

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2022-05-06

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Silva, C. S., Carvalho, H., Magalhães, E., Attar-Schwartz, S., Ornelas, S. V. & Calheiros, M. M. (2022). Organizational social context and academic achievement of youth in residential care: The mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 137

Further information on publisher's website:

[10.1016/j.chilyouth.2022.106449](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2022.106449)

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Silva, C. S., Carvalho, H., Magalhães, E., Attar-Schwartz, S., Ornelas, S. V. & Calheiros, M. M. (2022). Organizational social context and academic achievement of youth in residential care: The mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 137, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2022.106449>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

1 **Organizational Social Context and Academic Achievement of Youth in Residential Care:**
2 **The Mediating Role of Youth-Caregiver Relationship Quality**

3 **Abstract**

4 Existing research examining the academic performance of youth in residential care has often
5 overlooked the contextual factors contributing to youth achievements. Guided by an ecological
6 perspective, this study aimed to investigate the associations between various dimensions of
7 residential care settings' (RCS) organizational social context (i.e., organizational climate,
8 structure, and work attitudes) and youth's academic achievement, considering the mediating role
9 of youth-caregiver relationship quality in those associations. The study was based on a sample of
10 699 young people aged 12 to 25 ($M = 16.18$; $SD = 2.07$), and their respective main residential
11 caregivers ($N = 242$) and case managers ($N = 173$), from 55 RCS in Portugal. Given the
12 hierarchical structure of the data, analyses were performed using multilevel modelling. Results
13 showed that the association between caregivers' reports of the residential care setting
14 organizational social context, specifically regarding caregiver engagement and centralization
15 (i.e., authority hierarchy), and youth's academic achievement (i.e., higher scores in Math and
16 Portuguese language) was mediated by lower levels of negative interactions with caregivers,
17 reported by the youth. The findings demonstrate the need for an ecological, multilevel
18 perspective, in addressing youth's academic achievement in residential care. Awareness and
19 appropriate resources should be directed at improving child-caregiver relationship quality and
20 social climate of RCS, among other efforts, to improve poor academic performance of youth in
21 residential care.

22 *Keywords:* residential care; youth; academic achievement; social context; youth-caregiver
23 relationship

24

Introduction

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Youth in residential care are typically more likely to experience low academic achievement than youth living with their biological families, including those from socioeconomic disadvantaged backgrounds (Ferguson & Wolkow, 2012; Garcia-Molsosa de 2019; Gonzalez-García et al., 2017; Marion & Mann-Feder, 2020). Consequently, they are also more likely to enter adulthood with lower educational qualifications compared with young people of the general population (Berridge, 2012; del Valle et al., 2011; Jackson & Cameron, 2014). In fact, poorer academic performance among youth in care has been found to be one of the main predictors of poorer adaptation to independent life among care leavers, with long term detrimental consequences, such as unemployment and involvement with the justice system (Ferguson & Wolkow, 2012). Poor academic performance thus widens the social inequalities between these youth and those from normative developmental contexts (Jackson, 2010). Thus, academic success has been pinpointed as one of the most important contributing factors for the social inclusion of youth in residential care (Montserrat & Casas, 2018).

Existing research examining the academic performance of youth in residential care has often overlooked the role of contextual factors in youth achievements. To overcome this gap in the literature, the current study aims to investigate whether academic achievement – i.e., scores in Math and Portuguese language of youth in residential care – can be explained by different domains of RCS' organizational social context, (i.e., organizational structure, organizational climate, and staff's work attitudes), considering the mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality in those associations.

Research has indicated several explanatory factors for the overall poor academic achievement among youth in residential care (Harder et al., 2014; Marion & Mann-Feder, 2020).

47 At the individual level, in addition to a frequent history of poor educational support (Kirk et al.,
48 2011; Melkman et al., 2016), risk factors also include: high rate of prior parental maltreatment,
49 which has been shown to negatively impact youth's cognitive development (Sainero et al.,
50 2013); the high prevalence of mental health problems in youth in residential care, which hinders
51 their ability to succeed in school (Gonzalez-García et al., 2017; Harder et al., 2014); and factors
52 related to youth's educational trajectory, including the frequently long history of academic
53 difficulties or failure among youth who are placed in residential care at an older age (Attar-
54 Schwartz, 2009). Other factors contributing to these youth's frequent academic difficulties are
55 related to the experience of living in residential care. For instance, the instability of care
56 placements resulting in multiple school transfers which disrupts youth's educational process
57 (Trout et al., 2008). Moreover, residential care staff tend to focus on youth's emotional and
58 behavioral problems, giving a lower priority to their educational achievement (Gharabaghi,
59 2012; Harder et al., 2014).

60 Notwithstanding these vulnerability factors, recent research has also identified several
61 facilitators for these youth's academic achievement. Namely, a strong personal motivation, the
62 experience of stability in care and school placements, satisfactory accommodation, financial
63 support, and having residential caregivers who provide more home-based academic support have
64 been associated with higher academic success (Cheung et al. 2012, Harder et al., 2014; Melkman
65 et al., 2016). Regarding organizational characteristics of the RCS, research has shown that, in
66 RCS with a more family-like environment, with better physical conditions (e.g., with recreational
67 facilities), and which offer more after-school activities, children and youth have better academic
68 achievements (Attar-Schwartz, 2009).

69 However, while the literature regarding individual youth characteristics linked with
70 poorer academic performance among youth in residential care is quite developed, the knowledge
71 on the role of contextual, social, organizational factors, is limited (Cheung et al., 2012), and little
72 is known about their contribution to the academic achievement of youth in care. Specifically,
73 there is scarce research on how staff's behavioral expectations, the way they interact with each
74 other, and their attitudes toward work (i.e., job satisfaction and commitment with the
75 organization) are associated with youth's academic achievement. In addition, despite the
76 recognition of the importance of high-quality relationships between youth and their residential
77 caregivers for their successful overall adaptation (Assouline & Attar-Schwartz, 2020; Calheiros
78 et al., 2013; Calheiros et al., 2020; Izzo et al., 2020; Magalhães & Calheiros, 2017; Magalhães et
79 al., 2018; Marshall et al., 2020), little is known about how the quality of youth-caregiver
80 relationships is associated with youth's academic achievement and about its mediating role in the
81 relationship between social organizational factors and youth's academic performance.

82 **Residential Setting's Organizational Social Context and Youth's Academic Achievement**

83 Research focused on investigating risk and protective factors of youth's outcomes while
84 in residential care is increasingly paying attention to the setting's organizational social context as
85 an important cluster of contextual factors associated with youth's outcomes (Goering, 2018;
86 Leipoldt et al., 2019). The concept of organizational social context has been proposed by Glisson
87 (2002, 2007) as an overarching construct comprising three main different domains: culture,
88 climate, and attitudes towards work. Organizational culture and climate are system-level
89 constructs referring to features of the work environment, while work attitudes are an individual-
90 level element of the social context, referring to professionals' individual attitudes and behaviors
91 (Glisson et al., 2012).

92 Specifically, *organizational culture* refers to “the norms, expectations, and way things are
93 done in the organization” (Glisson, 2007, p. 739). Norms and expectations guide the way work is
94 performed and instruct new employees about the priorities of the organization (e.g., professionals
95 should be strict rather than flexible in following bureaucratic rules and regulations) (Glisson et
96 al., 2012). In this study we focus specifically on those aspects of the organizational culture that
97 capture the organization’s structure, namely the centralization of power, referring to the
98 hierarchy of authority and the extent to which professionals participate in decision-making, and
99 formalization of work roles, referring to the procedural specifications that guide work-related
100 interactions among the professionals (Glisson et al., 2008). *Organizational climate* refers to
101 professionals’ perceptions regarding the quality of the social environment of their workplace and
102 its influence on their own wellbeing and functioning, in terms of engagement, functionality, and
103 stress. Engagement refers to professionals’ ability to complete relevant tasks (i.e., personal
104 accomplishment) and to be personally involved with their professional role and their clients (i.e.,
105 personalization). Functionality is defined as having the necessary cooperation from other staff to
106 fulfil their work demands, and a clear understanding of how they can work effectively within the
107 organization (i.e., role clarity). Stress refers to emotional exhaustion, work overload and
108 difficulty in fulfilling their work task (Frazier et al., 2021; Glisson et al., 2008). Finally, *work*
109 *attitudes* refer to professionals’ satisfaction with the job (i.e., positive evaluation of their own job
110 tasks) and commitment with the organization (i.e., motivation to personally endeavor towards the
111 organization’s mission and desire to continue to belong to the organization staff), which together
112 reflect the staff morale (Glisson et al., 2012).

113 The current study is guided by the conceptual framework suggested by Glisson to study
114 organizational social context and therefore it includes, as explanatory variables of youth

115 academic performance, aspects from each domain, described above, of the RCS' organizational
116 social context: organizational structure (including: formalization and centralization),
117 organizational climate (including: engagement, functionality and stress) and caregivers' work
118 attitudes. Over the last two decades, a relatively small body of research literature in the broader
119 field of child and youth welfare services has been developed, documenting associations between
120 some of these organizational factors and youth's outcomes (e.g., Glisson & Green, 2011;
121 Williams & Glisson, 2014). In general, such research has suggested that services with less rigid
122 cultures (i.e., with lower centralization and formalization) and more engaged and functional
123 climates are linked with better service outcomes (Glisson et al., 2013; Glisson & Green, 2011;
124 Williams & Glisson, 2014). For example, a randomized control trial of an organizational
125 intervention designed to enhance the organizational social context of community mental health
126 services (Glisson et al., 2013) showed that youth who attended programs higher on engagement
127 and functionality, and lower on rigidity (i.e., with lower centralization and formalization) had
128 better outcomes than those who received services from programs lower on engagement and
129 functionality and higher on rigidity. In another study conducted in the United States among a
130 nationwide sample of approximately 2,400 youth in 73 child welfare systems it was found that
131 higher levels of organizational functionality and staff's engagement were related to better youth
132 psychosocial functioning (Williams & Glisson, 2014).

133 In the specific context of residential youth care, there is some evidence concerning the
134 role of these organizational features in youth's outcomes. However, such research has mostly
135 focused on youth's emotional and behavioral functioning (e.g., Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998;
136 Jordan et al., 2009; Silva et al., 2021, Wolf et al., 2014). For example, Jordan et al. (2009) found
137 among 17 residential youth care settings in US that in settings with higher levels of functionality,

138 there was a greater improvement in children's externalizing problems, after over a 15-months
139 period. Regarding centralization and formalization, previous research on the link between these
140 features of organizational structure and youth's mental health outcomes has provided mixed
141 results: one study (Jordan et al., 2009) found no significant effects of organizational structure,
142 while another (Wolf et al., 2014) revealed that higher centralization and formalization were
143 associated with better mental health outcomes in youth. In line with this evidence, it has been
144 argued (Schmid, 2006) that an authoritative and centralized management, marked by a close
145 supervision of staff, is the most appropriate leadership style in RCS. In these settings, managers
146 have to ensure that the quality of services remains adequate and that any changes introduced in
147 processes programs are moderate, slow, and gradual. According to Schmid (2006), staff's
148 adherence to the rules and regulations is essential for an effective service in RCS, since it ensures
149 the order and stability that these young people need.

150 Academic achievement, specifically, has remained significantly neglected in this line of
151 research. However, within the broader field of child welfare services, research studies have
152 highlighted some features of services' organizational social context as predictors of youth's
153 academic achievement. Namely, staff's clear roles and responsibilities, and collaboration and
154 communication among staff have been found to be qualitatively associated with higher academic
155 achievement of young people (Ferguson & Wolkow, 2012; Garstka et al., 2014; Stone, 2007).

156 **Quality of Youth-Caregiver Relationship as a potential mediator**

157 Residential caregivers are often the closest and most available adult figures to young
158 people living in residential care, given that they are in continuous, contact with them, attending
159 to their emotional, educational, and social needs on a daily basis (Sulimani-Aidan, 2016). They
160 are, thus, one of the main support providers in their lives (Assouline & Attar-Schwartz, 2020;

161 Lanctôt et al., 2016; Sulimani-Aidan, 2016). Studies examining the direct effect of different
162 aspects of youth-caregiver relationship have shown that close and supportive relationship with
163 residential care staff has been linked with reduced adjustment difficulties and with enhanced
164 well-being and positive adjustment (Assouline & Attar-Schwartz, 2020; Cahill et al., 2016; Izzo
165 et al., 2020; Magalhães et al., 2021; Moore et al., 2018). For example, Assouline and Attar-
166 Schwartz (2020) found among approximately 1400 youth living in Israeli educational RCS for
167 youth from underprivileged backgrounds that staff support was correlated with reduced
168 adjustment difficulties, above and beyond the contribution of parents' support.

169 Despite the lack of research specifically examining associations between factors of the
170 organizational social context and youth's academic achievement in residential care, there is
171 research pointing to youth-caregiver relationship quality as a potential mediating factor in the
172 relationship between organizational characteristics and the school performance of youth in care.
173 Studies show that the social context of an organization predicts its effectiveness regarding both
174 the quality and the outcomes of services delivery (Glisson & Green, 2011; Glisson &
175 Hemmelgarn, 1998). In the context of residential care, effective services require professional
176 caregivers to be responsive to the unique needs of each youth and capable of establishing
177 personal relationships with them characterized by support, trust, and confidence (e.g., Glisson &
178 Green, 2011). Such relationships, constructed through the daily interactions between residential
179 caregivers and youth, are the 'soft technology' (Glisson, 2007) through which the core service of
180 residential youth care, namely the care provided by residential caregivers, occurs (Cahill et al.,
181 2016; Harder et al., 2013). Therefore, the effectiveness of that service highly depends on the
182 quality of those relationships.

183 That “soft technology” (i.e., youth-caregiver relationships) is, in turn, particularly
184 vulnerable to the organizational social context of RCS (Glisson et al., 2012). Research has shown
185 that a poor organizational climate in residential youth care settings (e.g., high on role conflict and
186 low in role clarity and sense of fairness) undermines caregivers’ ability to effectively respond to
187 youth’s needs and establish supportive relationships with them, by increasing stress levels,
188 turnover rates, and depersonalization of caregiver-youth relationships (Brown et al., 2018;
189 Levrouw et al., 2020). The context of residential youth care is known to be a highly challenging
190 and stressful work context (Barford & Whelton, 2010), where caregivers typically face complex
191 dilemmas and experience strong emotional demands in performing their job (Whittington &
192 Burns, 2005). Nevertheless, the job demands and resources theory (Demerouti et al., 2001)
193 emphasizes that professionals can be effective even in highly stressful and demanding jobs,
194 especially if their work environment also provides them with the conditions that allow them to
195 remain engaged in their job, including, for example, social support, opportunities for growth and
196 high-quality relationship among the staff (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

197 Regarding the role of features of the organizational culture on the service quality, existing
198 literature has provided mixed findings. On the one hand, organizational cultures characterized by
199 professionals’ autonomy and involvement in decision making have been shown to associate with
200 higher service effectiveness (Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998; Schmid & Bar-Nir, 2001). On the
201 other hand, apparently opposite dimensions, namely higher levels of formalization and
202 coordination (i.e., centralization or authority hierarchy), have also been associated with higher
203 organizational effectiveness and satisfaction among staff and resident youth (Schmid & Bar-Nir,
204 2001). These rather inconsistent findings may reflect the diversity of professional roles within
205 RCS (Mota & Matos, 2015). Specifically, case managers, such as social workers, psychologists,

206 are responsible for evaluating youth's condition and defining and implementing their respective
207 intervention plan, while direct caregivers, usually under the supervision of case managers, are
208 front-line staff responsible for establishing and maintaining the residential daily routine,
209 supervising the youth, and providing daily socio-educational care (Jordan et al., 2009; Mota &
210 Matos, 2015). Thus, residential caregivers' work may benefit more from a more task-oriented
211 organizational structure (Schmid, 2006), marked by centralization and formalization, which frees
212 them from extra decision makings and allows them to focus their efforts on ensuring a smooth
213 day-to-day functioning of the residential care setting (Goering, 2018; Jordan et al., 2009). As for
214 negative work attitudes, prior research has indicated that low commitment to the organization
215 and low job satisfaction reduce caregivers' disposition to be warm, empathic, and supportive
216 towards youth in care, thus hindering effective residential youth care services (Glisson &
217 Hemmelgarn, 1998; Jordan et al., 2009).

218 In turn, the quality of the relationships that youth establish with their residential
219 caregivers have been found to be a relevant predictor of youth's academic achievement in
220 residential care (Garcia-Molsosa et al., 2019). It is widely acknowledged that it is through the
221 relationships established with adult caregivers that young people experience positive growth and
222 thriving (Holden & Sellers, 2019; Izzo et al., 2020; Marshall et al., 2020). Prior studies have
223 strongly suggested that the security and support provided by high-quality youth-caregiver
224 relationships, characterized by stability and permanence, are crucial to facilitate youth's
225 academic achievement (Cheung et al., 2012; Stone, 2007). More specifically, youth-caregiver
226 relationships characterized by support through, for example, high academic expectations,
227 encouragement, and instrumental help (e.g., assistance with homework, tutoring) facilitate
228 youth's academic achievement (Marion & Mann-Feder, 2020; Melkman et al., 2016).

229 **The Present Study**

230 Existing research has documented associations among the organizational social context of
231 services and different youth outcomes. However, research focused on such associations in the
232 unique context of residential care is very limited. Particularly, to the best of our knowledge, no
233 studies have yet focused on analyzing if and how different dimensions of the residential settings'
234 organizational social context are associated with youth's academic achievement. Regarding the
235 "how", existing evidence showing that different characteristics of the organizational social
236 context of RCS associate with the quality of youth-caregiver relationships (Glisson &
237 Hemmelgarn, 1998; Jordan et al., 2009) and that such quality is a pivotal predictor of youth's
238 outcomes in residential care (e.g., Izzo et al., 2020), including their academic achievement (e.g.,
239 Cheung et al., 2012), points to the hypothesis of youth-caregiver relationship quality as a
240 potential mediator of those associations.

241 Therefore, based on a bio-ecological approach (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006) with
242 multiple informants (i.e., youth and residential caregivers), the present study aims to expand
243 knowledge on the correlates of academic achievement of youth in residential care, by analyzing
244 the mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality in the associations between the
245 dimensions of the three domains of organizational social context (i.e., organizational climate,
246 organizational structure, and work attitudes) and youth's scores in Portuguese language and
247 Math, two disciplines that serve as proxies for two major domains of academic competence:
248 reading and mathematical literacy (OECD, 2019). These two disciplines are central for students
249 to move on to secondary education, in the Portuguese education system. A student
250 underperforming in both Portuguese and Math is automatically retained.

251 We hypothesized that residential caregivers' reports of the dimensions of the
252 organizational climate (i.e., engagement, functionality, and stress) and structure (i.e.,
253 formalization and centralization), and of their work attitudes would be associated with youth's
254 academic achievement via the quality of youth-caregiver relationship. Specifically, based on the
255 theoretical and research literature reviewed above (e.g., Glisson & Hemmelgarn, 1998; Jordan et
256 al., 2009; Schmid & Bar-Nir, 2001; Wolf et al., 2014) and considering the specificities of the
257 residential youth care context (Barford & Whelton, 2010), we hypothesized that caregivers'
258 perceptions of higher levels of engagement, functionality, stress, formalization, centralization,
259 and positive work attitudes would be associated with higher youth academic achievement via
260 youth's perceptions of a higher quality of youth-caregiver relationships (i.e., higher support and
261 lower negative interactions perceived by the youth in care). Moreover, given that prior studies
262 have shown differences in youth's academic achievement according to age, sex, and number of
263 grade retentions (Attar-Schwartz, 2009; Cruz-Jesus et al., 2020; Harder et al., 2014), and that
264 youth-to-caregiver ratio can have a significant contribution to both the quality of youth-caregiver
265 relationship and youth's outcomes in residential care (Calheiros & Patrício, 2014; Costa et al.,
266 2020), these variables were included in our multilevel model as covariates.

267 **Method**

268 **Research Context**

269 This study is part of a broader research project conducted in Portuguese residential youth
270 care settings on the quality of relationships in residential care. Residential care is a temporary or
271 long-term out-of-home setting designed to ensure the safety, well-being, and development of
272 children and youth who have been abused and/or neglected by their parents. In Portugal, the out-
273 of-home care system is supervised by the Ministry of Welfare and includes foster family care,

274 generalist RCS, and specialized RCS. Specialized care includes three types of settings: 1)
275 emergency shelters, 2) RCS aimed at addressing therapeutic or educational needs (e.g., for
276 children and youth with severe mental health problems), and 3) autonomization apartments
277 (which aim to support youth's transition to adult, independent life) (ISS.IP, 2020). The latest
278 available data from the Portuguese context show that 86% (i.e., 6129) of children and youth in
279 out-of-home care are living in generalist RCS, 2.7% in family foster care, and the remaining are
280 living in specialized residential care centers (ISS.IP, 2020). The current study focused on
281 generalist RCS, where most young people (72%) are 12 or more years old (ISS.IP, 2020). In
282 Portugal, residential care placement can last until youth are 21 years old. However, where the
283 best interest of the child requires, the protection can last until youth reach to 25 years old. Young
284 people in these RCS are accompanied by multidisciplinary teams, composed by case managers
285 (usually including social workers, psychologists), and residential caregivers. Case managers are
286 responsible for identifying their needs and services suitable for meeting those needs, advocating
287 for them, and defining the individual intervention plan, in strict collaboration with child
288 protection agencies. In turn, residential caregivers, usually under the supervision of case
289 managers, are the front-line staff who accompany the young people in care around the clock, in
290 rotating shifts. They are responsible for establishing and maintaining the residential life and
291 providing the young people with daily socio-educational care.

292 **Participants**

293 This study includes the reports of youth, caregivers, and case managers in RCS. It
294 includes the reports of 699 youth (51.0% males), aged between 12 and 25 years old ($M = 16.18$,
295 $SD = 2.07$), from 55 generalist RCS (i.e., non-therapeutic, non-correctional). The majority were
296 Portuguese (91.3%), and the remaining were Guineans (3.3%), Cape Verdeans (2.0%), Angolan

297 (0.9%), Brazilians (0.6%), German (0.5%), Ukrainian (0.3%), Guatemalan (0.3%), Romanian
298 (0.2%), Spanish (0.2%), San Tomeans (0.2%), and Moroccan (0.2%). Despite the different
299 nationalities of a small proportion of youth, all of them spoke Portuguese. Most youth (98.4%)
300 were up to 21 years old; only 7 youth (1.6%) were between 22 and 25. Youth's length of stay in
301 the current RCS ranged between 0.8 to 20.84 years ($Mdn = 2.18$ years). At least 37.3% had been
302 placed in out of home care previously. Regarding their academic achievement, 50.8% had a
303 positive score in Math while 71.1% had a positive score in Language (Portuguese).

304 This study also includes the reports of 242 caregivers (98.8% of those contacted), mostly
305 female (72.5%), aged between 23 and 71 years old ($M = 49.95$, $SD = 9.58$). Most caregivers
306 (44.2%) had a high school education level, about a third (37.2%) had a higher-education degree
307 (of which 9 had a specialization course), and 18.6% had a lower than high school education
308 level. Their professional experience in the current residential unit ranged between two months
309 and 28 years ($Mdn = 6.75$ years).

310 Finally, each youth's case manager also participated in this study ($N = 168$; 99.3% of
311 those contacted) by filling out a questionnaire asking for youth's sociodemographic data, such
312 gender, age, and placement date, along with other information and providing data regarding
313 youth's academic achievement. Most case managers filled the questionnaire for more than one
314 youth ($M = 4.00$; $SD = 2.50$). The majority was female (81.0%), their age ranged between 24 and
315 53 years old ($M = 34.3$, $SD = 6.03$), and they were working in the respective RCS for 0.33 (i.e.,
316 four months) to 20 years ($M = 6.69$; $SD = 4.16$). Regarding their professional background, there
317 was a similar percentage of psychologists (33.3%), educators (33.3%), and social workers
318 (32.7%), and one case manager was a sociologist.

319 The RCS hosted between 6 and 53 youths ($M = 20.64$, $SD = 10.45$), and had between 2
320 and 15 caregivers ($M = 7.67$, $SD = 3.26$), and youth/caregiver ratio ranged between 1 and 41
321 ($Mdn = 7.00$). This information was provided by the director of each unit.

322 **Measures**

323 **Dependent Variable: Youth's Academic Achievement.**

324 Youth's case managers filled out a table with the last school scores obtained by the youth.
325 In this study, only the scores in Mathematics and Portuguese language (for the non-Portuguese
326 youth we asked the case managers to refer to Portuguese as a Second or Foreign Language) were
327 used given their centrality in the Portuguese school curriculum, both in elementary and
328 secondary education. Since participating youth were in both middle and high schools, their
329 scores were in two different assessment scales (1 to 5 and 0 to 20, respectively). Therefore, for
330 all youth, the scores in Mathematics and in Portuguese language were standardized, by being
331 converted into a 0 to 100 percentual scale, according to official government instructions for
332 scores conversion (Decree Law No. 66/2018; Decree Order No. 223-A/2018). Values equal or
333 higher than 50% correspond to positive scores.

334 **Predictor Variable: Organizational Social Context.**

335 The organizational social context of the RCS was measured with the Portuguese version
336 of the Organizational Social Context Measurement System (OSC; Garrido et al., 2011; Glisson et
337 al., 2008), filled out by the residential caregivers. This instrument comprises 83 items organized
338 in three thematic scales: Organizational Climate (43 items), Organizational Structure (13 items),
339 and Work Attitudes (24 items). All items are evaluated in a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (never)
340 to 5 (always). Glisson, Green, and Williams (2012) specified a second-order factor model for the
341 OSC. According to this model, the *Organizational Climate* scale comprises three second-order

342 factors: 1) *Engagement* (11 items), which includes the following items relating to the dimensions
343 Depersonalization (5 items reversed scored; e.g., “I feel I treat some of the clients I serve as
344 impersonal objects”) and Personal Accomplishment (6 items; e.g., “I have accomplished many
345 worthwhile things in this job”); 2) *Functionality* (14 items), which comprises the dimensions
346 Growth and Achievement (4 items; e.g., “This agency provides numerous opportunities to
347 advance if you work for it”), Role Clarity (6 items; e.g., “My job responsibilities are clearly
348 defined”), and Cooperation (4 items; e.g., “There is a feeling of cooperation among my co-
349 workers”); and 3) *Stress* (21 items), composed by the dimensions Role Conflict (9 items; e.g.,
350 “Interests of the clients are often replaced by bureaucratic concerns (e.g., paperwork”), Role
351 Overload (6 items; e.g., “The amount of work I have to do keeps me from doing a good job”),
352 and Emotional Exhaustion (6 items; e.g., “I feel like I am at the end of my rope”).

353 *Organizational Structure* consists of a second-order factor, defined by the dimensions:
354 Formalization relating to the procedural specifications that guide work-related interactions
355 among the professionals (7 items; e.g., “The same steps must be followed in processing every
356 piece of work”) and Centralization, relating to authority hierarchy, division of work tasks, and
357 participation in decision making) (six items; e.g., “I have to ask a supervisor or coordinator
358 before I do almost anything”). Finally, *Attitudes Towards Work* also consists of second-order
359 factor composed by the dimensions: Job Satisfaction (11 items; e.g., “How satisfied are you with
360 the chance to do something that makes use of your abilities”) and Commitment to the
361 organization (13 items; e.g., “I really care about the fate of this organization”).

362 This second-order factorial structure (Glisson et al., 2012) was adapted for Portuguese
363 version through a confirmatory factorial analysis (CFA) performed for each scale described
364 above (Silva et al., 2021). For the Organizational Climate scale, the CFA provided an acceptable

365 model fit: $\chi^2(973) = 1664.86, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 1.71; CFI = 0.85; RMSEA = 0.06; SRMR = 0.08$.
366 Although CFI was relatively low, this was likely due to high number of items (i.e., 43) that
367 compose the scale, as emphasized by Kenny and McCoach (2003). The internal consistency of
368 the three organizational climate dimensions was good to excellent (Kline, 2011): Engagement (α
369 = .80), Functionality ($\alpha = .89$), and Stress ($\alpha = .91$). The CFA for the Attitudes Towards Work
370 scale yielded a good model fit: $\chi^2(244) = 509.62, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 2.09; CFI = 0.92; RMSEA =$
371 $0.07; and SRMR = 0.05$ (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011). Internal consistency of the Work
372 Attitudes dimension was excellent ($\alpha = .92$). The CFA for the Organizational Structure scale did
373 not provide an acceptable model fit: $\chi^2(64) = 190.39, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 2.98; CFI = 0.79; RMSEA$
374 $= 0.09; SRMR = 0.10$. However, a CFA for each subscale (i.e., Formalization and Centralization)
375 revealed very good fit statistics, respectively: $\chi^2(14) = 29.34, p = .009; \chi^2/df = 2.10; CFI = 0.94;$
376 $RMSEA = 0.06; SRMR = 0.05$., and $\chi^2(8) = 11.64, p = .17; \chi^2/df = 1.45; CFI = 0.98; RMSEA =$
377 $0.04; SRMR = 0.04$. Therefore, in this study, the two first order dimensions of this scale were
378 used separately, both of which presented acceptable internal consistency: Formalization ($\alpha = .73$)
379 and Centralization ($\alpha = .67$).

380 **Mediating Variable: Youth-Caregiver Relationship.**

381 The Social Provisions Version (SPV) of the Network of Relationship Inventory (NRI;
382 Furman & Buhrmester, 1985) was used to measure youth-caregiver relationship quality. The
383 NRI-SPV comprises 27 items designed to evaluate children's and youth's perceptions of their
384 relationships with significant others (e.g., parents/caregivers; friends), in a 5-point scale, ranging
385 from 1 (i.e., *none/not at all*) to 5 (i.e., *very much, almost always*). In this study, participating
386 youth were asked to rate to what extent each item was descriptive of their relationship with their
387 main residential caregiver. These 27 items are organized in nine conceptually different 3-item

388 factors, which further form two second-order factors: (1) *Support* (21 items; e.g., ‘How much
389 does this person help you figure out or fix things?’), comprising the first-order factors describing
390 positive relationship qualities (i.e., Affection, Reliable Alliance, Enhancement of Worth,
391 Intimacy, Instrumental Help, Companionship, and Nurturance first-order factors), and (b)
392 *Negative Interactions* (6 items; e.g., ‘How often do you and this person disagree and quarrel with
393 each other?’), composed by the first-order factors tapping that express negative relationship
394 qualities (i.e., Conflict and Antagonism first-order factors). A CFA supported the original
395 structure of this scale, providing a good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011): $\chi^2(314) =$
396 $843.307, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 2.69; CFI = 0.94; RMSEA = 0.06; \text{ and } SRMR = 0.06$. Internal
397 consistency for the support and negative interaction factors in the present sample was excellent,
398 respectively, $\alpha = .96$ and $\alpha = .90$ (Kline, 2011).

399 **Control variables**

400 Youth’s background information, namely their age, gender, and number of grade
401 retentions were measured through a sociodemographic questionnaire, filled out by a case
402 manager for each youth. Information about the characteristics of the RCS, including the number
403 of young people in care, number of caregivers, and youth-to-caregiver ratio was provided by the
404 residential setting director.

405 **Data Collection**

406 Following approval of the Ethics Committee of the researchers’ University, formal
407 contacts with the RCS were made to obtain the necessary authorizations to collect the data. All
408 youth placed in these units for more than 1 month, aged 12 or more years old, were invited to
409 participate, except those presenting major cognitive difficulties (information about such
410 difficulties were provided by the residential unit director). First, consent for youth’s participation

411 was obtained from the respective residential unit director, who is responsible for accompanying
412 and adjudicating youth's formal decisions in the context of residential care. In each unit, every
413 youth who met the inclusion criteria, who were authorized to participate by the residential unit
414 director and accepted to participate were included in the study.

415 Data collection with youths was conducted by the researchers in the RCS, in groups of 5
416 to 20 participants, with a research assistant helping the youth if any clarification questions arise.
417 To ensure youth that their participations in the study was independent from their case
418 management within the residential unit, no residential care staff was present in youth's data
419 collection sessions. The goals of the study and instructions for filling out the questionnaires
420 were explained at the beginning of the data collection session, and the researcher was always
421 present to answer any questions and provide with any help or assistance whenever necessary.
422 Information regarding the voluntary nature of the participation in the study, anonymity, and
423 confidentiality was also given at the beginning and the youth signed an informed consent form
424 prior to their participation. Youth with any reading and comprehension difficulties were
425 previously identified by their case managers and were individually interviewed by one of the
426 researchers, following the assessment protocol, and 88 (12.6%) individual interviews were
427 conducted. At the end of each data collection session, youth put their completed questionnaires
428 in a box, which was then sealed and taken by the research team. Finally, the questionnaires filled
429 out by the caregivers and the case managers were collected on the same day of the data
430 collection with the youth. They were also information informed about the aims of the research,
431 anonymity, and confidentiality of the data, and signed an informed consent prior to their
432 participation. To ensure anonymity of the data, a code-system was created for allowing the
433 research team to merge the data from youth's questionnaires with that of their corresponding

434 case manager. All youths were assigned a Youth-ID, all caregivers were assigned a Caregiver-
435 ID, all case managers were assigned a Case-manager-ID, and residential units were assigned a
436 Setting-ID. Then, for each residential unit, a masterfile was created, with personal identifiers
437 (i.e., name of the youth, case managers, and residential unit) and with the correspondence
438 between the IDs at the three levels (i.e., youth, caregiver, case manager, and residential unit).
439 These masterfiles were password-protected, could only be accessed by the research team, and
440 were only used prior to data collection to prepare the study materials. Such preparation involved
441 writing participants' unique IDs in the questionnaire to be handed to each participant. The form
442 filled out by the case managers contained Youth- Caregiver-, and Case-manager- IDs to allow
443 the research team to merge youth's and the respective caregiver's and case manager's
444 questionnaire without having to consult the masterfiles. Once the materials were prepared, the
445 masterfiles could only be accessed by the project lead researcher and were destroyed once data
446 collection was completed.

447 **Data Analysis**

448 First, descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among the study variables were
449 computed. Then, because of the hierarchical structure of the data (residential caregivers and
450 youths were nested in RCS), the study hypotheses were tested through multilevel modelling
451 (Hox, 2010; Snijders & Bosker, 2003). The multilevel mediation models were lower-level
452 mediation, as the mediators (support and negative interactions) were level-1 variables. As the
453 number of youths per residential caregivers did not allow configuring residential caregivers as a
454 level-2, a 1-1-1 model was assumed. In 1-1-1 models it is recommended to analyse between-
455 group mediation effect and within-group mediation effect separately (Zhang, Zyphur, &
456 Preacher, 2009). However, according to the current research hypotheses, only the within-group

457 relationships were tested. First, a Linear Mixed Models procedure was conducted to obtain path
458 coefficient estimations a and b for within-effects. To test the indirect effects, parametric
459 bootstrapping was used to create confidence intervals (Cis) in R (Preacher & Selig, 2012). Based
460 on the results of the correlation analysis and on existing evidence regarding the predictors of the
461 quality of youth-caregiver relationships and youth's academic achievement (Attar-Schwartz,
462 2009; Cruz-Jesus et al., 2020; Harder et al., 2014; Calheiros & Patrício, 2014; Costa et al., 2020),
463 youth's age, sex, number of grade retentions, and youth-to-caregiver ratio were included in the
464 model as covariates.

465 **Results**

466 **Descriptive Statistics and Bi-Variate Analyses**

467 Descriptive statistics (i.e., means and standard deviations), and bivariate correlations
468 between the study variables are presented in Table 1. The findings showed that engagement,
469 functionality, and work attitudes were positively correlated. In addition, functionality was
470 positively correlated with centralization, stress was negatively correlated with engagement,
471 functionality and work attitudes, and formalization was positively associated with centralization.
472 Moreover, support and negative interactions were negatively correlated, and youth's scores in
473 Portuguese and Math were positively correlated. Regarding correlations between the dimensions
474 of organizational social context, relationship quality, and academic achievement, results showed
475 that: engagement was negatively correlated with youth's reports of negative interactions, while
476 caregivers' perceived stress was positively correlated with youth's perceptions of support;
477 centralization was positively correlated with youth's grade in Math; work attitudes were
478 positively correlated with youth's grade in Portuguese; and youth's perceptions of negative
479 interactions were negatively correlated with their grade in Math. With regard to the covariates,

480 youth's age was positively correlated with the number of grade retentions and with youth's grade
481 in both Math and Portuguese; number of grade retentions was negatively correlated with youths
482 grade in both disciplines and with functionality in the residential care setting; and youth-to-
483 caregiver ratio was negatively correlated with youth's perception of support in their relationship
484 with their main caregiver. As to sex differences, males presented a higher number of grade
485 retentions than females, while females presented higher scores in both disciplines and reported
486 higher perceptions of negative interactions with their main caregiver than males. In addition,
487 youth-to-caregiver ratio and caregivers' reports of centralization were higher for females, while
488 caregivers' reports of engagement and functionality were higher for males.

489 [INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

490 **The Mediating Role of Youth-Caregiver Relationship Quality in Associations Between** 491 **Organizational Social Context and Youth's Academic Achievement**

492 The current study examines RCS context variables that might be associated with youth's
493 academic achievements (i.e., scores in Math and Portuguese). Before testing our hypotheses, we
494 calculated the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) values to determine to which extent our
495 dependent variables, that is, youth's scores in Math and Portuguese language, vary among
496 different RCS. We found that the ICC was .09, $F(54, 644) = 2.258, p < .001$ and .12, $F(54, 644)$
497 $= 2.755, p < .001$, respectively, indicating that 9.3% of the total variance of youth's scores in
498 Math and 12.0% of the total variance of youth's scores grade in Portuguese reside between RCS.
499 Because of this variance, a two-level analysis was conducted (Aguinis et al., 2013). Since the
500 model included multiple predictors, multicollinearity was verified, with acceptable tolerance
501 values ranging between 0.44 and 0.94 (Hair et al., 2019).

502 As shown in Table 2, older youth had higher scores in Math and in Portuguese. In
503 addition, females and youth with fewer retentions had higher scores in Portuguese. After
504 controlling for the effects of youth's age, sex, number of grade retentions and youth-to-caregiver
505 ratio, results showed that higher levels of caregivers' perceptions of stress, centralization, and
506 positive work attitudes were associated with higher youth's scores in Math and Portuguese.
507 Moreover, youth's reports of negative interactions with their main caregivers were negatively
508 associated with their scores in both Math and Portuguese. In other words, the lower the levels of
509 negative interactions in the youth-caregiver relationship, the higher lower the youth's scores in
510 both subjects (Table 2).

511 Regarding the mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality, results revealed a
512 significant indirect effect of caregivers' perceptions of engagement on youth's scores in Math
513 and in Portuguese, via youth's perceptions of negative interactions with their main caregiver,
514 with a 91% confidence interval (bootstrap estimates = 0.37, 91% CI = 0.01, 0.82; and bootstrap
515 estimate = 0.24, 91% CI = 0.01, 0.56, respectively). In other words, the higher the levels of
516 engagement, reported by the caregivers, the lower the level of negative interactions reported by
517 the youth, and the higher their scores in Math and Portuguese. Since the direct effect of
518 caregivers' reports of engagement on youth's scores in both disciplines was non-significant, the
519 relationship between caregivers' reports of engagement and youth's scores in Math and
520 Portuguese were fully mediated by youth's perceptions of negative interactions with their main
521 caregiver. The results also revealed a significant indirect effect of caregivers' perceptions of
522 centralization on youth's scores in Math and in Portuguese, via youth's perceptions of negative
523 interactions with their main caregiver, with a 95% confidence interval (bootstrap estimate = 0.32,
524 95% CI = 0.04, 0.70; and bootstrap estimate = 0.21, 95% CI = 0.01, 0.48, respectively). That is,

525 the higher the levels centralization, as reported by the caregivers, the lower levels of youth's
526 perceptions of negative interactions with their main caregiver, and the higher youth's scores in
527 both Math and Portuguese. Since the direct effect of caregivers' reports of centralization on
528 youth's scores in both disciplines was significant, youth's perceptions of negative interactions
529 partially mediate the relationship between caregivers' perceptions of engagement and
530 centralization and youth's scores in Math and in Portuguese.

531 [INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

532 **Discussion**

533 Poor adjustment to school and poor academic achievement have been identified by
534 researchers and policy makers as a significant difficulty for children in care (Attar-Schwartz,
535 2019). It is especially worrying because such disadvantage was found to have serious
536 implications for the future life prospects of children in care in adulthood (e.g., Ferguson &
537 Wolkow, 2012; Jackson, 2010; Montserrat & Casas, 2018; Schiff & Benbenishty, 2006).
538 Existing research examining the academic performance of youth in residential care has often
539 overlooked the contextual factors contributing to youth achievements (see a review in Attar-
540 Schwartz, 2009; Cheung et al., 2012). The present study aimed to expand the understanding of
541 the contextual explanatory aspects related to the academic achievement of children in residential
542 care. Specifically, it aimed to investigate the associations between multiple dimensions of the
543 RCS' organizational social context and youth's academic achievement in Math and Portuguese
544 language, considering the mediating role of youth-caregiver relationship quality in those
545 associations. This study is one of the few to examine academic performance of youth in
546 residential care from a multilevel ecological perspective. The findings show that youth's
547 academic achievement vary significantly across different RCS; in settings with certain

548 organizational social contextual characteristics youth have higher academic achievements.
549 Specifically, it was found that in RCS that were characterized by an organizational social context
550 marked by higher levels of stress, centralization, and positive work attitudes, as reported by the
551 caregivers, there were higher scores in Math and in Portuguese, regardless of youth's perception
552 of their relationship with their main caregiver. It seems, then, that in environments with those
553 characteristics, youth are more able to perform better academically.

554 Regarding the positive effect of stress perceived by the caregivers on youth's academic
555 achievement (math and Portuguese language), although this finding may seem counterintuitive, it
556 is consistent with prior studies showing a positive association between staff's perceptions of
557 stress and improved outcomes for youth, after controlling for the effects of perceived
558 engagement and functionality (e.g., Jordan et al., 2009; Silva et al., 2021; Wolf et al., 2014).
559 Residential youth care settings are inherently stressful workplaces, where caregivers experience
560 strong emotional demands in working towards promoting the wellbeing of youth with highly
561 adverse family backgrounds (Barford & Whelton, 2010). Thus, higher stress levels might mirror
562 caregivers' involvement, commitment, and concern with their work as well as an increased
563 awareness of the importance of providing the youth with high quality care (e.g., Hamama, 2012;
564 Jordan et al., 2009; Wolf et al., 2014). In face of such a demanding role, it seems inevitable that
565 they perceive their work environments as stressful. However, if caregivers receive the support
566 and resources they need, from their work environment, to deliver a good and effective service,
567 the quality of their work may actually improve, thereby enhancing youth's outcomes (Williams
568 & Glisson, 2014). Such interpretations should be further explored in future research.

569 The association of increased levels of centralization (i.e., authority hierarchy) with higher
570 youth academic achievement is consistent with previous studies suggesting that youth in

571 residential care benefit from a clearly structured environment (Leipoldt, et al. 2019). RCS with
572 an organizational social context characterized by a clearer structure, in terms of authority
573 hierarchy and formalization of work roles, might be more effective in creating the conditions that
574 facilitate a constructive focus on promoting youth's academic achievement (Hicks, 2008). The
575 association of higher levels of caregivers' positive work attitudes with better youth academic
576 achievement is also in line with prior research indicating that increased job satisfaction and
577 commitment with the organization of staff in residential care is associated with better youth
578 outcomes (Colton, 2005; Colton & Roberts, 2007).

579 In addition, the findings of this study highlight the importance of positive youth-caregiver
580 relationship quality to the academic performance of youth in residential care. Specifically, the
581 findings showed that lower levels of negative interactions in the youth-caregiver relationship, as
582 reported by the youth, were associated with better youth's achievement. That is, the lower the
583 youth's perceptions of negative interactions in their relationship with their main residential
584 caregiver, the higher their scores in Math and Portuguese language. These findings are in line
585 with previous studies showing that, in residential care, the quality of the relationship between
586 youth and their residential caregivers is an important predictor of their academic achievement
587 (Garcia-Molsosa et al., 2019). They highlight the role of staff in establishing satisfying
588 relationships with the youth in care, that can provide them the security and stability that facilitate
589 their academic success (Cheung et al., 2012; Stone, 2007).

590 Going beyond documenting associations between organizational social context, youth-
591 caregiver relationship quality, and youth's academic achievement, one of the main findings of
592 this study is showing that the relationships that youth have with their caregivers mediated the
593 association between some of the organizational social context factors included in this study and

594 the youth's academic achievements. Specifically, the findings showed that higher levels of
595 engagement and centralization, reported by the caregivers, were associated with higher youth's
596 achievement, via lower levels of negative interactions in the youth-caregiver relationship,
597 reported by the youth. That is, the higher the levels of engagement and centralization reported by
598 the caregivers, the less youth reported negative interactions with their main caregiver, and, in
599 turn, the higher the youth's academic achievement.

600 The positive effect of caregivers' engagement on youth academic achievement, via lower
601 levels of youth's reports of negative interactions with the caregivers is empirically and
602 conceptually plausible. Child and youth care services with an organizational climate marked by
603 high professional engagement climates have consistently been shown to yield better outcomes
604 for the young people they serve (Glisson & Green, 2011; Williams & Glisson, 2014).
605 Professionals who are more engaged in their work have a higher ability to remain personally
606 involved in their work and concerned about their clients and to provide an effective service
607 (Glisson et al., 2012). Indeed, prior research in the context of residential care have shown that
608 more engaged residential caregivers are more likely to establish better relationships with the
609 youth in care (Silva et al., 2021). High-quality youth-caregiver relationships, in turn, provide the
610 stability and feeling of security that are essential for youth's thriving (e.g., Cheung et al., 2012;
611 Holden & Sellers, 2019; Izzo et al., 2020; Marshall et al., 2020). Results of this study thus
612 suggest that better relationship quality, indicated by lower levels of negative interactions
613 between the youth and their main caregiver in the RCS, seems to explain the positive role of
614 residential caregivers' engagement on youth's academic achievement.

615 As for the finding that higher levels of centralization (i.e., authority hierarchy) are
616 associated with higher youth academic achievement through lower levels of negative interactions

617 between the youth and their main caregivers, this result possibly suggests that adequate levels of
618 authority hierarchy in child and youth RCS are desirable and benefit the quality of residential
619 care service (Hicks, 2008; Schmid & Bar-Nir, 2001). In these settings, directors, case managers,
620 caregivers have to continuously collaborate with each other to provide a good service to the
621 young people in care (Schmid, 2006). However, an efficient collaboration between the different
622 professionals in residential youth care can only be effectively established within a hierarchical
623 system of responsibilities, where all professionals clearly know and play their own part,
624 interdependently with each other (Hicks, 2008). Since caregivers are the frontline staff in
625 residential care, who spend the most time with youth and are responsible for providing daily
626 first-hand support to youth's needs (Sulimani-Aidan, 2016), higher levels of centralization might
627 enhance their availability to respond to youth's daily needs, by preventing excessive overlap
628 among the different professional roles within the broader team (e.g., Jordan et al., 2009). In
629 addition, a close supervision of staff's work, typical of a centralized leadership, is essential to
630 improve the quality of residential care services (e.g., Schmid, 2006). Indeed, findings of this
631 study suggest that centralization is a condition for organizational effectiveness of RCS. It seems
632 that staff working in RCS with higher levels of centralization are more able to establish better
633 relationships with the youth in care, thereby creating a milieu of security and stability that
634 facilitates youth's academic achievement.

635 **Limitations and Implications for Future Research**

636 This study is one of only a few studies to examine social contextual characteristics linked
637 with academic achievements of a relatively large-scale sample of youth in residential care, based
638 on the reports of the youth and their caregivers. However, its limitations should be addressed.
639 First, the cross-sectional nature of the study does not allow causal conclusions to be drawn about

640 the relationships of organizational social context factors, youth-caregiver relationship facets, and
641 youth academic achievement. Longitudinal studies should help us better understand the role of
642 social organizational context and youth-caregiver relationship and youth academic achievement.
643 In addition, this study focused on academic achievements of youth in care, represented by their
644 scores in Math and in Portuguese language. In addition, this study did not consider the potential
645 role of learning disabilities or other conditions that potentially interfere both with academic
646 achievement and youth-caregiver relationship, such as attention deficit disorder with or without
647 hyperactivity. Given that the literature in this field reveals high rates of such phenomena among
648 young people in residential care (González-Garcia et al., 2017; Trout et al., 2009; Sainero et al.,
649 2013), future research focused on analyzing the processes outlined in this study should take such
650 phenomena into account. Future studies should also broaden the scope of school functioning of
651 children in residential care and include also other, "softer" indices of education, such as youth's
652 academic motivation, commitment to school and learning, attachment to school, and school
653 satisfaction. They should also include youth's reports on various aspects of the climate of the
654 residential setting, not included in the current study, such as the setting's friendliness to children
655 (i.e., the degree to which the youth see each other as friendly), and youth's favorable attitudes
656 towards the residential setting. It would also be beneficial to consider different perspectives of
657 the organizational social context (e.g., managers', case managers', and residential caregivers'
658 perceptions) and consider both youth's and caregivers' perceptions of their relationship quality.

659 **Implications for Practice and Policy**

660 The research findings presented here demonstrate the need for an ecological perspective
661 in addressing youth's educational achievements within the residential care system. It is important
662 not to focus solely on the characteristics of youth at risk for poor academic achievements.

663 Instead, it is essential to identify the residential contexts in which low academic achievements
664 are more prevalent (see Attar-Schwartz, 2009; Cheung et al., 2012). The study demonstrates the
665 importance of allocating sufficient resources to RCS to help them to improve their social
666 environments and support the relationship between youth and their caregivers. The child-care
667 policy agenda should give further attention to the role of RCS staff in the lives of youth in
668 residential care and their chances for mobility later in life. Recruiting and maintain a high-quality
669 staff and providing training, and ongoing clinical supervision are essential to supporting staff in
670 their significant role (Ellenbogen-Frankovitz, 2018; Assouline and Attar-Schwartz, 2020).

671 Additionally, one of the targets of policy makers and professionals should be creating an
672 atmosphere that may foster professionals' engagement with their role (e.g., through better
673 employment conditions and organizational support) and that provide an organizational context
674 with clear rules and expectations regarding each professional's work tasks. To achieve this, all
675 agents in the residential care system (i.e., directors and staff) should be involved, since
676 leaderships are as important as the professionals' practices in care (Hicks et al., 2009).
677 Residential settings directors have a key role in fostering a positive working environment
678 (Pinchover et al., 2015). Furthermore, resources should be directed to the staff training in terms
679 of their abilities to adopt positive behaviors in the relationship with young people in care, being
680 supportive and preventing negative interactions that may increase problematic behaviors and
681 academic difficulties. Such conditions may create a milieu for children in care that is
682 characterized by therapeutic relationships which promote youth's prospects for better adjustment
683 and for rehabilitation. Ultimately, this would also enhance their chances for a better life as adults.

684

References

685

Aguinis, H., Gottfredson, R. K., & Culpepper, S. A.. (2013). Best-Practice Recommendations for

686

Estimating Cross-Level Interaction Effects Using Multilevel Modeling. *Journal of*

687

Management, 39(6), 1490–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478188>

688

Assouline, A. H., & Attar-Schwartz, S. (2020). Staff Social Support and Adolescent Adjustment

689

Difficulties: The Moderating Role of Length of Stay in the Residential Care

690

Setting. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 110, 104761.

691

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.104761>

692

Attar-Schwartz, S. (2019). Parental availability of support and frequency of contact: The reports

693

of youth in educational residential care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 101, 317–

694

328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.04.016>

695

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and

696

looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–

697

285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

698

Barford, S.W., Whelton, W.J. (2010). Understanding Burnout in Child and Youth Care

699

Workers. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 39, 271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-010->

700

[9104-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-010-9104-8)

701

Berridge, D. (2012). Educating young people in care: What have we learned? *Children and*

702

Youth Services Review, 34(6), 1171–1175.

703

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2012.01.032>

704

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The Bioecological Model of Human Development.

705

In R. M. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of*

706

human development (p. 793–828). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

- 707 Brown, T., Winter, K., & Carr, N. (2018). Residential child care workers: Relationship based
708 practice in a culture of fear. *Child & Family Social Work, 23*(4), 657–665.
709 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12461>
- 710 Cahill, O., Holt, S., & Kirwan, G. (2016). Keyworking in residential child care: Lessons from
711 research. *Children and Youth Services Review, 65*, 216–223.
712 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.04.014>
- 713 Calheiros, M. M., & Patrício, J. N. (2014). Assessment of needs in residential care: Perspectives
714 of youth and professionals. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 23*(3), 461–474.
715 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9702-1>
- 716 [Calheiros, M. M., Patrício, J. N., & Graça, J. \(2013\). Staff and youth views on autonomy and
717 emancipation from residential care: A participatory research study. *Evaluation and
718 Program Planning, 39*, 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2013.04.003>](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2013.04.003)
- 719 Calheiros, M. M., Lopes, D., & Patrício, J. N. (2011). Assessment of the needs of youth in
720 residential care: Development and validation of an instrument. *Children and Youth Services
721 Review, 33*(10), 1930–1938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.05.020>
- 722 Calheiros, M. M., Patrício, J. N., & Silva, C. S. (2020). Social support as a moderator of
723 associations between youths' perceptions of their social images and self-representations in
724 residential care. *Children and Youth Services Review, 119*, 105667.
725 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105667>
- 726 Cheung, C., Lwin, K., & Jenkins, J. M. (2012). Helping youth in care succeed: Influence of
727 caregiver involvement on academic achievement. *Children and Youth Services
728 Review, 34*(6), 1092–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2012.01.033>

- 729 Costa, M., Melim, B., Tagliabue, S., Mota, C. P., & Matos, P. M. (2020). Predictors of the
730 quality of the relationship with caregivers in residential care. *Children and Youth Services*
731 *Review, 108*, 104579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.104579>
- 732 Cruz-Jesus, F., Castelli, M., Oliveira, T., Mendes, R., Nunes, C., Sa-Velho, M., & Rosa-Louro,
733 A. (2020). Using artificial intelligence methods to assess academic achievement in public
734 high schools of a European Union country. *Heliyon, 6*(6), e04081.
735 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04081>
- 736 Decree Law No. 66/2018 of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (2018). Republic Diary:
737 Series I, nº 157. <https://data.dre.pt/eli/dec-lei/66/2018/08/16/p/dre/pt/html>
- 738 Decree Order No. 223-A/2018 of the Ministry of Education (2018). Republic Diary: Series I, nº
739 149. <https://data.dre.pt/eli/port/223-a/2018/08/03/p/dre/pt/html>
- 740 Del Valle, J. F., Lázaro-Visa, S., López, M., & Bravo, A. (2011). Leaving family care. *Children*
741 *and Youth Services Review, 33*(12), 2475–2481.
742 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.08.015>
- 743 Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–
744 resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 499–512.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- 746 Ferguson, H. B., & Wolkow, K. (2012). Educating children and youth in care: A review of
747 barriers to school progress and strategies for change. *Children and Youth Services*
748 *Review, 34*(6), 1143–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2012.01.034>
- 749 Frazier, S. L., Rusch, D., Coxe, S., Stout, T. J., Helseth, S. A., Dirks, M. A., Bustamante, E. E.,
750 Atkins, M. S., Glisson, C., Green, P. D., Bhaumik, D., & Bhaumik, R. (2021). After-school
751 programs and children's mental health: Organizational social context, program quality, and

- 752 children's social behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 50(2), 215–
753 228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2019.1683849>
- 754 Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in
755 their social networks. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(6), 1016–1024.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.21.6.1016>
- 757 Garcia-Molsosa, M., Collet-Sabé, J., Martori, J. C., & Montserrat, C. (2019). School satisfaction
758 among youth in residential care: A multi-source analysis. *Children and Youth Services*
759 *Review*, 105, 104409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.104409>
- 760 Garrido, M. V., Lopes, D., & Calheiros, M. M. (2011). Estudo de adaptação e validação de um
761 questionário de clima organizacional para organizações sociais. *Psicologia*, 25(2), 135–
762 162. <https://doi.org/10.17575/rpsicol.v25i2.293>
- 763 Garstka, T. A., Lieberman, A., Biggs, J., Thompson, B., & Levy, M. M. (2014). Barriers to
764 Cross-Systems Collaboration in Child Welfare, Education, and the Courts: Supporting
765 Educational Well-being of Youth in Care Through Systems Change. *Journal of Public*
766 *Child Welfare*, 8(2), 190–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15548732.2014.888697>
- 767 Gharabaghi, K. (2012). Translating evidence into practice: Supporting the school performance of
768 young people living in residential group care in Ontario. *Children and Youth Services*
769 *Review*, 34(6), 1130–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2012.01.038>
- 770 Glisson, C. (2007). Assessing and Changing Organizational Culture and Climate for Effective
771 Services. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 17(6), 736–747.
772 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731507301659>

- 773 Glisson, C., & Green, P. (2011). Organizational climate, services, and outcomes in child welfare
774 systems. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35(8), 582–591.
775 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.04.009>
- 776 Glisson, C., & Hemmelgarn, A. (1998). The effects of organizational climate and
777 interorganizational coordination on the quality and outcomes of children’s service
778 systems. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22(5), 401–421. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-
779 2134\(98\)00005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(98)00005-2)
- 780 Glisson, C., Green, P., & Williams, N. J. (2012). Assessing the organizational social context
781 (OSC) of child welfare systems: Implications for research and practice. *Child Abuse &
782 Neglect*, 36(9), 621–632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2012.06.002>
- 783 Glisson, C., Hemmelgarn, A., Green, P., & Williams, N. J. (2013). Randomized trial of the
784 availability, responsiveness and continuity (ARC) organizational intervention for
785 improving youth outcomes in community mental health programs. *Journal of the American
786 Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 52(5), 493-500.
787 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2013.02.005>
- 788 Glisson, C., Landsverk, J., Schoenwald, S., Kelleher, K., Hoagwood, K. E., Mayberg, S., ... &
789 Research Network on Youth Mental Health. (2008). Assessing the organizational social
790 context (OSC) of mental health services: Implications for research and
791 practice. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services
792 Research*, 35(1–2), 98–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-007-0148-5>
- 793 Goering, E. S. (2018). The impact of organizational culture and climate on outcomes in child
794 welfare: a modified systematic review. *Human Service Organizations: Management,
795 Leadership & Governance*, 42(1), 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2017.1360814>

- 796 González-García, C., Lázaro-Visa, S., Santos, I., Del Valle, J. F., & Bravo, A.. (2017). School
797 Functioning of a Particularly Vulnerable Group: Children and Young People in Residential
798 Child Care. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01116>
- 799 Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B. and Anderson, R. (2019) *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson New
800 International Edition (8th ed).
- 801 Hamama, L. (2012). Burnout in social workers treating children as related to demographic
802 characteristics, work environment, and social support. *Social Work Research*, 36(2), 113–
803 125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/svs003>
- 804 Harder, A. T., Huyghen, A.-M. N., Knot-Dickscheit, J., Kalverboer, M. E., Köngeter, S., Zeller,
805 M., & Knorth, E. J. (2014). Education Secured? The School Performance of Adolescents in
806 Secure Residential Youth Care. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 43(2), 251–268.
807 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-013-9232-z>
- 808 Harder, A. T., Knorth, E. J., & Kalverboer, M. E. (2013). A secure base? The adolescent–staff
809 relationship in secure residential youth care. *Child & Family Social Work*, 18(3), 305–317.
810 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2012.00846.x>
- 811 Hicks, L. (2008). The role of manager in children's homes: the process of managing and leading
812 a well-functioning staff team. *Child & Family Social Work*, 13(3), 241–251.
813 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2008.00544.x>
- 814 Hicks, L., Gibbs, I., Weatherly, H., & Byford, S. (2009). Management, leadership and resources
815 in children's homes: What influences outcomes in residential child-care settings? *British*
816 *Journal of Social Work*, 39(5), 828–845. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcn013>
- 817 Holden, M. J., & Sellers, D. (2019). An evidence-based program model for facilitating
818 therapeutic responses to pain-based behavior in residential care. *International Journal of*

- 819 *Child, Youth and Family Studies*, 10(2-3), 63-80. <https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs102->
820 [3201918853](https://doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs102-3201918853)
- 821 Hox, J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications* (2nd ed.). New York, NY:
822 Routledge.
- 823 Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
824 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55.
825 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 826 Instituto da Segurança Social. (2020). *CASA 2019: Caracterização anual da situação de*
827 *acolhimento das crianças e jovens*.
- 828 Izzo, C. V., Smith, E. G., Sellers, D. E., Holden, M. J., & Nunno, M. A. (2020). Improving
829 relationship quality in group care settings: The impact of implementing the CARE
830 model. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 109, 104623.
831 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.104623>
- 832 Jackson, S. (2010). Reconnecting care and education. *Journal of Children's Services*, 5(3), 28–
833 59. <https://doi.org/10.5042/jcs.2010.0550>
- 834 Jackson, S., & Cameron, C. (2014). *Improving access to further and higher education for young*
835 *people in public care: European policy and practice*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica
836 Kingsley Publishers.
- 837 Jordan, N., Leon, S. C., Epstein, R. A., Durkin, E., Helgersson, J., & Lakin-Starr, B. L. (2009).
838 Effect of organizational climate on youth outcomes in residential treatment. *Residential*
839 *Treatment for Children & Youth*, 26(3), 194–208.
840 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865710903130277>

- 841 Kenny, D. A., & McCoach, D. B. (2003). Effect of the number of variables on measures of fit in
842 structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *10*(3), 333–351.
843 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1003_1
- 844 Kirk, C. M., Lewis-Moss, R. K., Nilsen, C., & Colvin, D. Q. (2011). The role of parent
845 expectations on adolescent educational aspirations. *Educational Studies*, *37*(1), 89–99.
846 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055691003728965>
- 847 Kline, R. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling* (3rd. Ed.). New York,
848 NY: Guilford Press.
- 849 Lanctôt, N., Lemieux, A., & Mathys, C. (2016). The Value of a Safe, Connected Social Climate
850 for Adolescent Girls in Residential Care. *Residential Treatment for Children &*
851 *Youth*, *33*(3-4), 247–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0886571x.2016.1207218>
- 852 Leipoldt, J. D., Harder, A. T., Kayed, N. S., Grietens, H., & Rimehaug, T. (2019). Determinants
853 and outcomes of social climate in therapeutic residential youth care: A systematic
854 review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *99*, 429–440.
855 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.02.010>
- 856 Levrouw, D., Devlieghere, J., Vandavelde, S., & Roose, R. (2020). Developing a positive living
857 climate in residential youth care: a qualitative study. *Children and Youth Services*
858 *Review*, *116*, 105221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105221>
- 859 Magalhães, E., & Calheiros, M. M. (2017). A dual-factor model of mental health and social
860 support: Evidence with adolescents in residential care. *Children and Youth Services*
861 *Review*, *79*, 442–449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2017.06.041>

- 862 Magalhães, E., Calheiros, M. M., & Antunes, C. (2018). 'I always say what I think': a rights-
863 based approach of young people's psychosocial functioning in residential care. *Child*
864 *Indicators Research*, *11*(6), 1801–1816. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-017-9511-6>
- 865 Magalhães, E., Calheiros, M. M., Costa, P., & Ferreira, S. (2021). Youth's rights and mental
866 health: The role of supportive relations in care. *Journal of Social and Personal*
867 *Relationships*, 026540752097550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407520975507>
- 868 Marion, É., & Mann-Feder, V. (2020). Supporting the educational attainment of youth in
869 residential care: From issues to controversies. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *113*,
870 104969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.104969>
- 871 Marshall, G., Winter, K., & Turney, D. (2020). Honneth and positive identity formation in
872 residential care. *Child and Family Social Work*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12749>
- 873 Melkman, E., Refaeli, T., & Benbenishty, R. (2016). An empirical test of a model of academic
874 expectations among youth in residential care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *67*,
875 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.05.023>
- 876 Montserrat, C., & Casas, F. (2018). The education of children and adolescents in out-of-home
877 care: a problem or an opportunity? Results of a longitudinal study. *European Journal of*
878 *Social Work*, *21*(5), 750–763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2017.1318832>
- 879 Moore, T., McArthur, M., Death, J., Tilbury, C., & Roche, S. (2018). Sticking with us through it
880 all: The importance of trustworthy relationships for children and young people in
881 residential care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *84*, 68–75.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2017.10.043>

- 883 Mota, C. P., & Matos, P. M. (2015). Adolescents in institutional care: Significant adults,
884 resilience and well-being. *Child & Youth Care Forum, 44*(2), 209–224.
885 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-014-9278-6>
- 886 OECD. (2019). *PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do PISA*. Paris:
887 OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>.
- 888 Pinchover, S., Attar-Schwartz, S., & Matattov-Sekeles, H. (2015). Director's Leadership and
889 Burnout among Residential Child Care Workers: Possible Implications for
890 Practice. *Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care, 14*(2), 1–11.
- 891 Preacher, K. J., & Selig, J. P. (2012). Advantages of Monte Carlo confidence intervals for
892 indirect effects. *Communication Methods and Measures, 6*(2), 77–98.
893 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2012.679848>
- 894 Sainero, A., Del Valle, J. F., López, M., & Bravo, A. (2013). Exploring the specific needs of an
895 understudied group: Children with intellectual disability in residential child care. *Children
896 and Youth Services Review, 35*(9), 1393–1399.
897 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.04.026>
- 898 Schmid, H. (2006). Leadership styles and leadership change in human and community service
899 organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 17*(2), 179–194.
900 <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.142>
- 901 Schmid, H., & Bar-Nir, D. (2001). The relationship between organizational properties and
902 service effectiveness in residential boarding schools. *Children and Youth Services Review,*
903 *23*(3), 243–271. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-7409\(01\)00135-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0190-7409(01)00135-9)
- 904 Snijders, T., & Bosker, R. (2003). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and advanced
905 multilevel modeling*. London: Sage.

- 906 Stone, S. (2007). Child maltreatment, out-of-home placement and academic vulnerability: A
907 fifteen-year review of evidence and future directions. *Children and Youth Services*
908 *Review*, 29(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2006.05.001>
- 909 Sulimani-Aidan, Y. (2016). In between formal and informal: Staff and youth relationships in care
910 and after leaving care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 67, 43–49.
911 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.05.025>
- 912 Trout, A. L., Hagaman, J., Casey, K., Reid, R., & Epstein, M. H. (2008). The academic status of
913 children and youth in out-of-home care: A review of the literature. *Children and Youth*
914 *Services Review*, 30(9), 979–994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2007.11.019>
- 915 Whittington, A., & Burns, J. (2005). The dilemmas of residential care staff working with the
916 challenging behaviour of people with learning disabilities. *British Journal of Clinical*
917 *Psychology*, 44(1), 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466504X19415>
- 918 Williams, N. J., & Glisson, C. (2014). Testing a theory of organizational culture, climate and
919 youth outcomes in child welfare systems: A United States national study. *Child Abuse &*
920 *Neglect*, 38(4), 757-767. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.09.003>
- 921 Wolf, D. A. P. S., Dulmus, C. N., Maguin, E., & Cristalli, M. (2014). Do organizational culture
922 and climate matter for successful client outcomes?. *Research on Social Work*
923 *Practice*, 24(6), 670–675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731513506616>
- 924 Zhang, Z., Zyphur, M. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). Testing multilevel mediation using
925 hierarchical linear models problems and solutions. *Organizational Research Methods*,
926 12(4), 695–719. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108327450>