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Background and context

• Escalating demands for formal LTC due to population ageing
  – One of the fastest growing sectors offering 2M jobs in the UK
• High turnover (24% vs. an average of 15%) and vacancy rates (4% vs. 1.7%)
• Highly gendered; low paid; significant contribution from migrant and other vulnerable workers
• Dynamic policy context
• Increased levels of outsourcing and fragmentation of work
The Longitudinal Care Work Study (LoCS)

• LoCS programme of work started in 2008/09 and included a multi-mode survey and one-to-one interviews
• A total of 1342 frontline care practitioners took part in two rounds of surveys
• 300 interviews over two phases with social care workforce, employers, and service users/carers.
• Third phase of data collection started March 2016.
## Sample description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (s.d.)</td>
<td>44.8 (10.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BME</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With any disability</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Born outside the UK</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/partnership</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorce/Widowed</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Suffer from any long term illness/health condition†</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Judge their health to be poor or very poor during previous 12 months to the survey</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of valid cases</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question and Methods

• What are the factors influencing job satisfaction (JS) and intention to leave (ItL) among LTC workers?
• How does job-demand control model interplay with ItL and JS?
• Employing Principal Component Analysis and Structure Equation Modelling
• Exploratory data analysis conducted in R and SPSS- SEM model implemented in MPlus
Framework of analysis

• Job satisfaction and job quitting are measured by different questions
• JS and ItL are influenced by individuals’ ability to do their work, the rewards they get and the support they have- framed within the Karasek Control-Demand model
• Individual characteristics, personal and work pressures also impact on both outcomes
• Job satisfaction and job quitting are interdependent and thus need to be studied simultaneously
LTC and psychological job demand

• Emotionally taxing job
• Several studies focused on human service workforce
  – Usually reflecting the experience of professional staff (e.g. social workers) in areas of adult and children protection
  – Highlighting relatively high stress levels
• Few studies focused on frontline practitioners
  – Less skilled; have fewer decision power
  – Two studies identified prevalence rate of staff distress (wide range from 5% to 37% of those ‘at risk’)
  – Four studies reported mean stress scores (all were low)
  – Majority of studies are small scale and used instruments with unsatisfactory psychometric properties
Karasek Control-Demand Model

- Postulates that job strain is the result of an interaction between demand and control
- A job with high demand and low control is ‘high strain’ → unresolved stress
- A job with low demand and high control is ‘low strain’
- Somewhere between these 2 extremes lie ‘passive’ and ‘active’ jobs → ideal state
- Both elements interact and impact on job satisfaction and intention of job quitting
Passive Job: 16.7%

Low strain Job: 12.4%

Active Job: 36.7%

High strain Job: 34.3%

Karasek ‘norm’ for SS
Variations in Job D/C by some job characteristics

Cronbach’s α
Job control (KDL)= 0.83
Job Demand (KPJD)= 0.77
Social Support (KSoS)= 0.86
Job insecurity (KJI) = 0.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of work</th>
<th><strong>KDL</strong></th>
<th><strong>KPJD</strong></th>
<th><strong>KSoS</strong></th>
<th><strong>KJI</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All hands on care work</td>
<td>68 15</td>
<td>31 68</td>
<td>5 62</td>
<td>24 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly care work</td>
<td>70 71</td>
<td>33 72</td>
<td>5 94</td>
<td>24 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly administration with some care work</td>
<td>71 22</td>
<td>36 55</td>
<td>6 11</td>
<td>24 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no care work, mainly administration</td>
<td>73 09</td>
<td>36 51</td>
<td>6 16</td>
<td>24 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th><strong>KDL</strong></th>
<th><strong>KPJD</strong></th>
<th><strong>KSoS</strong></th>
<th><strong>KJI</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>71 11</td>
<td>32 46</td>
<td>5 54</td>
<td>24 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>70 98</td>
<td>36 62</td>
<td>6 36</td>
<td>24 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>71 89</td>
<td>34 59</td>
<td>5 77</td>
<td>23 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:                                          | 71 04   | 34 96    | 6 00     | 24 23   |

Job characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Karasek JCQ Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job demand</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job insecurity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social support</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Potential factors influencing job satisfaction and intention to leave

- Personal characteristics
- Individual circumstances
- Organisation characteristics
- Job demand and control
- Level of support received from line managers and co-workers
- Job insecurity
- Other factors
Measuring JS and ItL

- Several variables from the survey could be used to measure JS and ItL
  - E.g. for JS: facet and general; ItL: intentional and actual job searches
- Principal component method employed to create ‘global’ JS and ItL factors that incorporate specific elements/components of JS and ItL
Defining the outcomes: ‘Global’ job satisfaction and intention to leave
Estimating key independent factors

Diagram showing relationships between factors with corresponding coefficients.

- `firstscj` with coefficient 0.169
- `type_emp` with coefficient 0.233
- `jobrole` with coefficient 0.088
- `health` with coefficient 0.069
- `nu16` with coefficient 0.184
- `marital` with coefficient 0.203

Additional nodes:
- `jobchar` with coefficient 0.144
- `family` with coefficient 0.021

Inter-node coefficients:
- `firstscj` to `jobchar`: 0.307
- `type_emp` to `jobchar`: -0.322
- `jobrole` to `jobchar`: 1.000
- `health` to `jobchar`: 1.517
- `nu16` to `jobchar`: 0.724
- `marital` to `jobchar`: 1.000
- `jobchar` to `family`: 0.001
- `jobchar` to `marital`: 0.021
The model
Results (significant only)
Key findings 1

• Compared to other studies focused on professional social service staff, LTC workers have
  – Similar levels of job control but higher levels of job demand (with 34% are in high strain jobs)
  – Higher levels of job insecurity
• There is a significant negative association between levels of global job satisfaction and intention to leave
• There is a significant relation between family commitment and job characteristics
Key findings 2

• Level of work social support significantly improves JS and reduces ItL
• Higher level of job control significantly improves global JS but has no significant impact on ItL
• Both job demand and job insecurity significantly reduces JS and increases the likelihood of ItL
• There was no significant relationship between level of social support and job demand
• Job characteristics improves JS but has no significant impact on ItL
• Family commitment significantly improves JS but also significantly increases ItL
Implications

• Supervisor and co-worker support is crucial in improving JS and also reducing ItL
  – Fragmentation of work and lack of supportive environment

• The relationship between current LTC reorganisation: marketisation, outsourcing, zero-hours contracts and job insecurity in light of their significant relationship with both

• Family commitment and external pressures influence both JS and ItL:
  – 59% of respondents are in receipt of some forms of benefits and 29% judges their finance to be difficult or very difficult
Conclusion

• Within the context of casualisation and fragmentation of LTC work there is a clear need to acknowledge the impact on JS and ItL
  – Both in relation to the individual workers as well as the sector as a whole

• Innovative thinking to provide cost-effective in-work support are highly beneficial in light of the current findings

• The impact of low wages and increased job demand have wider implications than just higher turnover and vacancy rates
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