decision-making process and go through hard times with the organization (Su & Ng, 2018). CPO held by social workers may explain why some of them stay in their jobs even when they are working under high level of job demands with low level of job resources. However, no empirical research has been conducted to incorporate CPO as psychological resources into the JD-R model and examine how it influences social workers’ turnover intention after controlling the effects of job demands, job resources, work burnout and engagement.

The present study aims to answer the question of how CPO will add values to the JD-R model for explaining turnover intention of social service workers. A hypothesis is formulated

based on this research question: CPO will be negatively associated with turnover intention among social service workers after controlling for socio-demographic factors (i.e. gender, age, educational attainment, marital status, and family economic condition), job-related factors (i.e. organizational size, job position, monthly income, job tenure, and hours of work per week), and psychosocial predictors of turnover intention revealed by prior studies informed by the JD-R model, including job demands, job resources, work burnout, and work engagement.

Method

Participants

With the use of snowball and convenience sampling method, the study was conducted in Guangdong, a southern province of China, from January 2016 to April 2016. All participants in this study were full-time social service workers, including frontline social workers, social work supervisors, administrative assistants, and different levels of managers employed by social service organizations. Participants were recruited by using email invitations and phone calls requesting representatives of the social service organizations in several cities of Guangdong province of China, including Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Dongguan, and Foshan to circulate the link of a self-report online questionnaire to their employees. It turned out that around 40 representatives from different organizations responded to the research team regarding their willingness to share the information to their staff. We used the widely-used online survey tool in China, *Wenjuanxing*, for the survey and received 777 completed online questionnaires at the end of April 2016. Included in our analyses are all participants who were social service workers with valid data for turnover intention and CPO ($N = 761$). Ethics approval was granted by the Ethics Research Committee of the

University where the first author had pursued doctoral study before conducting the study. Descriptive characteristics for variables used are reported in Table 1.

< Insert Table 1 about here >

As Table 1 shows, close to two-thirds (63.9%) of the participants had professional social work training background and 64.7% were frontline social workers. Most (71.6%) participants were females. Around 95% aged 35 or below, which was similar with the demographic characteristic of social worker population in Guangdong. Over half (60%) of the participants had a Bachelor's degree; near two-thirds (64.5%) were single or unmarried; more than half (61.5%) received very low monthly income less than 4,000 yuan or US\$572. The mean value for the length of participants' job tenure was 2 years. The mean value for the family economic condition of the participants was 3.6 (the item was answered ranging from 1-7).

Measures

Dependent variable: Turnover intention. Turnover intention was measured by two dichotomous questions in terms of yes or no. The first question was: "Have you ever considered leaving the organization in the past one month", which assessed the thinking of leaving the organization. The second question was: "Have you searched for new jobs in the past one month", which assessed the participants' behaviors to prepare for their leaving. The answers to both questions were divided into three levels: level 1 (answered no to both questions, representing that the participant did not think about leaving and no action was taken), level 2 (answered yes to question one and no to question two, suggesting that the participants thought about leaving but no

action was taken), level 3 (answered yes to question two or yes to both of the questions, suggesting that actions were taken to seek for a new job).

Despite a long history of turnover intention studies, the definition of the concept still varies across different studies. Some studies have focused on the cognitive or affective components of turnover intention regarding individuals' attitudes to leave or stay on with their current job (Hui et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2010). Some studies (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Muliawan et al., 2009) emphasized the behavioral aspect of the concept as they agreed that the behavioral intention to leave is more relevant to the final step of the decision-making process before a person conducts the actual act of leaving the current workplace. Given that the behavioral dimension of turnover intention was understood as a higher level of turnover intention than cognitive thinking about leaving, the present study incorporated both workers' thinking about leaving the current organization and their actions taken to find new jobs into the conceptualization of turnover intention.

Independent variable: CPO. The collective psychological ownership scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$) developed and validated by Su and Ng (2018) was adopted. Participants were asked to indicate their own perceptions regarding the shared sense of ownership in their organization according to their own feelings and work experiences by responding to a six-item Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (I hardly feel this way) to 4 (I strongly feel this way). The scale contains six items, three items of which measure the factor of shared decision-making, and the other three items measure the factor of shared-hardship endurance.

Covariates: Socio-demographics, job-related factors, and psychosocial correlates. Socio-demographics included gender, age, educational attainment, marital status, and family economic condition. Gender was measured by a dichotomy with two options: male=0 and

female=1. Participants were asked to report their age range by choosing among the following options: 24 or below, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-59, and 60 or above. Educational attainment was measured by an ordinal variable with the following options: Secondary school or below, Associate degree, Bachelor's degree, Master's degree or above. Marital status was measured by a nominal variable with three options: "single or unmarried", "married or cohabiting", and "separated, widowed or divorced". Family economic condition was measured by a single item that "I think my family economic condition is", and responses were collected on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1= (very tight) to 7 (very well-off).

Job-related factors included organizational size, job position, monthly income, job tenure, and hours of work per week. Participants need to report the size of their current organization by choosing among the following options: >20, 20-49, 50-99, ≥ 100 . Job position was measured by an ordinal variable with four options: administrative assistant, frontline workers, middle manager, and senior manager. Monthly income was reported by choosing among a few options for income range (yuan): $\leq 4,000$, 4,001-5,000, 5,001-6000, and $\geq 6,001$. Participants reported the date when they joined the current organization, the answer of which was further calculated into the unit of year. Participants were asked to report their average weekly working hours in the last month where hour was used as a unit.

Psychosocial correlates revealed by prior studies informed by the JD-R model included job demands, job resources, work burnout, and work engagement. Participants were asked to indicate their job resources on a ten-item scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$) from -3 (very inadequate) to 3 (very adequate), which include supervisors' support, staff training, financial resources of the organization, and social network of the organization. Participants were asked to indicate their job demands on a nine-item scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$), from -3 (very low) to 3 (very high),

including their workload, working hour demands, organization's demands, and physical demands. The scales of job demands and job resources were developed by Su & Ng (2019). The Chinese version of Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) established by Ngai (1986) and modified by Kay (2007) (Cronbach's $\alpha=.82$) was adopted in this study. It comprised three dimensions and 18 items, including emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. All responses were collected on a five-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The validated nine-item Chinese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) (Cronbach's $\alpha=.94$) (Fong & Ng, 2012) was adopted in the research study. Participants were asked to indicate their work engagement at work by a scale from 0 (never) to 6 (every day).

Analyses

Multinomial logistic regression was conducted to test the hypothesis of the association between CPO and turnover intention. The correlates were entered in two steps to assess the unique relationship of CPO to turnover intention. Model 1 was consisted of socio-demographic and job-related variables (gender, age, educational attainment, marital status, family economic condition, organizational size, job position, monthly income, job tenure, and hours of work per week) and psychosocial correlates (job demands, job resources, work burnout, and work engagement). CPO was entered into Model 2.

Results

Table 1 presents the results of comparison of participants with different levels of turnover intention across independent variables and covariates. The results of ANOVA and Chi-square tests showed three groups of participants reporting different levels of turnover intention varying

significantly across the following variables: job position, family economic condition, job resources, burnout, work engagement, and CPO. Most effect sizes of the inter-associations between variables were relatively low ($<.5$) except the inter-associations between job position and monthly income ($\phi = .93, p < .0001$), job tenure and age group ($\phi = .75, p < .0001$), and job tenure and monthly income ($\phi = .75, p < .0001$). The association of CPO with turnover intention will not be affected by any multicollinearity, as the effect sizes of the inter-associations between CPO and all covariates were lower than $.5$ (Kutner et al., 2004).

Table 2 displays the results of multinomial logistic regressions. Both models were significant in predicting turnover intention. Model 1 indicated that it explained approximately 22.0% to 25.0% of the variance in turnover intention. The results of likelihood ratio tests also revealed that significant correlates of turnover intention included family economic condition ($p < .05^*$), job demands ($p < .01^{**}$), job resources ($p < .05^*$), work burnout ($p < .001^{***}$), and work engagement ($p < .001^{***}$). The confidence interval for family economic condition included the value of one, therefore family economic condition will not be perceived as a statistically significant correlate in the model (Nick & Campbell, 2017).

< Insert Table 2 about here >

When CPO was entered, Model 2 explained approximately 23.0% to 26.0% of the variance in turnover intention. Compared to Model 1, there was a significant increase of 1% in explained variance of turnover intention. As Model 2 shows, CPO was negatively associated with turnover intention after controlling for socio-demographic factors, job-related factors, and psychosocial correlates. More specifically, for every one-unit increase in CPO, there was a 9% decreased odds

for participants to report “thought about leaving my job” versus to report “did not think about leaving my job”. Also, for every one-unit increase in CPO, there was a 7% decreased odds for participants to report “have been seeking for new jobs” versus to report “did not think about leaving my job”.

The results of the likelihood ratio tests in Model 2 also revealed that, besides CPO, significant correlates for turnover intention included family economic condition ($p < .05^*$), job demands ($p < .01^{**}$), work burnout ($p < .001^{***}$), work engagement ($p < .01^{**}$), and job position ($p < .05^*$). The confidence interval for family economic condition included the value of one, therefore family economic condition will not be perceived as a statistically significant correlate in the model (Nick & Campbell, 2017). Specifically, compared with frontline workers, middle managers were 49% less likely to report “have been seeking new jobs” versus to report “did not think about leaving my job”. With every one-unit increase in job demands, participants were 1.04 times more likely to report “thought about leaving my job” relative to “did not think about leaving my job” and 1.05 times more likely to report “have been seeking new jobs” relative to “did not think about leaving my job”, respectively. With every one-unit increase in work burnout, participants were 1.07 times more likely to report “thought about leaving my job” relative to “did not think about leaving my job” and “have been seeking new jobs” relative to “did not think about leaving my job”, respectively. With every one-unit increase of work engagement, there was a 4% decreased odds of participants reporting “thought about leaving my job” versus reporting “did not think about leaving my job” and a 3% decreased odds of participants reporting “have been seeking new jobs” versus reporting “did not think about leaving my job”, respectively. Due to the high correlation between job position and monthly income, causation should be taken when interpreting the association of monthly income with turnover intention.

Discussion

There is so far no research study examining the influence of CPO on the turnover intention of social service workers. Using a sample of 761 full-time social service workers in the Guangdong province of China, this study has empirically examined how CPO adds values to the JD-R model in terms of explaining their turnover intention. To our best knowledge, this may be the first study examining the influence of CPO on the turnover intention of social service workers after controlling for a comprehensive group of covariates. The findings from this study provide empirical support for the proposed hypothesis and may draw implications for the development of the JD-R model in relation to explaining turnover intention of helping professions which are value-oriented. Practical implications may also be drawn from the findings with regard to keeping social service workers and other value-driven human helping professionals in their jobs by enhancing their CPO which is specified by two specific factors of shared decision-making and shared hardship endurance.

The main finding is that CPO was negatively associated with turnover intention of social service workers after controlling for psychosocial predictors derived from the JD-R model, including job demands, job resources, work burnout, and work engagement. This finding contributes to the related literature on a few levels: first, as most of prior studies informed by the JD-R model were conducted in western countries (Korunka et al., 2009; Schaufeli et al., 2013), this finding revealed the impact of job demands, job resources, work burnout and engagement on turnover intention with a sample of social service workers in the Chinese context, suggesting a possible cross-cultural similarity in the close link of psychosocial correlates to turnover intention in social service workers. Second, this finding implied the mediating role of CPO on the impact of job resources on turnover intention. Compared with Model 1, the impact of job resources on

turnover intention disappeared in Model 2 after entering CPO. Future studies will be in need to further examine the role of CPO on the impact of work conditions such as job demands and job resources on turnover intention. Third, this is also the first study to test a comprehensive model of turnover intention with socio-demographic factors, job-related factors, and psychosocial correlates among Chinese social service workers, which will provide empirical evidence to inform future research to apply the JD-R model in non-western contexts. Finally, this finding enriches the existing knowledge about the positive influence of CPO in organizational contexts such as decreasing work burnout and enhancing work engagement of social service workers (Su & Ng, 2019) by emphasizing its influence on reducing turnover intention of social service workers.

Another key finding reveals that job position is related to turnover intention with controlling for important predictors of turnover intention in the JD-R model. The decreased odds showed that when compared with frontline social workers, middle managers were less likely to report “have been seeking new jobs”. In other words, middle managers were more stable human resources than frontline workers. Given the results, it is deemed important to support those social service workers working at lower job or frontline positions with both tangible and intangible measures in order to keep them in the organization. These results are in line with prior studies that job position will influence the turnover intention in the sense that staff colleagues with a supervisor role are more associated with stronger identification and involvement in an organization than frontline workers (Lu et al., 2016).

The findings may have profound implications for the workplace well-being and organizational behaviors of social service workers and other value-driven human helping professions by highlighting the importance of a non-exclusionary notion of sharedness held by workers in organizational contexts. The two specific domains of CPO around shared decision-

making and shared hardship endurance shed light on informing the direction for changes in relation to organizational management. The negative association between CPO and turnover intention revealed by the current study implies that on human resources management levels, efforts should be made to enhance the feelings of shared decision-making and shared hardship endurance held by social service workers in organizational context by leveraging supervisory or collegial efforts. In recognition of social service's value-driven spirit, the organizations may need to consider giving more weight to engage social service workers, including frontline workers and workers with a management role in decision making for the development of the organization and its embodied professional practice. The policy makers, funders and the leaders of social service organizations need to attend to the feedback from social service workers in relation to addressing hurdles against their wellbeing and against the development of the profession in order to take actions for making improvement accordingly. Social service workers also need to familiarize with their workplace environment, work with multiple stakeholders and different organizations in a more proactive manner so as to enhance their own participation in policy advocacy and policy-implementation process to reduce the gap between the aspired ideal and the apparent reality.

Regarding research implications, the findings of the current study shed light on informing future research direction about turnover intention of social service professionals such as social workers. This is the first study providing empirical evidence to support the impact of CPO on turnover intention of social service workers by incorporating CPO into the JD-R model as psychological resources. After controlling two overarching construct of job conditions: job demands and job resources, and two psychological constructs: work burnout and engagement, CPO still contributes a significant impact on reducing the turnover intention of social service workers and other human helping professionals alike. Future studies are expected to investigate

the impact of CPO on human helping professionals' turnover intention in other countries and societies, whether developing or developed, by following the tested models in the current study. With more empirical findings to support the impact of CPO on turnover intention, CPO may provide another effective means for a human service organization to retain manpower of the type and caliber it requires for delivering quality services by co-creating a shared sense of organizational ownership with colleagues at the frontline level in particular.

Contribution to the literature notwithstanding, this study has several limitations that should be addressed in future research. This study was a cross-sectional study, which limited the generalization of the conclusions of the findings. Longitudinal or experimental studies are needed to draw causal inferences on turnover intention. Second, a snowball and convenience approach was used in the study, and therefore some cautions are required in generalizing the results to the larger population. Third, the lack of further post-hoc testing such as Suest-based Hausman Test, Hausman Test, and Small-Hsiao Test to determine the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA) may cause biased estimates in the multinomial logistic regression analyses. Forth, this study was conducted in a national context where the social work profession is still at its preliminary stage of professional development. Relatively, social workers in developed societies are enjoying a higher level of recognition, better access to job resources and better welfare due to the maturity of the profession. Conceptually, CPO is associated with job resources and monthly income (Ng & Su, 2018). In this connection, the context of social work employment and the extent of professionalization have to be taken into consideration when studying the association of CPO with turnover intention of social workers. Finally, cultural issue is another concern. The current study was conducted in mainland China, a collective-oriented country where dedication to collective interest is highly valued. CPO is more likely to be higher in collective-oriented societies than in

individual-oriented societies. Therefore, it remains a research gap to examine the different levels of CPO among social service workers in China and their counterparts in developed societies.

In conclusion, the present study reveals the impact of CPO on influencing turnover intention among social service workers. The link of CPO to turnover intention may have important implications for developing organizational measures and initiatives in retaining professional manpower in human services in particular. The findings of the study revealed the potential role of CPO in reducing turnover intention by means of promoting a non-exclusionary notion of sharedness in terms of shared decision-making and shared hardship endurance that can be materialized in an organizational context. CPO, understood as an emerging concept of psychosocial resources, is yet to be further explored in human helping professions steered by values-oriented and mission-minded people committed to promoting the rights and welfare of clients in need.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviations of the Variables under Study and Comparison of Participants with Different Levels of Turnover Intention across Independent Variable and Covariates

Variables	M (SD)/N (%)	Level 1: Did not think about leaving my job N = 354	Level 2: Thought about leaving my job N = 227	Level 3: Have been seeking new jobs N = 180	ANOVA or Chi- square (<i>F</i> or <i>X</i> ²)
1. Turnover intention					
level 1	354 (46.5)				
level 2	227 (29.8)				
level 3	180 (23.7)				
Correlates					
2. Gender					1.26
Male	216 (28.4)	107 (49.5)	59 (27.3)	50 (23.1)	
Female	545 (71.6)	247 (45.3)	168 (30.8)	130 (23.9)	
3. Age group					9.96
24 or below	189 (24.8)	91 (48.1)	46 (24.3)	52 (27.5)	
25-29	429 (56.4)	189 (44.1)	137 (31.9)	103 (24.0)	
30-34	111 (14.6)	55 (49.5)	36 (32.4)	20 (18.0)	
35-39	17 (2.2)	9 (52.9)	4 (23.5)	4 (23.5)	
40 or above	15 (2.0)	10 (66.7)	4 (26.7)	1 (6.7)	
4. Educational attainment					10.89
Secondary school or below	18 (.02)	13 (72.2)	1 (5.6)	4 (22.2)	
Associate degree	213 (.28)	106 (49.8)	57 (26.8)	50 (23.5)	
Bachelor	460 (.61)	208 (45.2)	142 (30.9)	110 (23.9)	
Master or above	59 (.08)	21 (35.6)	23 (39.0)	15 (25.4)	

5.Marital status					7.82
Single or unmarried	491 (64.5)	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (.0)	
Married or cohabiting	266 (35.0)	138 (51.9)	77 (28.9)	51 (19.2)	
Separated or widowed	4 (.5)	214 (43.6)	148 (30.1)	129 (26.3)	
6.Organizational size					2.66
Fewer than 20	52 (6.8)	28 (53.8)	12 (23.1)	12 (23.1)	
20–49	97 (12.7)	48 (49.5)	28 (28.9)	21 (21.6)	
50–99	100 (13.1)	42 (42.0)	32 (32.0)	26 (26.0)	
100 or above	512 (67.3)	236 (46.1)	155 (30.3)	121 (23.6)	
7.Job position					15.43*
Admin. assistant	49 (6.4)	27 (55.1)	8 (16.3)	14 (28.6)	
Frontline worker	492 (64.7)	104 (55.6)	52 (27.8)	31 (16.6)	
Middle manager	187 (24.6)	13 (39.4)	11 (33.3)	9 (27.3)	
Senior manager	33 (4.3)	210 (42.7)	156 (31.7)	126 (25.6)	
8.Monthly income (1 USD is about 7 yuan)					4.58
4,000 or below	468 (61.5)	207 (44.2)	141 (30.1)	120 (25.6)	
4,001–5,000	195 (25.6)	96 (49.2)	56 (28.7)	43 (22.1)	
5,001–6,000	52 (6.8)	27 (51.9)	17 (32.7)	8 (15.4)	
6,001 and above	46 (6.0)	24 (52.2)	13 (28.3)	9 (19.6)	
9.Family economic condition	3.6 (1.1)	3.68 (1.06)	3.66 (1.04)	3.35 (1.21)	6.03**
10.Job tenure	2.06 (1.86)	2.10 (1.89)	2.19 (1.75)	1.82 (1.91)	2.08
11.Hours of work per week	41.03 (7.96)	41.13 (8.44)	40.91 (7.11)	40.98 (8.06)	0.06
12.Job demands	7.52 (6.53)	7.12 (6.37)	7.93 (6.51)	7.77 (6.86)	1.24
13.Job resources	.28 (8.61)	2.18 (8.13)	-1.35 (8.51)	-1.41 (8.92)	16.82***
14.Work burnout	46.41 (7.53)	43.88 (7.27)	48.58 (7.17)	48.65 (6.92)	41.23***
15.Work engagement	29.88 (9.37)	33.00 (8.70)	27.09 (9.17)	27.26 (9.01)	40.54***
16.CPO	12.92 (4.22)	14.08 (4.16)	11.83 (3.85)	12.01 (4.20)	26.88***

Note. *Ns* range from 750 to 76. Family economic condition ranges from 1 (very tight) to 7 (very well-off). Job demands range from -27 to 27. Job resources range from -30 to 30. Burnout ranges from 18 to 90. Engagement ranges from 0 to 54. CPO ranges from 6 to 24.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 2

Multinomial Logistic Regressions Examining Models to Predict Turnover Intention (N=761)

<i>Correlate</i>	Model 1		Model 2	
	Level 2 OR (95% CI)	Level 3 OR (95% CI)	Level 2 OR (95% CI)	Level 3 OR (95% CI)
Gender				
Male	.80 (.52-1.23)	.91 (.58-1.43)	.82 (.53-1.26)	.92 (.59-1.46)
Female	1	1	1	1
Age group				
24 or below	.52 (.12-2.36)	1.81 (.19-17.02)	.54 (.12-2.49)	1.84 (.19-17.34)
25-29	.96 (.23-4.02)	2.61 (.29-23.47)	1.02 (.24-4.36)	2.68 (.30-24.21)
30-34	.93 (.22-3.96)	1.81 (.20-16.69)	.98 (.23-4.22)	1.85 (.20-17.04)
35-39	.72 (.10-5.34)	5.07 (.41-62.51)	.76 (.10-5.78)	5.09 (.41-63.16)
40 or above	1	1	1	1
Educational attainment				
Secondary school or below	.11 (.01-1.02)	0.52 (.11-2.39)	.10 (.01-.94)*	.47 (.10-2.22)
Associate degree	.54 (.25-1.20)	0.61 (.25-1.46)	.51 (.23-1.13)	.57 (.24-1.39)
Bachelor	.53 (.26-1.09)	0.60 (.27-1.34)	.48 (.23-1.00)	.56 (.25-1.25)
Master or above	1	1	1	1
Marital status				
Separated or widowed	.76 (.09-6.68)	.00 (.00-.00)	.66 (.07-5.86)	.00 (.00 -.00)
Married or cohabiting	.65 (.41-1.04)	.59 (.35-.97)*	.62 (.39-.99)*	.57 (.34-.94)*
Single or unmarried	1	1	1	1

Organizational size				
Fewer than 20	.67 (.30-1.49)	0.81 (.37-1.80)	.81 (.36-1.82)	.93 (.42-2.09)
20-49	.78 (.44-1.40)	0.64 (.34-1.22)	.87 (.48-1.57)	.70 (.37-1.33)
50-99	1.15 (.65-2.05)	1.11 (.61-2.03)	1.12 (.63-2.00)	1.09 (.60-2.00)
100 or above	1	1	1	1
Job position				
Admin assistant	.55 (.22-1.33)	1.26 (.58-2.75)	.53 (.21-1.30)	1.24 (.56-2.71)
Middle manager	.68 (.38-1.23)	.52 (.27-1.00)*	.68 (.37-1.21)	.51 (.27-.99)*
Senior manager	2.05 (.54-7.69)	3.19 (.73-13.40)	2.09 (.54-8.04)	3.13 (.70-13.93)
frontline workers	1	1	1	1
Monthly income (1 USD is about 7 yuan)				
4000 or below	1.54 (.45-5.26)	1.27 (.30-5.30)	1.10 (.31-3.92)	.95 (.22-4.12)
4001-5000	1.10 (.34-3.56)	1.33 (.33-5.42)	.84 (.25-2.80)	1.05 (.25-4.36)
5001-6000	1.14 (.32-3.98)	.92 (.20-4.18)	.83 (.23-3.01)	.70 (.15-3.28)
6001 and above	1	1	1	1
Family economic condition	1.13 (.95-1.35)	.85 (.71-1.02)	1.14 (.95-1.37)	.86 (.72-1.03)
Job tenure	1.09 (.96-1.23)	0.97 (.85-1.12)	1.09 (.97-1.24)	.98 (.85-1.12)
work hour	.99 (.97-1.02)	.99 (.97-1.02)	.99 (.96-1.02)	.99 (.97-1.02)
Job demands	1.05 (1.02-1.08)**	1.05 (1.02-1.09)**	1.04 (1.01-1.08)**	1.05 (1.01-1.09)**
Job resources	.97 (.95-.99)*	.96 (.94-.99)**	.99 (.96-1.02)	.98 (.95-1.00)
Work burnout	1.07 (1.03-1.10)***	1.07 (1.03-1.10)***	1.07 (1.04-1.11)***	1.07 (1.04-1.11)***
Work engagement	.94 (.92-.97)**	.96 (.93-.99)**	.96 (.93-.98)**	.97 (.94-1.00)*
CPO			.91 (.86-.96)**	.93 (.88-.99)*

Note. OR= odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; the reference group of the dependent variable turnover intention is level 1: Did not think about leaving my job; level 2 = Thought about leaving my job; level 3 = Have been seeking for new jobs; Model fit index: Model 1: $X^2(52) = 182.38^{***}$, $-2 \log \text{likelihood} = 1405.91$, Cox and Snell $R^2 = .22$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .25$; Model 2: $X^2(54) = 195.37^{***}$, $-2 \log \text{likelihood} = 1392.92$, Cox and Snell $R^2 = 0.23$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.26$. Significant correlates revealed by likelihood ratio tests in Model 1: family economic condition ($p < .05^*$), job demands ($p < .01^{**}$), job resources ($p < .05^*$), work burnout ($p < .001^{***}$), engagement ($p < .001^{***}$); significant correlates revealed by likelihood ratio tests in Model 2: family economic condition ($p < .05^*$), job demands ($p < .01^{**}$), work burnout ($p < .001^{***}$), work engagement ($p < .01^{**}$), CPO ($p < .01^{**}$), and job position ($p < .05^*$).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

References

- Antoinette Bargagliotti, L. (2012). Work engagement in nursing: A concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 68(6), 1414-1428. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05859.x>
- Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20(4), 265-269. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0963721411414534>
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2006). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187-200. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>
- Bothma, C. F., & Roodt, G. (2013). The validation of the turnover intention scale. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(1), 1-12. <http://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v11i1.507>
- Chen, C. F., & Chen, S. C. (2012). Burnout and work engagement among cabin crew: Antecedents and consequences. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 22(1), 41-58. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10508414.2012.635125>
- Chen, I. H., Brown, R., Bowers, B. J., & Chang, W. Y. (2015). Job demand and job satisfaction in latent groups of turnover intention among licensed nurses in Taiwan nursing homes. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 38(5), 342-356. <http://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21667>

- Chong, V. K., & Monroe, G. S. (2015). The impact of the antecedents and consequences of job burnout on junior accountants' turnover intentions: A structural equation modelling approach. *Accounting & Finance*, 55(1), 105-132. <http://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12049>
- Cho, Y. J., & Song, H. J. (2017). Determinants of turnover intention of social workers: Effects of emotional labor and organizational trust. *Public Personnel Management*, 46(1), 41-65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017696395>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2000). A model of burnout and life satisfaction among nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32, 454-464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01496.x>, PMID:10964195
- Nachtsheim, C. J., Kutner, M. H., Wasserman, W., & Neter, H. (2004). *Applied linear regression models*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
- Farquharson, B., Allan, J., Johnston, D., Johnston, M., Choudhary, C., & Jones, M. (2012). Stress amongst nurses working in a healthcare telephone-advice service: Relationship with job satisfaction, intention to leave, sickness absence, and performance. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 68(7), 1624-1635.
- Fong, T. C. T., & Ng, S. M. (2012). Measuring engagement at work: Validation of the Chinese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 19(3), 391-397. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12529-011-9173-6>
- Gabel Shemueli, R., Dolan, S. L., Suárez Ceretti, A., & Nuñez del Prado, P. (2016). Burnout and engagement as mediators in the relationship between work characteristics and turnover

- intentions across two Ibero-American nations. *Stress and Health*, 32(5), 597-606.
<http://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2667>
- Gao, J. G., & Yan, M. C. (2015). Social work in the making: The state and social work development in China. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 24(1), 93-101.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12089>
- Hui, C., Wong, A., & Tjosvold, D. (2007). Turnover intention and performance in China: The role of positive affectivity, Chinese values, perceived organizational support and constructive controversy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(4), 735-751.
<http://doi.org/10.1348/096317906X171037>
- Jourdain, G., & Chênevert, D. (2010). Job demands–resources, burnout and intention to leave the nursing profession: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 47(6), 709-722. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2009.11.007>
- Kay, S.Y. (2007). *A study of job satisfaction and burnout among mental healthcare workers in psychiatric service* [Master's thesis]. University of Hong Kong
- Kim, T. K., Solomon, P., & Jang, C. (2012). Organizational justice and social workers' intentions to leave agency positions. *Social Work Research*, 36(1), 31-39.
<http://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svs001>
- Kim, H., & Stoner, M. (2008). Burnout and turnover intention among social workers: Effects of role stress, job autonomy and social support. *Administration in Social Work*, 32(3), 5-25.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/03643100801922357>
- Korunka, C., Kubicek, B., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hoonakker, P. (2009). Work engagement and burnout: Testing the robustness of the Job Demands-Resources model. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(3), 243-255. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760902879976>

- Leunissen, J. M., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., & Cohen, T. R. (2018). Organizational nostalgia lowers turnover intentions by increasing work meaning: The moderating role of burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 44. http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/28869/1/PubSub6400_Leunissen.pdf
- Liu, B., Liu, J., & Hu, J. (2010). Person-organization fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(5), 615-625. <http://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2010.38.5.615>
- Liu, C., Yuan, Y., Sun, Z., & He, X. (2020). China social work longitudinal study 2019: Research design, implementation, and sampling (in Chinese). *Journal of East China University of Science and Technology*, 1(35).
- Liu, Y., Lam, C. M., & Yan, M. C. (2012). A challenged professional identity: the struggles of new social workers in China. *China Journal of Social Work*, 5(3), 189-200. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17525098.2012.721166>
- Lu, L., Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Neale, N. R. (2016). Work engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions: A comparison between supervisors and line-level employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 737-761. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2014-0360>
- Maslach, C. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Ministry of Civil Affairs (2018). *Notice on the implementation of regulations, policies and plans for social work and voluntary services*. <http://www.mca.gov.cn/article/gk/wj/201802/20180215007894.shtml>

- 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), 625-661. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/323166>
- Mo, K. Y. H., & Lai, H. S. (2018). Social worker turnover issue in mainland China: Organizations can do something. *The Hong Kong Journal of Social Work*, 52(1/2), 63-83. <http://doi.org/10.1142/S0219246218000062>
- Mo, K. Y. H., & Tsui, M. S. (2016). External supervision for social workers in another socio-political context: A qualitative study in Shenzhen, China. *China Journal of Social Work*, 9(1), 62-74. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17525098.2016.1141474>
- Muliawan, A.D., Green, P.F., & Robb, D.A. (2009). The turnover intentions of information systems auditors. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 10(3), 117–136. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2009.03.001>
- Ngai, S. (1986). Occupational stress, social support, and burnout syndrome among outreaching social workers of Hong Kong [Master's thesis]. *Chinese University of Hong Kong*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/48543401.pdf>
- Ng, S. M., & Su, X. (2018). An investigation into the correlates of collective psychological ownership in organizational context. *Cogent Psychology*, 5(1), 1470484. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311908.2018.1470484>
- Nick, T. G., & Campbell, K. M. (2017). Logistic Regression. In W.T. Ambrosius (Eds.), *Topics in Biostatistics* (pp.273-301). Humana Press Inc.

- Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2010). Collective psychological ownership within the work and organizational context: Construct introduction and elaboration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(6), 810-834. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.628>
- Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Pierce, J. L., Jussila, I., & Li, D. (2018). Development and validation of an instrument for assessing collective psychological ownership in organizational field settings. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(6), 776-792. <http://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.66>
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 25, 293–315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. (2013). The job demands-resources model: A critical review. *Gedrag & Organisatie*, 26(2), 182-204. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4
- Schmid, H. B., Schulte-Ostermann, K., & Psarros, N. (Eds.). (2013). *Concepts of sharedness: Essays on collective intentionality* (Vol. 26). Walter de Gruyter.
- Shields, M.A., & Ward, M. (2001). Improving nurse retention in the National Health Service in England: the impact of job satisfaction on intentions to quit. *Journal of Health Economics*, 20(5):677-701. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6296\(01\)00092-3](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6296(01)00092-3)
- Su, X. (2017). *Colletive psychological ownership: An emerging construct for workplace well-being* [Doctoral dissertation]. The University of Hong Kong. <http://hub.hku.hk/handle/10722/249813>

- Su, X., & Ng, S. M. (2018). Development and validation of the collective psychological ownership scale in organizational contexts. *International Social Work*, 62(5), 1431-1443. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0020872818767483>
- Su, X., & Ng, S. M. (2019). The differential impacts of collective psychological ownership and membership identification on work burnout and engagement. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 45(1), 44-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2018.1479340>
- Trépanier, S. G., Fernet, C., Austin, S., Forest, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2014). Linking job demands and resources to burnout and work engagement: Does passion underlie these differential relationships?. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(3), 353-366. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9384-z>