DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF AN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURAL MEASURE IN SOCIAL WELFARE SETTINGS

Jerf W. K. Yeung[1]
orcid.org/0000-0003-3454-4543

Hui-Fang Chen[2]
orcid.org/0000-0002-5037-4559

Andrew Yiu Tsang Low[3]
orcid.org/0000-0001-6554-2757

Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences
City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

ABSTRACT

Organizational culture refers to the norms, beliefs, and values imbedded in an organization that may profoundly affect various working outcomes of the organization. Due to a lack of well-validated measures of organizational culture in social welfare settings, organizational cultural research conducted in social work and social service is scarce. The main purpose of this study is to develop and validate an organizational culture measure, Organizational Culture Scale in Social Welfare (OCS-SW), for use in social work and social service research. The study is based on a total sample of 891 practitioners in a major and well-established social welfare organization in Hong Kong. OCS-SW contains five cultural aspects: a) service mission and values, b) management and leadership, c) professional development and training, d) working conditions and environment, and e) teamwork and relations. The five cultural aspects of OCS-SW were empiri-

---

1 Jerf W. K. YEUNG, PhD, associate professor and registered social worker, ssjerf@gmail.com
2 Hui-Fang CHEN, PhD, associate professor and quantitative psychologist, hfchen@cityu.edu.hk
3 Andrew Yiu Tsang LOW, PhD, assistant professor and registered social worker, yiutlow@cityu.edu.hk

cally confirmed to load on an overall organizational culture of social welfare from the results of Rasch modeling, supporting its construct validity. In addition, the adequate internal reliability, concurrent validity, criterion validity, and predictive validity of OCS-SW and its subscales were well supported in subsequent analyses. The current study confirmed that OCS-SW has practical utility in assessing organizational culture in social work and social service research. Study limitations and future research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Culture is described as "designs for living," connoting that present values, norms, beliefs, behaviours, tacit rules, and material objects as a whole constitute our way of life (Macionis and Plummer, 2012: 144). Due to this, culture influences almost every aspect of our social lives and human interactions (Schudson, 1994). The workplace is one major domain of human life, in which different organizations possess different patterns of organizational culture that may in turn shape their performance, efficiency, productivity, service and product quality, innovation, and sustainability (Afshari, Nasab and Dickson, 2020; Hartnell, Ou and Kinicki, 2011; Schein, 1990). Culture within an organization may also directly affect employees' commitment, professional development, work attitude, job satisfaction, and retention (Bellou, 2010; Gregory, Harris, Armenakis and Shook, 2009; Paais and Pattiruhu, 2020), which then formulate the overall performance and development of the organization in an aggregate way (Hartnell et al., 2011; Lim, 1995).

Research on the relationship between organizational culture and organizational performance and efficiency, as well as employees' working attitude and behavior has been increasing in the past two decades. However, most studies were conducted in the sectors of for-profit business corporations, education, and health care (Bellou, 2010; Hartnell et al., 2011; Jung et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2018). Little relevant research has been done in the social welfare settings, such as organizations of social work and social services. This is because the lack of appropriate and well validated organizational cultural measures germane to the cultural aspects of social work and social service organizations manifestly hampers pertinent organizational cultural research to be conducted (Hugman, 2012; Schudrich, 2014; Vlaicu, Neagoe and Tiru and , 2019). The reason is that most existing measures of organizational culture developed in the above-mentioned sectors bear specific cultural foci that make them less suitable for direct social work and social service research (Heritage, Pollock and Roberts, 2014; Hofstede, 1998; Jung et al., 2009). According to Scott et al. (2003.: 929, "investigators and consultants looking for an 'ideal' instrument to measure the culture of health organizations will be frustrated. While a range of instruments is

available, and researchers would have to justify developing yet another new tool from scratch, all of them have limitations in terms of their scope, ease of use, or scientific properties". Therefore, the present study attempted to develop and validate an organizational culture measure, termed as Organizational Culture Scale in Social Welfare (OCS-SW), for use in social work and social service research.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF OCS-SW

Theoretical definitions of organizational culture in research

Despite substantial organizational culture studies conducted in for-profit businesses, industries, education, and health-care organizations, there has been no consensual definition of organizational culture in the literature (Baek, Chang and Kim, 2019). Apparently, scholars have proposed different definitions of organizational culture. Glisson (2007: 742) refers to organizational culture as "the expectations that govern the way things are done in an organization". M. Shim (2010: 848) thinks of organizational culture as "the way things (that) are done in an organization shapes employee behavioral expectations and norms". Besides et al. define organizational culture as "a set of cognitions shared by members of a social unit"; and Koberg and Chusmir (1987: 397) consider organizational culture representing "a system of shared values and beliefs that produces norms of behavior and establish an organizational way of life". Moreover, some researchers propose organizational culture as the working norms, beliefs, and shared behavioral expectations within an organization, in which these norms, beliefs, and expectations prescribe the way work is approached and done (R. A. Cooke and Szumal, 2000; Mang, 2018; Rousseau, 1990).

According to what has been reviewed above, organizational culture focuses on norms, beliefs, and values of an organization in regulation of employees' working attitudes and behaviors. This narrow interpretation of organizational culture explicitly confines research to the norms and values within an organization in relation to the behavioral manifestations of its employees (Gregory et al., 2009; Jung et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2018). However, organizational culture in social welfare settings is much complicated and dynamic (Abramovitz, 2012; Glicken, 2007; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017). Hence, certain researchers recently reckoned that the concept of organizational culture, especially in the social welfare settings, should be much broader than only focusing on working norms, values, and behaviors (Abramovitz, 2012; Vlaicu et al.,

2019). Thereby, existing organizational culture measures in business, education, and health care are unsuitable for direct use in social work and social service research (Glisson, 2007; M. Shim, 2014). In fact, organizational culture permeates and imbeds in various aspects of an organization because the workplace is a multilayered and complex entity that contains different functional domains ranging from abstract (e.g. organizational mission and values) to concrete (e.g. staff development and training), which are all integrated and interacted synchronously to construct the cultural phenomenon and features of the organization (Baek et al., 2019; Lopez-Martin and Topa, 2019). This is especially true for organizations in social welfare settings (M. Shim, 2014; Smith et al., 2017; Vlaicu et al., 2019).

The cultural nature in social welfare settings

Social welfare, referring to the practices implemented by social work and social services, is a human development profession that provides preventive, developmental, rehabilitative, and treatment programmes and interventions for clients in need (Abramovitz, 2012; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017). This requires organizations in social welfare settings to integrate its service mission and values, leadership and management, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, as well as teamwork and relations concertedly in response to clients' problems and needs humanely and efficiently (Birkenmaier, Berg-Weger and Dewees, 2011; Ewijk, 2018; Parton and Kirk, 2010). As such, social work and related social services are the mainstay of social welfare that needs to incorporate the functioning and interactions of the cultural aspects mentioned above (Abramovitz, 2012; Rothman, 2015). Manifestly, service mission and values refer to the philosophical base of a social work and social service organization in support for its developmental and professional directions and orientations in serving potential and current clientele (Reamer, 2006.; Rothman, 2015). Management and leadership connote the way managerial and senior social work and social service practitioners lead and operate the organization in alignment with the preset philosophical base (Ewijk, 2018; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017; Rothman, 2015). Professional development and training mean the degree of the social work or social service organization and its management and leadership to establish and provide practitioners with constructive opportunities and latitude for professional development (Birkenmaier et al., 2011; Ewijk, 2018). Working conditions and environment indicate whether the social work and social service organization can render its practitioners enough resources and supportive working environments to carry out their professional interventions and development (Birkenmaier et al., 2011; Trevor, Jonathan and Greta, 2013). Teamwork and relations point to the magnitude

of trustworthy working relationships and effective cooperation among practitioners and working units in the social work and social service organization (Foster, 2017; Trevor et al., 2013). Taken together, these five cultural aspects are pivotal to formulate an overall organizational culture of organizations in social welfare settings, which in turn leads to its professional continuity, growth, and sustainability.

In fact, organizational culture is believed to profoundly shape the practitioner-client relationships, quality of service and intervention, professional development, public perception, and community reaction to a social work and social service organization (Clark, 2015; Foster, 2017.; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017; Vlaicu et al., 2019). Social systems theory and the thesis of reciprocity help interpret the way these cultural aspects of social welfare influence social work and social service organizations for professional performance and development (Dale and Smith, 2009; Glisson, 2007). Relevantly, both social systems theory and the thesis of reciprocity posit that the five cultural aspects of social welfare regulate collectively and dynamically to cultivate the part-whole relationships, which not only constitute an overall organizational culture within a social work and social service organization, but also contribute interactively to its professional engagement, development, efficiency, working attitudes, and service quality (Chetkow-Yanoov, 1997; Dale and Smith, 2009; Smith et al., 2017). Therefore, if each of these cultural aspects can reinforce, react, and coordinate effectively and concertedly through the process of reciprocation, a positive climate of optimal organizational culture can be attained and revealed in the social work and social service organization (Blok, 2012; Glisson, 2007; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017), which therefore benefits efficacious service delivery, performance, continuity, and sustainability.

As organizations in social welfare settings are generally philanthropic and non-profit-seeking for fulfilling their humanitarian duties and responsibilities to serve the needy (Abramovitz, 2012; Ewijk, 2018; Glicken, 2007; Rothman, 2015), the cultural aspect of the service mission and values are fundamental to direct their formulation of management and leadership styles, establishment of professional development and training, construction of working conditions and environment, and cultivation of teamwork and relations (Blok, 2012; Foster, 2017; Reamer, 2006; Vlaicu et al., 2019). Moreover, organizational management and leadership are an important activator to contribute to the cultural aspects of professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork collaboration and relations in a social work and social service organization, which in turn affect whether the organization can adequately achieve its service mission and values (Lawler and Bilson, 2010; Reamer, 2006; Rothman, 2015). In addition, provision of professional development and training to practitioners in a social work and social service organization can signify whether its mission and values are implemented adequately and whether

its management and leadership are efficacious or not, which then directly affect its professional development, practitioners' perceptions of their working conditions and environment, and organizational teamwork and collaboration (Ewijk, 2018; Hugman, 2012; Trevor et al., 2013; Vlaicu et al., 2019). Besides, the resourceful and supportive working conditions and environment of a social work and social service organization are not only reflective of its adherence to the lofty service mission and values upheld and efficient management and leadership performed, but can also fortify practitioners' positivity toward professional development and training as well as collaborative working relationships in the organization (Parrott and Maguinness, 2017; Schram, 2012; M. Shim, 2014). Lastly, effective teamwork and relations within a social work and social service organization indicate its other cultural aspects being sufficiently enforced, signifying the effectuation of its service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, and working conditions and environment (Foster, 2017; M. Shim, 2010). Therefore, when mapping organizational culture of social work and social service, practitioners and researchers must consider all these cultural aspects concomitantly in reflection of the cultural complexity in social welfare settings.

Limitations of existing organizational culture measures and development and validation of OCS-SW

Although various organizational culture measures in the sectors of business, education, and health care exist, they are not specifically designed for social work and social service research. Thereby, the extant organizational culture measures are incapable of responding to the cultural circumstances and complexity of organizations in social welfare settings. For example, some commonly used organizational culture measures employ a dichotomy-opposite approach to define and measure organizational culture, e.g. Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) Cooke and Lafferty, 1987) and Organizational Social Context (OSC) (Glisson, 2007). Specifically, OCI divides organizational culture into constructive and proficient culture, passive and rigid culture, and aggressive/defensive culture (Cooke and Lafferty, 1987; Cooke and Szumal, 2000), and OSC classifies organizational culture as proficient, rigid, or resistant (M. Shim, 2010). Moreover, other organizational culture measures, such as Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) (Heritage et al., 2014) and Corporate Culture Questionnaire (CCQ) (Walker, Symon and Davies, 1996), are domain-specific, which emphasizes certain cultural dimensions or aspects of an organization and ignores others. For instance, OCAI assesses the clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and marketing culture of an organization, which pertain only to

organizational management and relationship domains. CCQ taps only the cultural dimensions of performance, human resources, decision-making, and relationship, which, like OCAI, concern the management and relationship domains of an organization. Besides, CCQ confusingly measures performance as a cultural aspect of an organization, which in fact reflects an organization's working outcome rather than organizational culture.

Accordingly, adopting existing organizational culture measures to directly conduct organizational culture research in the social welfare settings is improper as they explicitly lean toward some cultural aspects and overlook the cultural facets of social work and social service (Abramovitz, 2012; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017). Regarding relevant organizational culture research conducted in the social welfare settings, Yoo and Brooks (2005) studied how organizational culture in children and family services contributed to the outcomes of child placement/child non-placement in out-of-home services and found that organizations of workers with more routine work, leaders with more transformational qualities, and settings with more supervisor and co-worker support significantly had better child outcomes in terms of fewer out of home placements. In addition, Schoenwaldn et al. (2009) investigated organizational culture of decision making, hierarchy of authority, and procedural and rule specification in social service organizations and family participants of a family intervention programme to examine youths' criminal charges, in which they found that organization of culture of participation in decision-making significantly predicted lower rates of youths' posttreatment charges. Recently, Wolf et al. (2014) examined organizational culture of rigidity, resistance, proficiency, engagement, functionality, and stress in residential and community-based services of child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, education, and developmental disabilities in relation to clients' lower level of care and treatment success, in which these cultural dimensions all significantly predicted lower level care. However, the above-mentioned organizational culture studies conducted in social welfare settings directly employed organizational culture measures from other sectors that not only overlook the multiple cultural aspects of organizations in the social welfare settings, but also discount the cultural complexity of these organizations. Therefore, it is necessary to develop and validate an organizational cultural measure of social welfare that can be sensitively and appropriately reflective of the complicated and reciprocal cultural phenomena in social work and social service organizations in order to facilitate evidence-based practices and relevant social work and social service research.

In sum, the present study aimed to develop and validate Organizational Culture Scale in Social Welfare (OCS-SW), which is used to measure the cultural aspects of service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations in

social work and social service organizations that are believed to aggregately form an overall organizational culture applicable in the social welfare settings. We expected that these five cultural aspects would be mutually reinforced and related to converge on an overall organizational culture of social welfare latently by the support of construct validity, concurrent validity, and internal consistency. Furthermore, the five cultural aspects and overall measure of OCS-SW would show good criterion validity to recognize group differences of practitioners in social welfare settings and would also demonstrate adequate predictive validity to predict organizational outcomes of practitioners' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention.

METHOD

Sample and procedure

The development of OCS-SW was instigated by the management and senior social work practitioners at the Hong Kong Christian Women's' Association (HKYW-CA), which was founded in 1920 and has been a major and well-established social work and social service organization in Hong Kong. HKYWCA provides multiple social services to diverse clientele that include children and families, students, young people, working adults, elderly individuals, new arrivals, and ethnic minorities. The organization receives direct financial subvention from the Hong Kong government and provides regular social service projects of kindergartens, after-school care, youth development, outreach work for marginal people, school social work, family support services, elderly services, residential homes for the fragile, community development, job training, and social integration programs. In addition, the organization also carries out various non-regular service projects and programs for compensated-dating adolescent girls, school drop-out youths, hidden elderly, at-risk couples, and those who are unemployed or underemployed. The organization had 1,014 employees at the time of conducting this study. For understanding how organizational culture may affect organizational performance, practitioners' working attitudes and behaviors, and professional development of the organization, HKYWCA formed a research team to develop and validate an organizational culture measure for use in social work and social service research. The research team included the deputy chief executive, one service director, one supervisor, two employee representatives, and two social service research scholars from a university.

First, the research team reviewed extant organizational culture research and related organizational culture scales and instruments in business, education, and health-care research. The team also made reference to the social service literature

and their practice experiences to define the cultural nature of social work and social service. After several research meetings, the team decided to use a multifaceted approach to develop and validate OCS-SW for use in social work and social service research. The cultural aspects of service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations were considered reflective of the working cultural phenomena of social work and social service (Chetkow-Yanoov, 1997; Ewijk, 2018; Foster, 2017; Hugman, 2012; Shim, 2014). Next, the research team constructed pertinent question items as measurement indicators for each of the five cultural aspects in manifestation and reflection of the cultural complexity of social welfare by referring to the existing organizational cultural measures (Cooke and Szumal, 2000; Glisson, 2007; Gregory et al., 2009; Heritage et al., 2014; Jung et al., 2009; Shim, 2010); the social work and social service literature (Abramovitz, 2012; Ewijk, 2018; Lawler and Bilson, 2010; Rothman, 2015; Trevor et al., 2013), as well as frontline practice wisdom of practitioners in the organization. In the process of face validity, the research team first listed possible question items for each of the five cultural aspects of social welfare to decide the most germane question items for the construction and validation of OCS-SW with reference to the relevant social work and social service literature and their professional knowledge and practice experiences. Consequently, 7 items were retained for the cultural aspect of service mission and values, 9 for management and leadership, professional development and training, and working conditions and environment, and 8 items for teamwork and relations (Table 1).

Table 1. Initial item contents of OCS-SW by cultural aspects

Service mission and values		M	SD
a1	The organization has a clear and consistent mission and values to guide employees in providing services and handling work interventions.	4.87	1.139
a2	The organization has a clear and consistent mission and values to guide and develop the work content and service delivery.	4.81	1.125
a3	The organization has a clear and consistent mission and values that make our work meaningful and provide a sense of direction.	4.71	1.188
a4	Employees from different units within the organization have a common mission and hold the same values.	4.48	1.199
a5	The organization provides services that reflect and live up to its values and mission.	4.73	1.103
a6	The organization lacks a clear and consistent mission and values to provide a direction for its services.	4.34	1.316

a7	The organization has a clear code of ethics to help staff members understand the difference between appropriate and inappropriate behavior.	4.96	1.167

Management and Leadership

b1	The executive management establishes long-term goals that are in accordance with the vision and the needs of services provided by the organization.	4.64	1.199
b2	The executive management holds a broad view in regard to developing and promoting services.	4.59	1.244
b3	The executive management encourages staff to participate in planning and developing service strategies.	4.45	1.288
b4	The executive management is effective in organizing and implementing the service plan and tasks.	4.67	1.132
b5	The executive management keeps the promises it makes.	4.47	1.255
b6	We often have to follow strict regulations and procedures at work.	2.68	1.095
b7	The executive management receives trust and support from staff when making long-term decisions for the organization.	4.5	1.231
b8	The executive management demonstrates effective leadership.	4.67	1.225
b9	The executive management listens to different ideas and suggestions from the staff.	4.47	1.401

Professional Development and Training

c1	The organization provides opportunities for staff to improve their abilities and reach their full potential.	4.64	4.154
c2	The organization continuously invests resources to enhance employees' professional development.	4.71	1.143
c3	The organization values everyone's individual skills.	4.62	1.205
c4	My job position allows room for me to demonstrate my abilities.	4.92	1.152
c5	My immediate supervisor will make sure that I get the professional training I need for my post.	4.86	1.179
c6	The organization will take my professional views and judgment seriously.	4.73	1.093
c7	My supervisor can give useful and clear feedback in regard to my job performance.	4.96	1.179
c8	The training that the organization provides is very helpful for my development at work.	4.72	1.128
c9	In the organization, reforms and changes are often met with resistance and opposition.	3.78	1.212

Working Conditions and Environment

d1	The organization has a clear description regarding the responsibilities of my job.	4.89	1.049
d2	The organization rewards staff appropriately for their contributions and performance.	4.40	1.248
d3	My job is a barrier to my normal family life.	4.27	1.430
d4	Sometimes my work will make me feel exhausted.	3.38	1.399
d5	My workload in the organization is reasonable.	4.27	1.253
d6	I firmly believe that the organization can treat staff fairly and justly.	4.50	1.232
d7	My organization cares about the remuneration of the staff.	4.13	1.399
d8	The organization is indifferent to me.	4.68	1.274
d9	The organization shows understanding when staff members make small, unintentional mistakes.	4.71	1.129

Teamwork and Relations

e1	Cooperation among different departments in the organization is good and harmonious.	4.68	1.212
e2	On the whole, the staff in the organization has team spirit.	4.93	1.155
e3	Although there may sometimes be conflicts in the organization, the involved parties will eventually be able to come up with a solution together.	4.72	1.066
e4	When I come across difficulties at work, other employees are willing to lend a helping hand.	5.20	1.103
e5	Work relationships between employees in the organization tend to be tense and strained.	4.46	1.331
e6	I can trust the colleagues I work with in the organization.	5.22	1.117
e7	My supervisor will show appropriate support and approval when I do my job well.	5.11	1.159
e8	In the organization, colleagues will show approval and appreciation for my work from time to time.	4.78	1.104

Note: The items are rated by a 7-point scale of 1 – completely disagree, 2 – mostly disagree, 3 – somewhat disagree, 4 – neutral, 5 – somewhat agree, 6 – mostly agree, and 7 – completely agree

After determining the question items in each of the five cultural aspects of social welfare, a survey questionnaire containing the proposed question items of OCS-SW and measures of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, leave intention, and mental health, and other related sociodemographic variables of social work and social service practitioners in the organization was compiled for a pilot study. The

question items were reviewed and approved by the institutional review board (IRB) in the organization. In the pilot study, 15 practitioners in the organization were randomly invited to fill out and comment on the questionnaire. The presentation and wording style of the questionnaire were then modified according to the respondents' comments and suggestions. Before conducting the main study to validate OCS-SW, an introduction and a request for participation in the study were publicly announced at a bi-monthly meeting for staff members in the organization. Afterward, leaders of respective service units in HKYWCA were contacted to help distribute the questionnaires to their frontline practitioners and participation in the study was conducted on a voluntary basis. In the process of collecting data, confidentiality and anonymity were assured, in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the organization. The completed questionnaires were then collected and sent backed by the leaders of respective service units in HKYWCA to the research team for data input and analysis. Finally, 891 practitioners out of 1 014 employees in HKYWCA completed and returned the questionnaires, constituting a response rate of 87.86%.

Measurement

Organizational Culture Scale in Social Welfare (OCS-SW) contains 42 items (7 for service mission and values, 9 for management and leadership, professional development and training, and working conditions and environment, and 8 for teamwork relations). The measure is rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Both the research team and IRB in the organization agreed to the question items of OCS-SW developed to measure organizational culture in social welfare settings. The alpha coefficients for each cultural aspect ranged from $\alpha = .861$ to $.899$. Internal consistency of the whole measure was $\alpha = .968$, indicating strong reliability.

Job satisfaction is a 3-item measure, which includes "I like the current organization where I am working", "I appreciate the duties and tasks that I need to perform", and "My work in the current organization gives me a sense of contentment." Again, the research team and IRB in the organization concurred with the three items that are able to measure social work and social service practitioners' job satisfaction. The measure was rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree, higher scores indicating better job satisfaction among employees. The internal reliability was $\alpha = .916$.

Organizational commitment has 2 items, which include "I have a strong sense of belonging to the current working organization" and "I would like to work in this organization until retirement if possible." Both the research team and IRB in the

organization supported these two question items in reflection of practitioners' organizational commitment. The measure was rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree, higher scores connoting more organizational commitment among employees. The internal reliability was α = .810.

Leave intention is a 2-item measure: "I keep looking for a chance to work in another organization" and "If there was a job offer for me from another organization that is similar to my current one, I would change jobs immediately without consideration". The two question items were reviewed and agreed by the research team and IRB in the organization and considered indicative of practitioners' leave intention. The measure was rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree, higher scores meaning greater intention to leave. The internal reliability was α = .840.

Mental health of practitioners in the organization was measured by the 12-item *General Health Questionnaire* (GHQ-12) (Lundin et al., 2016) which was rated on 4-point scale, ranging from 0= not at all to 3= much more than usual. Example items include "Able to concentrate" and "Feeling unhappy and depressed", with high scores representing poorer self-reported mental health. Internal reliability was α = .848.

Sociodemographic covariates include practitioners' gender, age, education levels, years of employment, and monthly income, which were adjusted in the analysis. Specifically, gender is a dichotomous variable (1= male, 2= female), and education levels, years of employment, and monthly income are continuous variables. Controlling for these sociodemographic covariates is important as they have been empirically corroborated to affect working performance and behaviors. Being female, older, having worked longer in the organization, and having a higher income means that employees are generally more devoted to and content with their organization (Barnay and Defebvre, 2019; Leana and Meuris, 2015; Marcos and Garcia, 2012; Ryu, 2016; Van Den Ouweland and Van den Bossche, 2017). However, employees of higher education tend to regard their working environment more negatively and have stronger leave intention (Alp, Sefil and Sak, 2015; Hu, Fan and Sun, 2017; Iammarino and Marinelli, 2015; Zhang, 2017). Thereby, all these sociodemographic covariates were controlled in the modeling procedures for precluding confounding effects.

Validation techniques

The Rasch model was used to validate OCS-SW. Due to a five-factor structure by design, the Multidimensional Rasch measurement model was first applied to examine the construct validity. The purpose of this investigation was to study the item fit of individual items and the appropriateness of items to see if all items can

appropriately reflect the underlying dimensions of the organizational culture of social welfare. The multidimensional Rasch model is confirmatory, where the items are pre-assigned to individual dimensions based on theoretical backgrounds (Purya and Vahid, 2015; Waugh, 2007). It can simultaneously calibrate all subscales to specify multiple traits of a scale and yield more precise estimates of item and person parameters, as well as reliability estimates, than does the unidimensional Rasch model when the underlying test structure contains more than one dimension (Wang, Chen and Cheng, 2004). The multidimensional random coefficient multinomial logit (MRCML) modeling procedures were used to model the five-factor model (Coulacoglou and Saklofske, 2017). Item fit was then examined using mean square (MNSQ) and the corresponding T fit statistics (Linacre, 2002), which was conducted by ConQuest 3.0 (Adams et al., 2012). MNSQ and T statistics indicate how much the residuals vary relative to the expected variance. The weighted (infit) and unweighted (outfit) are used to summarize unexpected responses. Ideally, if an item fits the model, both infit and outfit MNSQs are approximately 1 (Purya and Vahid, 2015; Wang et al., 2004). Values outside the range of 0.6 and 1.4 for infit and outfit MNSQ with T fit statistics greater than 2 were considered problematic (Wright et al., 1994). Linacre (2002) further suggested removing an item with MNSQ and T fit statistics exceeding 2 because it degrades the whole measurement. Based on these suggestions, the items with both MNSQ and T fit statistics larger than 2 were removed, and then the team considered removing an item with a greater deviation from the acceptable range. The data were reanalyzed until no items showed problematic item fit.

Moreover, the internal reliability and concurrent validity of the newly validated OCS-SW and its subscales were tested by Cronbach reliability and correlation analysis. It is considered to have good internal consistency if Cronbach's $\alpha \geq .70$ (Miller and Salkind, 2002), and satisfactory concurrent validity if the correlation coefficients $r \geq .40$ and $\leq .85$ among the subscales of OCS-SW (Cohen et al., 2003). Furthermore, general linear modeling and multivariate linear regression were conducted to test known-groups validity and predictive validity. Specifically, known-groups validity was to investigate whether OCS-SW and its subscales were able to discriminate gender and mental health status of practitioners in the organization (Gregory et al., 2009; M. Shim, 2010). Predictive validity was used to test whether OCS-SW and its subscales predict current job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention of practitioners in the organization concurrently while adjusting their sociodemographic covariates of gender, age, education attainment, years of employment in the organization, and income levels. Empirically, using multivariate linear regression rather than multiple linear regression to predict the organizational outcomes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention can effectively reduce biases of multi-collinearity and Type I errors as the former is capable of regressing

multiple organizational outcomes on the predicators of OCS-SW and its subscales, as well as pertinent sociodemographic covariates concomitantly (Olive, 2017), hence leading to more accurate results of predictive validity.

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of practitioner participants in HKYWCA, in which female practitioners (n= 705, 79.1%) predominantly outnumber their male counterparts (n = 186, 20.9%). This is common in the social welfare settings. The mean of the age range is 3.32, which indicates employed practitioners in HKYWCA were generally in their thirties. Specifically, 30.5% and 26% of the practitioners in HKYWCA were at the age range between 30 and 39 years (n = 272) and between 40 and 49 years (n = 232), and 24.6% of the practitioners (n = 220) were aged between 25 and 29 years or below. The share of practitioners who were aged 50 years or above was 18.9%. For educational attainment, senior secondary school (n = 233, 26.2%) and university degree graduates (n = 237, 26.6%) are the most frequent, and those of junior secondary school (n=178, 20%) and associate degree level (n = 172, 19.3%) are similar. Only few had a postgraduate degree level (n = 71, 8%). For duration of employment, the mean is 3.62, referring that practitioner participants have generally worked for around 5 years in HKYWCA, at which 23.3% and 23.1% of the practitioners have been employed in HKYWCA within 2 to 5 years (n = 208) and within 5 to 10 years (n = 206). Nevertheless, 30% of the practitioners (n = 267) had worked 10 or more years in HKYWCA, although 13% of them (n = 116) had only been employed for no more than 1 year. The mean income level of practitioners in HKYWCA is 2.31, which tells that they on average earned around more than ten thousand Hong Kong dollars per month. In fact, 47% of the practitioners (n = 419) had monthly income between HK$10,000 and 19,999, and those who earned below HK$10,000 and between HK$20,000 and 29,999 shared 22.3% (n = 199) and 14.8% (n = 132). The remaining few practitioners who had monthly income between HK$30,000 and 39,999 and HK$40,000 or more shared 9.1% (n = 91) and 6.7% (n = 60).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of demographic covariates of practitioner participants in HKYWCA

Demographic Covariates	Mean/ Frequency	SD/%	Range
Gender	1.79	.407	1,2
1) Male	186	20.9%	
2) Female	705	79.1%	
Age	3.32	1.173	1-5
1) Below 25 years	64	7.2%	
2) 25 to 29 years	156	17.4%	
3) 30 to 39 years	272	30.5%	
4) 40 to 49 years	232	26%	
5) 50 years or above	168	18.9%	
Educational Level	2.76	1.262	1-5
1) Junior secondary school or below	178	20%	
2) Senior secondary school	233	26.2%	
3) Associate degree	172	19.3%	
4) Undergraduate degree	237	26.6%	
5) Postgraduate degree	71	8%	
Years of Employment	3.62	1.566	1-6
1) Below 1 year	116	13%	
2) Within 1 to 2 years	94	10.5%	
3) Within 2 to 5 years	208	23.3%	
4) Within 5 to 10 years	206	23.1%	
5) Within 10 to 15 years	128	14.4%	
6) Above 15 years	139	15.6%	
Monthly Income	2.31	1.117	1-5
1) Below HK$10,000	199	22.3%	
2) Between HK$10,000 and 19,999	419	47%	
3) Between HK$20,000 and 29,999	132	14.8%	
4) Between HK$30,000 and 39,999	81	9.1%	
5) HK$40,000 or above	60	6.7%	

Note: For increasing the response rates of the practitioner participants, Age, Educational Level, Years of Employment, and Monthly Income are all measured by a range-rating approach with a 5-point and 6-point scale

Table 3 presents the results of the Rasch model, in which three items had MNSQ and t statistics exceeding 2, and the estimates of reliability for the cultural aspects of service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations were .93, .94, .95, .94, and .94 respectively, reaching an excellent level. The items with both infit and outfit MNSQ and t statistics outside the acceptable range were repeatedly removed, resulting in 25 items in the scale. Five items were used to measure service mission and values, 8 items for assessing management and leadership, 6 for measuring professional development and training, 3 items for working conditions and environment, and 3 items for teamwork cooperation and relations. As a result, the 25 items were retained in the subsequent analyses.

Table 3. Results and item information of Rasch model

Item No.	Item difficulty	Infit		Outfit	
		MNSQ	T statistics	MNSQ	T statistics
Service mission and value					
a1	-0.34	0.94	-1.4	0.96	-0.8
a2	-0.21	0.78	-4.9	0.79	-4.6
a3	0.04	0.84	-3.5	0.85	3.1
a4	0.53	1.14	2.8	1.10	1.8
a5	-0.02	0.89	-2.3	0.89	-2.2
Management and leadership					
b1	-0.18	0.88	-2.6	0.89	-2.4
b2	-0.08	0.86	-3.1	0.86	-2.9
b3	0.23	1.10	2.1	1.10	2.0
b4	-0.24	0.74	-6.0	0.74	-5.6
b5	0.20	0.99	-0.2	0.99	-0.1
b7	0.13	0.85	-3.2	0.86	-2.9
b8	-.25	0.80	-4.5	0.81	-3.9
b9	0.19	1.21	4.1	1.25	4.6
Professional development and training					
c1	0.18	1.07	1.4	1.07	1.4
c2	0.04	1.16	3.3	1.17	3.2
c3	0.25	.00005	1.0	1.07	1.4
c4	-0.45	1.39	7.3	1.41	7.3
c5	-0.02	1.13	2.7	1.14	2.8
c6	0.01	1.16	3.3	1.20	3.7

Item No.	Item difficulty	Infit		Outfit	
		MNSQ	T statistics	MNSQ	T statistics
Working conditions and environment					
d1	-0.67	1.32	6.1	1.35	6.5
d2	0.44	1.42	7.9	1.36	6.4
d6	0.23	1.23	4.5	1.26	4.7
Teamwork and relations					
e1	0.22	1.29	5.7	1.31	5.6
e2	-0.35	0.98	-0.5	1.31	5.6
e3	0.13	0.99	-0.2	1.00	0.1

The composite scores of OCS-SW and its subscales were then formed by averaging the respective items pertinent to their cultural aspects and the overall organizational cultural measure of OCS-SW. Table 4 displays the correlation coefficients among the five subscales of OCS-SW and the total score of OCS-SW. The five subscales of OCS-SW were significantly and positively correlated with each other in a substantial way with a range from $r = .673$ to $.824$, $ps < .01$. They were also strongly and significantly correlated with the total score of OCS-SW ranging from $r = .810$ to $.891$, $ps < .01$. These substantial and significant correlations among the subscales and the total score of OCS-SW support a good concurrent validity of OCS-SW and its subscales.

Table 4. Correlations of Organizational culture scale in social welfare (OCS-SW) and its subscales

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Service mission and values	--					
2	Management and leadership	.824**					
3	Professional development and training	.702**	.764**				
4	Working conditions and environment	.684**	.754**	.783**			
5	Teamwork and relations	.679**	.702**	.673**	.694**		
6	OCS-SW total	.891**	.947**	.888**	.857**	.810**	--

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

Besides, Table 5 shows that Cronbach's alpha coefficients of OCS-SW and its five cultural aspects were all adequate, in which OCS-SW was $\alpha = .972$, and the five cultural aspects of service mission and value, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and

relations were α = .937, .960, .905, .804, and .869 respectively. In addition, intraclass correlation coefficients of OCS-SW and its five cultural aspects of service mission and value, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations were ρ = .585, .745, .744, .612, .576, and .685, connoting their very good level (Table 4). In fact, the item means were ranged from = 4.556 to 4.746, slightly above the average from a 7-point scale, which were supported by the significant Hotelling's T-squared tests to vindicate their different from the hypothesized mean vector, μ_0.

Table 5. Cronbach alpha and intraclass correlation coefficients of Organizational culture scale in social welfare (ocs-sw) and its subscales

		α	ρ	Item Means	Hotelling's T^2
1.	Service mission and values	.937	.745	4.719	36.505**
2.	Management and leadership	.960	.744	4.556	129.809**
3.	Professional development and training	.905	.612	4.746	102.686**
4.	Working conditions and environment	.804	.576	4.596	198.286**
5.	Teamwork and relations	.869	.685	4.777	95.349**
6.	OCS-SW total	.972	.585	4.665	599.708**

*Legend: α= Cronbach alpha coefficient; ρ= Intraclass correlation coefficient; Hotelling's T^2 = Hotelling's T-squared test. *p< .05, **p<.01*

To test the criterion validity of OCS-SW and its subscales, known-groups validity was conducted to verify whether both OCS-SW and its subscales would be discriminative among theoretically different working groups of practitioners in the organization. Empirically, gender and mental health status were selected as the known-groups criteria. Past research indicated that female workers generally have higher loyalty and appreciation of the working culture of their organization (Cheung and Yeung, 2015; Hyde et al., 2016). In addition, it is believed that mentally healthy employees would regard the culture of their organization more positively than would their less mentally healthy counterparts, as the latter may hold a negative attribution to external events (Gonzalez, Gonzalez and San Jose, 2017; Zhou et al., 2018). Based on the results of adequate sensitivity and specificity from the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (ROC) found in prior research, the standard scoring method of GHQ-12 (0-0-1-1) with a threshold of ≥ 2 was used as the cut-off to classify the practitioner participants into mentally healthy and unhealthy groups. General linear modeling was applied to these group difference effects. Table 6 presents that, as compared to their male

counterparts, female practitioners had significantly higher scores on OCS-SW and its subscales, except for development and training, and mentally healthy practitioners regarded organizational culture significantly higher than did their mentally less healthy counterparts across all subscales and the total score of OCS-SW.

Table 6. Results of known-groups validity between male and female and mentally healthy and unhealthy practitioners

		Gender			Mental Status		
		Male	Female		Mentally healthy	Mental unhealthy	
		M (SD)	M (SD)	F	M (SD)	M (SD)	F
1	Service mission and values	4.55 (1.01)	4.76 (1.02)	6.16*	4.93 (1.05)	4.56 (.977)	29.21**
2	Management and leadership	4.33 (1.08)	4.61 (1.09)	9.57**	4.77 (1.11)	4.39 (1.06)	25.82**
3	Professional development and training	4.64 (1.00)	4.77 (.93)	2.51	4.97 (.93)	4.57 (.92)	39.65**
4	Working conditions and environment	4.41 (1.04)	4.64 (.98)	7.57**	4.83 (1.00)	4.42 (.95)	37.92**
5	Teamwork and relations	4.54 (.95)	4.83 (1.02)	11.95**	4.97 (1.00)	4.62 (1.00)	26.29**
6	OCS-SW total	4.48 (.90)	4.71 (.91)	8.69**	4.88 (.93)	4.50 (.87)	38.62**

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

Furthermore, multivariate linear regression was conducted to test the predictive validity of OCS-SW and its subscales in relation to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention of practitioners in the organization. In conducting multivariate linear regression, sociodemographic covariates of practitioners' gender, age, educational attainment, years of employment in the organization, and income levels were all adjusted. Empirically, the outcomes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention were significantly correlated with each other, ranging from r = -.504 to .760, ps < .01, which denote the adequacy of using multivariate linear regression instead of multiple linear regression to tackle the problems of multi-collinearity and non-independence for ensuring unbiased results. Table 7 shows that both OCS-SW and its five subscales were significantly predictive of higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and lower leave intention of

practitioners in the organization. Specifically, social work and social service practitioners of higher OCS-SW scores significantly exhibited higher job satisfaction, β = .654, p < .01, and organizational commitment, β = .614, p< .01, as well as lower leave intention, β = -.485, p < .01. Moreover, higher scores of the cultural aspects of service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations were significantly related to higher job satisfaction, β = .434 to .629, ps < .01, and higher organizational commitment, β = .448 to .570, ps < .01, among practitioners in the organization. Moreover, higher scores of the five cultural aspects of OCS-SW were significantly and negatively predictive of lower leave intention of practitioners, β = -.361 to -.468, ps < .01. In sum, OCS-SW exhibited the strongest predictive effects on the three outcome variables, and the five cultural aspects of OCS-SW presented varying effects on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and leave intention of social work and social service practitioners in the organization.

Table 7. Multivariate linear regression predicting job satisfaction, job commitment and leave intention of practitioners by OCS-SW and its subscales[a]

Model / Outcome	Job satisfaction		Job commitment		Leave intention		X^2 (df)[c]
	β	SE[b]	β	SE	β	SE	
1. Service mission and values	.434**	.027	.448**	.029	-.361**	.026	1485.649 (12)**
2. Management and leadership	.585**	.023	.570**	.022	-.468**	.027	1706.043 (21)**
3. Professional development and training	.629**	.020	.547**	.023	-.434**	.027	1747.354 (21)**
4. Working conditions and environment	.601**	.022	.542**	.023	-.441**	.027	1701.627 (21)**
5. Teamwork and relations	.541**	.024	.537**	.023	-.368**	.029	1621.166 (21)**
6. OCS-SW total	.654**	.020	.614**	.020	-.485**	.026	1846.314 (21)**

*Note. [a] The predictors of OCS-SW and its subscales were entered in the regression model respectively when the outcomes of job satisfaction, job commitment and leave intention were regressed simultaneously while adjusting for gender, age, education attainment, years of employment, and income levels of the practitioner participants as covariates. For simplicity, the coefficients of participants' gender, age, education attainment, years of employment, and income levels were not displayed, but can be obtained on request. [b]SE= Stand Error. [c] Model Chi-Square (X^2) and its degree of freedom (df) in the model fit index of the entire multivariate regression model. *p < .05, **p < .01*

DISCUSSION

Organizational culture is an important factor contributive to various organizational performances and outcomes (Baek et al., 2019; Bellou, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009; Lim, 1995), such as organizational continuity and sustainability, service and production quality, employees' work attitude and behavior, public perceptions, and social acceptance. Relevantly, social work and social service organizations of optimal organizational culture can help enhance professional development and provide responsive and competent services and interventions to clients (Cheung and Yeung, 2015; Ewijk, 2018; Shim, 2014; Taormina, 2008; Vlaicu et al., 2019). Nevertheless, well-validated and appropriate organizational culture measures capturing cultural complexity of organizations in the social welfare settings have been lacking, which heavily hinders evidence-based inquiries regarding cultural phenomena in the profession. Therefore, OCS-SW was developed and validated in this study for use in social work and social service research (Cheung and Yeung, 2015; Walker, 2014).

Compared to the available organizational culture measures in other fields, OCS-SW is better able to tap on the complexity and multidimensionality of cultural phenomena in social work and social service. In fact, the five cultural aspects of OCS-SW, service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations, are considered relevant and responsive to the organizations in social welfare settings that can help examine the role and influence of cultural complexity of social work and social service organizations in relation to their organizational development and outcomes. Apparently, each cultural aspect of OCS-SW reinforces the others and constitutes an integral part of an overall organizational culture of social welfare. The multifaceted nature of OCS-SW demonstrated satisfactory reliability and validity that can assist to effectively assess different cultural domains of social work and social service organizations to scrutinize if any cultural areas need to be improved and enhanced (Ewijk, 2018; Johnson, 2010; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017). Explicitly, OCS-SW can help social work and social service practitioners, researchers, and educators to thoroughly inspect the cultural aspects of service mission and values, management and leadership, professional development and training, working conditions and environment, and teamwork and relations, or their entirety in the organizations in social welfare settings. All these cultural aspects and the whole of OCS-SW are conducive to help identify cultural strengths, weaknesses, and health of social work and social service organizations, which are pivotal to its professional continuity, sustainability, and development (Abramovitz, 2012; Glicken, 2007; Walker, 2014).

Given the strong psychometric properties of OCS-SW, future studies can employ this culturally appropriate measure to investigate the ways of cultural phenomena

in social welfare settings that may shape the organizational outcomes of efficiency, innovation, sustainability, team spirit, communication, service quality and delivery, and employees' working ethics and performance (Bellou, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009; Hyde et al., 2016; Vlaicu et al., 2019). Furthermore, organizational culture is a contextual contributor that can influence employees' turnover and psychological and mental health (Cheung and Yeung, 2015; Schudrich, 2014; M. Shim, 2014). Thus, researchers and senior practitioners of social work and social services can use OCS-SW to investigate how the status of organizational culture affects practitioners' mental and behavioral health, which are crucial for maintaining and improving the cultural quality and climate of the organization in a reciprocal and sustainable way (Baek et al., 2019; Hugman, 2012; O'Reilly et al., 1991). In fact, generalist perspective is the prime and chief professional development and intervention approach of social welfare (Birkenmaier et al., 2011.; Johnson, 2010.), which is applicable to different social work and social service organizations in serving family and children, youths, the elderly, rehabilitants, offenders, the disabled, and community residents. The newly validated OCS-SW is a multifaceted and comprehensive organizational culture measure that is corresponding to the generalist approach upheld in social work and social services (Abramovitz, 2012; Parrott and Maguinness, 2017). Hence, it can be used to conduct applied research in social welfare settings.

However, some limitations of the present study should be considered. One is the sample of social work and social service practitioners coming from a single organization only. The present study employed the data of practitioners in social welfare settings only collected by HKYWCA that possesses a strong cultural background of Christianity. This may raise the question of whether the newly developed and validated OCS-SW is well suited to other social work and social service organizations with different religious backgrounds or without a religious culture. Future studies are needed to validate OCS-SW with samples from more diverse social welfare organizations. For this reason, it is suggested that recruiting a representative sample of social work and social service practitioners from different organizations to help cross-validate the psychometric properties and reliability of OCS-SW would further validly confirm whether the currently validated OCS-SW is reliable or it needs any modifications to enhance its internal and external validity and predictive power. Moreover, validity studies are suggested to examine the stability of reliability and validity of OCS-SW across different social work and social service organizations in different societal and cultural contexts. By comparing the measurement invariance of OCS-SW in different societal and cultural contexts, both internal reliability and external validity of OCS-SW can be vindicated to have equivalence when applied in different populations of social work and social service. Therefore, it is useful to confirm whether measurement invariance of OCS-SW exists, which includes both

factorial invariance and construct validity invariance. If measurement invariance of OCS-SW maintains, future organizational culture research can employ OCS-SW for different social work and social service organizations in diverse geographical regions.

Despite these limitations, the present study extends the existing scholarship on social work and social service research by providing a newly developed and validated organizational culture measure of OCS-SW for empirical use in social welfare settings. As supported by the good internal reliability, concurrent validity, criterion validity, and predictive validity of OCS-SW in a sample of social work and social service practitioners, this study has laid a foundation for future directions in organizational culture research in social welfare. Therefore, it is recommended that large-scale cross-region and cross-organization research should be conducted in the future by using OCS-SW and its subscales to see how cultural phenomena in different social work and social service organizations may shape or hinder their service competence and professional development in a comprehensive and comparative way.

REFERENCES

1. Abramovitz, M. (2012). Theorising welfare for social work. In: Gray, M., Midgley, J., & Webb, S. A. (eds.), *The Sage handbook of social work*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 33–66.
2. Adams, R. J., Wu, M., Haldane, S. A. & Sun, X. X. (2012). *ACER ConQuest version 3.0: Generalised item response modeling software*. Melbourne: Australia Council for Educational Research and University of California, Berkeley.
3. Afshari, L., Nasab, A. H. & Dickson, G. (2020). Organizational culture, social capital, and knowledge management: An integrated model. *International Journal of Knowledge Management,* 16 (2), 52–66. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijkm.2020040104
4. Alp, E. A., Sefil, S. & Sak, A. K. (2015). The impact of education level and gender on job search duration in Turkey. *Educational Sciences-Theory & Practice, 15*(2), 313–324.
5. Baek, P., Chang, J. & Kim, T. (2019). Organizational culture now and going forward. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 32 (6), 650–668. https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-05-2018-0121
6. Barnay, T. & Defebvre. (2019). Gender differences in the influence of mental health on job retention. *Labour-England*, 33 (4), 507–532. https://doi.org/10.1111/labr.12154
7. Bellou, V. (2010). Organizational culture as a predictor of job satisfaction: The role of gender and age. *Career Development International*, 15, 4–19.

8. Birkenmaier, J., Berg-Weger, M. & Dewees, M. (2011). *The practice of generalist social work*. New York: Routledge.

9. Blok, W. (2012). *Core social work: International theory, values and practice*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

10. Chetkow-Yanoov, B. (1997). *Social work practice: A systems approach*. New York: Haworth Press.

11. Cheung, C. K. & Yeung, J. W. K. (2015). Enhancing job performance and mental health through organizational nurturing culture. *Human Service Organizations Management Leadership and Governance*, 39 (4), 251–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2015.1039153

12. Clark, E. (2015). What changes and what remains in a practice profession. In: Corcoran, K. & Roberts, A. R. (eds.), *Social workers' desk reference*. New York: Oxford University Press, 3–9.

13. Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G. & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Routledge.

14. Cooke, R. A. & Lafferty, J. C. (1987). *Organizational Culture Inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.

15. Cooke, R. A. & Szumal, J. L. (2000). Using the Organizational culture inventory to understand the operating cultures of organizations. In: Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M. & Peterson, M. P. (eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 147–162.

16. Coulacoglou, C. & Saklofske, D. H. (2017). *Psychometrics and psychological assessment: Principles and applications*. London: Academic Press.

17. Dale, O. & Smith, R. (2009). *Human behavior and the social environment: Social systems theory*. Boston: Pearson Education.

18. Ewijk, H. V. (2018). *Complexity and social work*. New York: Routledge.

19. Foster, J. (2017). *Building effective social work teams*. Oxon: Routledge.

20. Glicken, M. D. (2007). *Social work in the 21st century: An introduction to social welfare, social issues, and the profession*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

21. Glisson, C. (2007). Assessing and changing organizational culture and climate for effective services. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17, 736–747.

22. Gonzalez, R. P., Gonzalez, M. J. A. & San Jose, C. (2017). Positive and negative affect in the future teacher: Relationships with their academic achievement, mental health and satisfaction with life. *Contextos Educativos-Revista De Educacion*, 20, 11–26. https://doi.org/10.18172/con.2996

23. Gregory, B. T., Harris, S. G., Armenakis, A. A. & Shook, C. L. (2009). Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 673–679.

24. Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y. & Kinicki, A. J. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 677–694.

25. Heritage, B., Pollock, C. & Roberts, L. (2014). Validation of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument. *Plos One*, 9 (3), e92879.

26. Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, values and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies*, 19, 477–493.

27. Hu, L. Q., Fan, Y. L. & Sun, T. S. (2017). Spatial or socioeconomic inequality? Job accessibility changes for low- and high-education population in Beijing, China. *Cities*, 66, 23-33. https://doi.org/10.1016

28. Hugman, R. (2012). *Culture, values and ethics in social work: Embracing diversity*. London: Taylor and Francis.

29. Hyde, M. K., Dunn, J., Wust, N., Bax, C. & Chambers, S. K. (2016). Satisfaction, organizational commitment and future action in charity sport event volunteers. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 21, 148–167.

30. Iammarino, S. & Marinelli, E. (2015). Education-job (mis)match and interregional migration: Italian university graduates' transition to work. *Regional Studies*, 49 (5), 866–882. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2014.965135

31. Johnson, L. C. (2010). *Social work practice: A generalist approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

32. Jung, T., Scott, T., Davies, H. T. O., Bower, P., Whalley, D., McNally, R. & Mannion, R. (2009). Instruments for exploring organizational culture: A review of the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 69, 1087–1096.

33. Koberg, C. S. & Chusmir, L. H. (1987). Organizational culture relationships with creativity and other job-related variables. *Journal of Business Research*, 15 (5), 397–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(87)90009-9

34. Lawler, J. & Bilson, A. (2010). *Social work management and leadership: Managing complexity with creativity*. New York: Routledge.

35. Leana, C. R. & Meuris, J. (2015). Living to work and working to live: Income as a driver of organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9 (1), 55–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2015.1007654

36. Lim, B. (1995). Examining the organizational culture and organizational performance link. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 16, 16–21.

37. Linacre, J. M. (2002). What do infit and outfit, mean-square and standardized mean? *Rasch Measurement Transaction*, 16, 878.

38. Lopez-Martin, E. & Topa, G. (2019). Organizational culture and job demands and resources: Their impact on employees' wellbeing in a multivariate multilevel

model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16 (17). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173006

39. Lundin, A., Hallgren, M., Theobald, H., Hellgren, C. & Torgen, M. (2016). Validity of the 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire in detecting depression in the general population. *Public Health*, 136, 66–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2016.03.005

40. Macionis, J. J. & Plummer, K. (2012). *Sociology: A global introduction*. London: Prentice Hall.

41. Mang, L. M. (2018). The relationship between organizational culture and an organization's performance in the Austrian private sector. *Journal of Organisational Studies and Innovation*, 5 (4), 11–24.

42. Marcos, C. B. & Garcia, F. G. (2012). Job satisfaction and wages: Does labor income compensate nonmonetary conditions of work? *Revista De Economia Aplicada*, 20 (60), 25–51.

43. Miller, D. C. & Salkind, N. J. (2002). *Handbook of research design and social measurement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

44. O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. & Caldwell, D. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487–516.

45. Olive, D. J. (2017). *Linear Regression*. Cham: Springer.

46. Paais, M. & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business*, 7 (8), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no8.577

47. Parrott, L. & Maguinness, N. (2017). *Social work in context: Theory and concepts*. London: Sage.

48. Parton, N. & Kirk, S. (2010). The nature and purposes of social work. In: I. Shaw (ed.), *The SAGE handbook of social work research.* London: Sage, 23–36.

49. Purya, B. & Vahid, A. (2015). Modeling local item dependence due to common test format with a multidimensional Rasch model. *International Journal of Testing*, 15 (1), 71–87.

50. Reamer, F. G. (2006). *Social work values and ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

51. Rothman, J. C. (2015). Integrating values into social work practice. In: Corcoran, K. & Roberts, A. R. (eds.), *Social workers' desk reference.* New York: Oxford University Press, 197–204.

52. Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. In: Schneider, B. (ed.), *Organizational climate and culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 153–192.

53. Ryu, G. (2016). Public employees' well-being when having long working hours and low-salary working conditions. *Public Personnel Management*, 45 (1), 70–89. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015601143

54. Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45, 105–119.

55. Schoenwald, S. K., Chapman, J. E., Sheidow, A. J. & Carter, R. E. (2009). Long-term youth criminal outcomes in MST transport: The impact of therapist adherence and organizational climate and structure. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 38 (1), 91–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410802575388

56. Schram, S. (2012). Welfare professionals and street-level bureaucrats. In: Mel, G., Midgley, J. & Webb, S. A. (eds.), *The Sage handbook of social work*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 67–80.

57. Schudrich, W. Z. (2014). Validating a measure of organizational cultural competence in https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731513516513

58. Schudson, M. (1994). Culture and the integration of national societies. In: Crane, D. (ed.), *The Sociology of culture: Emerging theoretical perspectives*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 21–44.

59. Scott, T., Mannion, R., Davies, H. & Marshall, M. (2003). The quantitative measurement of organizational culture in health care: A review of the available instruments. *Health Services Research*, 38 (3), 923–945.

60. Shim, M. (2010). Factors influencing child welfare employee's turnover: Focusing on organizational culture and climate. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32, 847–856.

61. Shim, M. (2014). Do organisational culture and climate really matter for employee turnover in child welfare agencies? *British Journal of Social Work*, 44 (3), 542–558. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcs162

62. Smith, M., Cree, V. E., MacRae, R., Sharp, D., Wallace, E. & O'Halloran, S. (2017). Social suffering: Changing organisational culture in children and families social work through critical reflection groups-Insights from Bourdieu. *British Journal of Social Work*, 47 (4), 973–988. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw087

63. Taormina, R. J. (2008). Interrelating leadership behaviors, organizational socialization, and organizational culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29, 85–102.

64. Taylor, W. C., Suminski, R. R., Das, B. M., Paxton, R. J. & Craig, D. W. (2018). Organizational culture and implications for workplace interventions to reduce sitting time among office-based workers: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00263

65. Trevor, L., Jonathan, P. & Greta, B. (2013). *Social work intervention*. London: Sage.

66. Van Den Ouweland, L. & Van den Bossche, P. (2017). The impact of values-job fit and age on work-related learning. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 21 (3), 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12103

67. Vlaicu, F. L., Neagoe, A., Tiru, L. G. & Otovescu, A. (2019). The organizational culture of a major social work institution in Romania: A sociological analysis. *Sustainability*, 11 (13). https://doi.org/10.3390/su11133587

68. Walker, H., G., Symon, G. & Davies, B. (1996). Assessing organizational culture: A comparison of methods. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 4 (7), 96–105.

69. Walker, J. (2014). *Social work and human development*. London: Sage.

70. Wang, W.-C., Chen, P.-H. & Cheng, Y.-Y. (2004). Improving measurement precision of test batteries using multidimensional item response theory. *Psychological Methods*, 9 (1), 116–136.

71. Waugh, R. F. (2007). Rasch measurement model. In: N. J. Salkind (ed.), *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1, 821–825.

72. Wolf, D., Dulmus, C. N., Maguin, E. & Cristalli, M. (2014). Do organizational culture and climate matter for successful client outcomes? *Research on Social Work Practice*, 24 (6), 670–675. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731513506616

73. Wright, B., Linacre, J. M., Gustafsson, J. E. & Martin-Loff, P. (1994). Reasonable mean-square fit values. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 8, 370.

74. Yoo, J. & Brooks, D. (2005). The role of organizational variables in predicting service effectiveness: An analysis of a multilevel model. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 15 (4), 267–277. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731505275868

75. Zhang, Y. P. (2017). A study of the affecting vocational education on job involvement and job burnout from the view of venue workers. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics Science and Technology Education*, 13 (8), 5557–5568. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.01006a

76. Zhou, S. Y., Da, S., Guo, H. & Zhang, X. C. (2018). Work-family conflict and mental health among female employees: A sequential mediation model via negative affect and perceived stress. *Frontiers in Psychology,* 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00544

Jerf W. K. Yeung
Hui-Fang Chen
Andrew Yiu Tsang Low

RAZVOJ I VALIDACIJA MJERNE LJESTVICE ORGANIZACIJSKE KULTURE U USTANOVAMA SOCIJALNE SKRBI

SAŽETAK

Organizacijska kultura odnosi se na norme, uvjerenja i vrijednosti ugrađene u organizaciju koje mogu bitno utjecati na različite radne ishode organizacije. Zbog nedostatka provjerenih mjera organizacijske kulture u ustanovama socijalne skrbi, istraživanja organizacijske kulture u području socijalnog rada i socijalnih usluga su malobrojna. Glavni cilj ovog istraživanja bio je razviti i provjeriti mjernu ljestvicu organizacijske kulture, Mjernu ljestvicu organizacijske kulture u socijalnoj skrbi (Organizational Culture Scale in Social Welfare OCS-SW), koja bi se koristila u istraživanjima u području socijalnog rada i socijalnih usluga. istraživanje se temelji na ukupnom uzorku od 891 zaposlenika u velikim i ustaljenim ustanovama za socijalnu skrb u Hong Kongu. Mjerna ljestvica OCS-SW sadrži pet kulturalnih aspekata: a) zadaća i vrijednosti, b) upravljanje i vodstvo, c) profesionalni razvoj i obuka, d) radni uvjeti i okružje i e) timski rad i međuljudski odnosi. Rezultati primjene Rascovog modela emprijski potvrđuju da tih pet kulturalnih aspekata mjerne ljestvice utječe na ukupnu organizacijsku kulturu, što podupire valjanost ljestvice. osim toga, odgovarajuća interna pouzdanost, istodobna valjanost, valjanost kriterija i prediktivna valjanost ljestvice i njezinih podljestvica potvrđeni su u daljnjim analizama. Ovo istraživanje potvrđuje da mjerna ljestvica OCS-SW ima praktičnu primjenu u procjeni organizacijske kulture u istraživanjima u području socijalnog rada i socijalnih usluga. U radu se raspravlja o ograničenjima u istraživanju i daljnjim istraživanjima.

Ključne riječi: *organizacijska kultura; ustanove socijalne skrbi; Raschov model; mjerna ljestvica organizacijske kulture u socijalnoj skrbi*