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\textbf{A B S T R A C T}

Administrators of youth Therapeutic Residential Care (TRC) centers are faced with unique staffing challenges. The current study aims to investigate these challenges and the ways in which administrators at one agency face them, emphasizing specifically, staff motivation and staffing patterns. To do this, we assessed youth workers and cottage coordinators (administrators) at a rural therapeutic residential care center in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States by measuring a) what motivates staff to work at the agency as measured by the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ), b) what are the staffing patterns by performance and turnover, and c) what is the interrelationship between performance, turnover and MNQ needs. The results indicate that cottage coordinators exhibited significantly higher needs for achievement (as measured by the MNQ) than youth workers. Additionally, cottage coordinators were significantly higher on autonomy than youth workers. Lastly, both indicated low/moderate dominance and moderate/high affiliation with little difference between the two groups.

Based on these results, we present recommendations on recruitment, training and teambuilding for TRC centers.

\section{1. Introduction}

Historically, recruiting and maintaining high quality staff in child welfare settings has been challenging. Such settings oftentimes experience high staff turnover rates, recruiting challenges, and variability in service delivery (Child Welfare League of America- CWLA, 2009; DePaniBlis & Zlotnik, 2008). In the United States and the United Kingdom, residential care facilities struggle with staffing due to many issues including: emphasis on permanency of placement, abuse scandals, and negative perceptions of residential facilities (Colton & Roberts, 2007). Many staff who work in residential care in the United States and in the United Kingdom experience burnout, low wages, difficulty with work-life balance, and a lack of professional respect (Colton & Roberts, 2007).

Therapeutic Residential Care (TRC) agencies are no exception to these ongoing staffing challenges. They, too, struggle to attract and retain effective staff. Approximately 50,000 children reside in residential treatment centers in the United States and the number of facilities is estimated at about 1600 (Coll & Haas, 2013; Roberts, Battaglia, & Epstein, 1999). Centers that are able to attract and retain high-quality staff are a step ahead of others in delivering high quality services due to the large number of youth who reside in TRCs and the challenges they are facing (Hopkins, Cohen-Callow, Kim, & Hwang, 2010).

Given staffing challenges at TRCs, the focus of our study was to explore ways to address staffing challenges at a Joint Commission accredited TRC, particularly related to staff motivational needs and staffing patterns. The concepts, recommendations, and suggestions presented are directly tied to the Guidelines for Staffing in Child Welfare (2009). The first aim of this study was to explore the motivational needs of staff who work at a TRC as measured by the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) and what differences exist between residential care professionals (RCP’s) and cottage coordinators. We hypothesized that due to the high demands of the job and the need to coordinate staff and campers that cottage coordinators would have a high need for achievement and a high need for dominance. We hypothesized that both cottage coordinators and RCP’s would have a low need for autonomy, because they live and work with one another and...
residents.

The second aim of our study was to explore the staffing patterns by performance, motivational need, and turnover. We hypothesized that there would be trends in performance level related to experience/turnover and motivational need. We hypothesized that staff with higher performance levels would have higher experience and less turnover. We hypothesized that staff with higher performance levels would have a higher need for achievement, need for dominance, and need for autonomy.

The final aim of our study was to determine the interrelationship between performance, turnover and MNQ needs. We hypothesized that lower performing new staff would have different motivational needs than higher performing experienced staff.

2. Review of literature

2.1. Therapeutic residential care

The following is a nominal definition for therapeutic residential care designed to be used internationally:

Therapeutic residential care (TRC) involves the planful use of a purposefully constructed, multi-dimensional living environment designed to enhance or provide treatment, education, socialization, support, and protection to children and youth with identified mental health or behavioral needs in partnership with their families and in collaboration with a full spectrum of community-based formal and informal helping resources. (Whittaker, Del Valle, & Holmes, 2014, p. 24).

The editors who developed this definition desired to encompass the critical elements of therapeutic residential care across nations.

TRCs often involve community-based centers or children’s homes with schooling and treatment philosophies incorporated (Whittaker et al., 2016). TRCs have different models across cultures, theories, and countries. Some overarching principles of TRCs are as follows: do no harm; maintain a connection between families and TRC programs; maintain grounded in communities, cultures, and social relationships; human connections facilitate learning; and use evidence-based practices that can be replicated across TRCs regardless of their size (Whittaker et al., 2016).

3. TRC staffing challenges

Youth worker staff (typically bachelor degree level or below) and administration (typically masters’ degree level) in TRC settings are faced with many professional challenges (Smith, 2003). Compared with other social services (e.g., hospitals, outpatient clinics), staff tend to lag in training for diagnosing, intervening and treating mental illness (Colton & Roberts, 2007; DeLeon & Denhardt, 2000). Many TRC staff begin their employment with little training or background in working with such youth even as the need for such understanding urgently grows (Coll, Kovach, Cutler, & Smith-Robinson, 2008; Colton & Roberts, 2007; Ringle, Ingram, Newman, Thompson, & Waite, 2007).

It is not surprising then that when compared to other social services settings, TRC settings consistently report higher incidences of employee attrition (Roberts et al., 1999). This occurs even though there are many reported benefits to these settings, such as varied tasks and functions, and community recognition for valuable work (Coll & Haas, 2013). However, TRC staff all too often face high role overload, heightened stress and burnout, relationship/role/boundary challenges, professional isolation, economic issues (e.g., scarcity of resources), lack of social/cultural opportunities, and lack of privacy (DeLeon & Denhardt, 2000). This reality is often exacerbated by an ongoing and challenging balance between professional and ethical issues (Smith, 2003). Coll and Haas (2013) and Weigel and Brown (1999) also noted that other challenges typically indicated by TRC staff include large caseloads, widely varied presenting client issues, and limited supervision.

Given these challenges, TRC staff supervisors are an important group to consider since they lead the organization, hire staff, and conduct performance evaluations on staff (Hicks, Archer, & Whittaker, 1998). They are typically senior level, successful TRC staff promoted after at least 3-5 years of experience and with excellent performance. Studies cite the importance of hiring qualified candidates and providing training initiatives that best prepare these supervisors to perform in their roles (Landsman, 2007). Within this need is the high-performance demands that TRC agencies face, which has reportedly increased exponentially even as resources have not (Landsman, 2007).

Studies further cite that retention of TRC supervisors is an ongoing concern as well, due in part to the structural conditions of the workforce and the hectic organizational environment in youth residential treatment agencies (Landsman, 2007). There is no doubt that supervisors play a critical role in the function of any TRC (Hicks et al., 1998). Consequently, knowing how supervisors can more effectively work with staff for better service delivery and lower turnover is of urgent importance (Child Welfare League of America, 2009; DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Hopkins et al., 2010). Shinn, Moch, Robinson, and Neuner (1993) found that employees of residential child care programs should focus not only on individual coping strategies but that coworkers should support one another, and the agency should be design to support workers to deal with the stressors related to work. While there are many issues that influence turnover, such as role conflict, stress, and role overload (DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008; Hopkins et al., 2010), this study focused specifically on motivational needs of staff and supervisors that may influence turnover.

4. Manifest needs theory and questionnaire

The Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) is based on Manifest Needs Theory, which states that behavior is driven by the desire to satisfy manifest (easily perceived or most current) needs. These needs include: need for achievement, affiliation, autonomy and dominance (Steers & Braunstein, 1976). A need consists of physical, material, and psychological conditions, aspects, and circumstances, which a worker prefers to have in a work setting and which serve as an impetus for enhancing job motivation and job satisfaction.

Following is additional elaboration of the four manifest needs measured by the instrument.

Need for Achievement: ‘achievement motivated’ and therefore seeks achievement, attainment of realistic but challenging goals, and advancement in the job. There is a strong need for feedback as to achievement and progress, and a need for a sense of accomplishment.

Need for Affiliation: ‘affiliation motivated’ and has a need for friendly relationships and is motivated towards interaction with other people. The affiliation driver produces motivation, which stems from the need to be liked and held in popular regard. These people are team players.

Need for Autonomy: An individual with this need tends to rely upon their own decision-making and performance abilities. Their behavior tends to reflect their own beliefs, morals, attitudes, and desires rather than those placed upon them. There is a strong need to feel that their free will is not being stifled by a dominator.

Need for Dominance: This person is ‘authority motivated’. This driver produces a need to be influential, effective and to make an impact. There is a strong need to lead and for their ideas to prevail. There is also motivation and need towards increasing personal status and prestige.

5. Method

5.1. Participants

Average age of staff at the residential treatment center was 27.6 (range 21-55, standard deviation 6.3). Fifty-seven percent were female and 43% male. Seventy-four percent of the participants indicated less
than two years of experience and 59% of staff turned over within 2 years. Ten cottage coordinators and 99 residential care professionals had complete data and were included in the study. Cottage coordinators act as managers of the home, and residential care professionals (RCPs) are general staff. In addition to general staff duties, cottage coordinators supervise staff, implement policy and procedures, and maintain other managerial duties.

5.2. Setting

The setting of this Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved study is a rural therapeutic residential care center in the Rocky Mountain Region of the United States. The agency offers specialized educational, psychological, and therapeutic services for adolescents. Youth live in cottages or houses with staff who are able to supervise them within the TRC. Youth are referred to this facility for one or more of the following reasons: (a) non-compliance in school, (b) history of criminal activity, or (c) having been a referral to Child Protective Services. The youth range in age from 12 to 17, with approximately 57% male and 43% female. Typically, 75 to 85% of the participants identify their ethnicity as European American, with 10–15% Hispanic, and 5–10% American Indian/Alaska Native. Forty to 50% of the youth come from families below the poverty line, and about 55% report parental substance abuse/addiction.

6. Instrumentation

The Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) was developed by Steers and Braunstein (1976) to measure the motivational needs of workers, to screen workers into categories according to their needs, and to make job placement decisions according to individual needs in work settings. The 20-item inventory is designed to assess job-related needs of workers. The MNQ measures four manifest needs: Need for Achievement (nAch), Need for Affiliation (nAff), Need for Autonomy (nAut), and Need for Dominance (nDom). The general consensus among those who have used the instrument is that the reliability and stability are consistent and that the tool is still one of the most instrumental to studying achievement, affiliation, autonomy and dominance (Arvey, Rotundo, Johnson, Zhang, & McGue, 2006; Eisenberger, Jones, Stinglhamber, Shanock, & Randall, 2005; Kooij, De Lange, Jansen, Kanfer, & Dikkers, 2011; Krauss, Frese, Friedrich, & Unger, 2005; Mudrack & Naughton, 2001; O’Connor & Morrison, 2001; Valle & Perrewe, 2000).

Consistent with past research (Dreher & Mai-Dalton, 1983; Gallagher, Maher, Gallagher, & Valle, 2017), MNQ scales met the 0.70 cutoff for an acceptable level of reliability, in that test-retest reliability for the four needs (0.72 nAch, 0.75 nAff, 0.77 nAut, and 0.86 nDom, respectively) appear to be highly acceptable for such need scales (Nunnally, 1978).

In addition to test-retest reliability, analyses were also undertaken to determine the degree of internal consistency of the four scales. Using a technique developed by Cronbach (1951), coefficient alphas were calculated for each scale. The results (0.66, 0.56, 0.61, and 0.83, respectively) indicate acceptable levels of internal consistency, given the type of measure, and compare favorably with other scales (e.g., Personality Research Form, Jackson, 1967).

In our study, we checked the MNQ’s stability over time by conducting pair-wise t-tests on 57 youth workers who had completed two administrations of the MNQ with a six month interval. The results were stable as there were no significant differences in scores (df = 56; t = 1.31; p = .20).

An additional measure was employed in this study. Annual performance evaluations of all staff were collected. Every 6 months, staff were rated by their supervisor (cottage coordinators) on a written scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being well below standard performance, 2 being somewhat below standard performance, 3 being standard performance, 4 being somewhat above standard performance, and 5 being well above standard performance. The resulting evaluation, with suggestions, was then shared.

7. Procedure

Data were collected over a one-year period for every TRC staff member, called residential care professional or RCP (n = 99), and their supervisors, called cottage coordinators (n = 10).

7.1. Design

Data were analyzed with descriptive and inferential statistical tools including independent sample t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA). An additional exploration of time at the institution and MNQ profiles was also conducted. This was done to explore the relationship between the MNQ profiles of new hires and those of workers with longer tenure. Such an analysis might provide insights into hiring and retention variables. Independent samples t-test were computed for all MNQ subscales between a group of new hires who had less than one year of experience and had performance ratings of 1 or 2 and a group who had been in the institution three or more years and had ratings > 3.

8. Results

Research Question 1: What motivates staff to work for a TRC as measured by the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) and what differences exist between residential care professionals (RCP’s) and cottage coordinators? Table 1 provides means and standards deviations by group along with results from the independent samples t-tests.

Independent samples t-tests revealed significant differences between cottage coordinators and youth workers for autonomy at the 0.05 level of significance and for achievement at the 0.10 level.

Research Question 2: What are the staffing patterns by performance, motivational needs, and turnover? Table 2 provides results for RCP’s. Cottage coordinators are not included because they conducted the performance evaluations of the RCP’s.

Out of 99 RCP’s that were given performance ratings, 27 were rated below average (i.e., performance levels one or two). This represents 27.3% of the staff. The lowest performers, (i.e., performance level one) were predominantly newcomers to the institution with 58% of them having less than one year at the institution and another 33% having between one and two years’ experience. Experience patterns for those receiving a performance level of two were different from those receiving level ones.

Seventy-eight percent of employees receiving a performance level of two had been between one and two years’ experience at the institution and only 11% had less than one year at the institution. So, most level twos were not new hires but were still quite new to the organization and were still significantly underperforming during their second year at the institution. Performance levels three and four showed an emerging trend of greater years of experience being associated with higher performance. And performance level five presented a unique nearly bimodal distribution with 60% of these high performers having less than...
Table 2: RCP staffing patterns by performance, motivation, and turnover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1 (N = 15)</th>
<th>2 (N = 12)</th>
<th>3 (N = 32)</th>
<th>4 (N = 23)</th>
<th>5 (N = 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>nAll M (SD)</td>
<td>26.5 (2.9)</td>
<td>25.3 (3.4)</td>
<td>24.7 (3.7)</td>
<td>25.5 (3.8)</td>
<td>24.3 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nAch M (SD)</td>
<td>25.3 (3.8)</td>
<td>25.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>24.0 (3.7)</td>
<td>25.7 (3.1)</td>
<td>23.9 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nAust M (SD)</td>
<td>15.4 (4.3)</td>
<td>15.4 (4.3)</td>
<td>16.8 (4.6)</td>
<td>16.7 (3.2)</td>
<td>17.3 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nDom M (SD)</td>
<td>21.2 (4.9)</td>
<td>23.3 (2.7)</td>
<td>21.3 (4.7)</td>
<td>22.6 (3.5)</td>
<td>22.7 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 1 Yr.*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 &amp; ≤ 2 Yrs.*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 &amp; ≤ 3 Yrs.*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 Yrs.*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of staff turnover categorized by years at facility.

one year at the institution and 40% having more than three years.

In summary, more experienced workers tended to have higher levels of performance; however, all performance categories had large percentages of workers who had less than two years’ experience, underscoring the significant turnover that this institution experiences. These statistics underscore the importance of careful hiring procedures so that the number of underperformers in the newly hired staff can be minimized.

Additional concerns emerged from the data on staff who were rated a performance level three. This represents adequate but not above average performance. Granted, 75% of the staff that received this rating had three or fewer years of experience but that leaves 25% having four or more years of experience. These statistics underscore the importance of ongoing professional development so that all staff within three years of beginning to work at the institution perform above average.

Research Question 3: What is the interrelationship between performance, turnover and MNQ needs? Using the data in Table 2 a series of one-way ANOVA’s were computed with the five performance categories as the independent variable and each of the MNQ subscales as the dependent variables. There were no significant differences between the performance categories on any of the MNQ subscales. Thus, results revealed that all performance categories had similar motivation patterns with both achievement and affiliation being on the higher end of the continua.

A comparison was made between underperforming new hires and higher performing experienced staff. There were no significant differences between the two groups on achievement motivation and affiliation, but there were significant differences between the two groups on autonomy and dominance. Low performing new hires had significantly lower mean autonomy scores (df = 17; t = 2.59; p = .02) and significantly lower dominance scores (df = 17; t = 2.06; p = .05).

9. Discussion

9.1. Summary of results

The first research question of this study was to explore what motivates staff to work for a TRC as measured by the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ) and what differences exist between residential care professionals (RCPs) and cottage coordinators. We hypothesized that due to the high demands of the job and the need to coordinate staff and campers that cottage coordinators would have a high need for achievement and a high need for dominance. We hypothesized that both cottage coordinators and RCPs would have a low need for autonomy, because they work and live with one another and residents. Staff with higher responsibility levels (cottage coordinators) had higher need for achievement and need for autonomy than youth workers (RCPs). RCPs and cottage coordinators have a low need for autonomy, yet cottage coordinators desire slightly more autonomy.

The second research question of our study was to explore the staffing patterns by performance, motivation, and turnover. We hypothesized that there would be trends in performance level related to experience/turnover and motivation. We hypothesized that staff with higher performance levels would have higher experience and less turnover. We hypothesized that staff with higher performance levels would have a higher need for achievement, need for dominance, and need for autonomy. We found that greater experience was associated with greater performance and that the newest staff tended to have the lowest performance levels. Nearest staff also had the highest turnover rate. We did not find any clear trends for motivation.

The final aim of our study was to determine the interrelationship between performance, turnover and MNQ needs. We hypothesized that lower performing new staff would have different motivational needs than higher performing experienced staff. Higher performing experienced staff had a higher need for dominance for motivation.

Cottage coordinators exhibited significantly higher needs for achievement than youth workers (RCPs). This makes sense within the context of the work role that they have. They are responsible for the ongoing operation of a 24-h care and treatment facility for struggling youth. This is a large responsibility so it makes sense that the desire to achieve would be strong in those who choose to become cottage supervisors. They are also charged with building and maintaining community within their cottage and oftentimes do so by building a cottage identity and either overtly or subtly getting clients to feel strongly in relation to other cottages. In short, high need for achievement seems to fit a cottage coordinator well, but supervisors need to be aware of this and manage accordingly.

Although affiliation did not achieve significance, youth workers tended to have a higher need for affiliation than cottage workers. This makes sense given the role youth workers play. It may be important for supervisors to realize that their youth workers have this attribute and probably need to be managed in such a way. This may help to cottage workers incorporate the “actions to avoid” (e.g., downgrading other people, not caring about relationships with other workers) for affiliation and to “modify the environment” (e.g., encourage a warm, social climate at work, set aside time in regular staff meetings for informal communication) related to affiliation (Wiesenfeld, RaghuRam, & GaRud, 2001).

Cottage coordinators had more need for autonomy than youth workers. Both groups, however, were classified as having a low need on this construct. The need for autonomy might be one reason why cottage coordinators move into that role from being a youth worker. They want the greater autonomy that the supervisory role offers. It is probably a positive finding that both cottage coordinators and youth workers have such low needs for autonomy. Working and living side-by-side, day-after-day with both staff and clients demands people with low needs for autonomy. Moses (2000) found that one motivation for working in the field that staff enjoyed working with people, and children in particular.

A low to moderate need for dominance may be a positive finding. Perhaps the healthiest environment would be created when lower dominance needs are consistent across the organization. Yet, the need for dominance has to be high enough to keep the organization and its inhabitants under control and functioning towards goals. Either too low or too high a need for dominance could be problematic.

Additional insights can be derived from comparing new hires that were underperforming and higher performing experienced staff. Low performing new hires were lower on autonomy and dominance when compared to their high performing experienced co-workers. Whether the more experienced, higher performing co-workers started out with lower levels of autonomy and dominance and then changed as a consequence of their employment to possess higher levels cannot be ascertained from this study, but it is still important information that...
underperforming new hires had significantly lower needs for autonomy and dominance. Shinn, Morch, Robinson, and Nuener (1993) found that lack of autonomy, role conflicts, and a lack of opportunity for advancement were stressors for workers within residential child care programs.

Underperforming new hires may be struggling in their new work role, because they require a more collaborative work environment than what this particular residential treatment facility provides. This lack of fit with their work environment might be further exacerbated by their lower need for dominance. They fail to assert themselves in the workplace to overcome their lack of fit. Supervisors, when confronted with new hires who are underperforming and who exhibit low needs for autonomy and dominance, might consider either adjusting the work environment to better align with these employees' needs or discuss with them possible courses of action that they can take to better align their needs with what the workplace culture naturally provides. This is consistent with findings from Shinn et al. (1993) who found that lack of support and feedback was stressful for residential child care workers. Hicks et al. (1998) noted the importance of staff working in an integrated way regardless of their differences.

9.2. Recommendations for practice

Although both cottage coordinators and RCP's had relatively low need for autonomy, knowing that RCP's are significantly lower on this construct than cottage coordinators holds importance. As supervisors scan the organization for future cottage coordinators, taking into consideration need for autonomy might help in the selection process. Effective cottage coordinators appear to have a higher need for autonomy so looking for candidates who like working more independently might be an important attribute for effective leadership. A similar recommendation follows concerning the significant difference between cottage coordinators and RCP's in regard to need for achievement. Cottage coordinators had higher needs in this area. Again, when looking at staff for potential future coordinators, taking into consideration higher needs for achievement might aid in making effective selection decisions.

A high percentage of low performing RCP’s were in their first two years of employment at the agency. Thus, it is imperative that RCP's receive intensive staff development, support, and coaching during their first year of employment. If after the first year, the RCP is not performing at average or above levels or is not showing strong evidence that such a goal will be achieved early in the second year, then that person should be counseled out of the position. Clients should not be subject to RCP's who are learning on the job whether or not they have the skills and dispositions to be an effective RCP.

Ongoing staff development is important not just for new hires. Twenty-four percent of staff receiving a performance rating of 3 had four or more years of experience at the agency. Average performance is probably not adequate at TRC's. Thus a goal for supervision would be to have all personnel within the shortest time possible perform above average.

Hiring high quality, successful staff is quite possible. Sixty percent of the RCP's rated at performance level five had less than one year at the institution. These were new hires who were top performers from the start. If these top performers continue to do so in subsequent years, this shows that hiring procedures can result in new hires that are especially adept at the jobs. If this is found to be the case, then retaining these high performers becomes the paramount challenge for the institutions.

The finding that low performing new hires when compared to high performing veteran employees had lower needs for autonomy and dominance provides potentially quite important insights into hiring practices and staff development needs. Perhaps, some new hires are being given roles that require too much autonomy when they have low needs for autonomy. In other words, they want to work closely with others in collaborative work settings but they are given roles where they work more independently, thus taking them out of their comfort zone. Their low performance is thus no surprise. The same holds for dominance. The low performing new hires have relatively low needs for dominance but it is possible that they are being placed in work roles where higher levels of dominance are needed. Supervisors need to be cognizant of these potential misalignments between work roles and new hires' preferred modes of working.

9.3. Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. One is that the participants in the study were limited to one agency, in one part of the country. For future research, it would be important if participants were chosen from multiple agencies in different parts of the country. Yet another limitation is that the number of participants was not large (e.g., there was an uneven n for cottage coordinators (much lower number of participants, n = 10) and youth workers. With a larger number of participants, significant trends would be better represented in data and the data may look somewhat different than what was reported in this study thus the results of this study are preliminary. Finally, future research should be conducted to continue to explore the usefulness and effectiveness of exploring and making decisions related to employee motivational needs in adolescent RTCs.
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