Professionalization in public child welfare: Historical context and workplace outcomes for social workers and non-social workers

Maria Scannapieco *, Rebecca L. Hegar, Kelli Connell-Carrick

The University of Texas at Arlington, School of Social Work, Center for Child Welfare, United States

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This article recaps the historic role of the U.S. Children's Bureau in the development and professionalization of public child welfare services. A review of the empirical literature explores relationships between professional preparation and outcomes in service delivery, job performance and preparedness, social work values, and retention of staff. This review informs the evaluation study, which draws from a longitudinal appraisal of almost 10,000 child welfare workers in Texas, about one third with degrees in social work. The study found significant differences between the experiences and perceptions of those with social work degrees and those with degrees in other fields.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In the United States, schools of social work have a long history of partnerships with the U.S. Children's Bureau and state child welfare agencies to develop a workforce made up of professional, degreed social workers. During the past 15 years, partnerships have grown to include most state child welfare departments and many public and private universities. Schools of social work recruit students and child welfare employees to work in that field after they obtain Master of Social Work (MSW) or Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) degrees with the support of educational stipends. Recently, workforce issues in child welfare have been brought once again to the forefront by the findings of the Children's Bureau's Child and Family Services Reviews and State Program Improvement Plans (PIPs), which reaffirm the need for a well-qualified staff with the knowledge, skills and commitment to provide competent services to vulnerable children and families who are involved in the public child welfare system (Perry & Ellett, 2008; Zlotnik et al., 2005a).

During this centennial year for the U.S. Children's Bureau, this article first recaps that organization's historic role in the development and professionalization of public child welfare services, including key policies and programs that have shaped the field. This historical discussion highlights collaborations among the Bureau, public child welfare departments, and schools of social work that are forerunners of the present IV-E stipend program.

A review of empirical literature then explores relationships between social work education and preparation and outcomes in service delivery, job performance and preparedness, social work values, and retention of staff. This targeted review of the literature informs the evaluation study

presented in the balance of the article, which sought to answer the following question: At three intervals of employment tenure with the Texas public child welfare system, what are the differences and similarities between social workers and non-social workers concerning staff retention and personal perceptions of job readiness, ongoing use of training, and relationships with peers and supervisors?

The evaluation study presented in the third major section draws from an ongoing longitudinal appraisal of almost 10,000 individuals who entered employment in Texas as child welfare workers, about one third of whom have social work degrees. Texas child welfare workers are surveyed at three points in time: After about three months of employment at graduation from basic skills-development training (BSD), which includes three weeks of on-the-job training (OJT); eighteen months post-employment when staff can become certified CPS Specialists and three years' post-hire when they are eligible to become CPS Advanced Specialists. The goal of this study is to analyze the experiences of child welfare workers from the time they complete their initial training through their third year of employment. We track the staff members' experiences, perceived knowledge, perceived skills, views of organizational culture, supervisory experiences, overall satisfaction, and retention over time. This article reports significant differences between the experiences and perceptions of those with social work degrees and those with degrees in other fields.

2. The U.S. Children's Bureau and the public child welfare workforce

The history of the U.S. Children's Bureau, established a hundred years ago with a broad mandate to study and report on the health and social conditions of the country's children, has long been the subject of scholarship (e.g., Abbott, 1938; Chepaitis, 1972; Perry & Ellett, 2008; Rodems, Shaefer, & Ybarra, 2011; Zlotnik, 2003). After setting the context for the

---

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 817 272 3535.
  E-mail address: mscannapieco@uta.edu (M. Scannapieco).

establishment of the Bureau in 1912, we explore its role in the creation, expansion, and professionalization of public child welfare services, particularly through support for staff and students to pursue social work education, programs that were precursors of current efforts to employ social workers in public child welfare agencies.

Prior to the establishment of the Children's Bureau, the U.S. had developed by the end of the 19th century an array of voluntary agencies devoted to child saving and child placement, including humane associations, anti-cruelty societies, orphanages, and children's aid societies. In addition, some child welfare institutions, such as state schools for special populations and general orphanages, had been founded under public auspices (Jones, 1993). Juvenile courts, which expanded through state legislation the judges' traditional powers under English common law to oversee wardship of minors, had begun by 1899 to promote a rehabilitative approach to delinquent and dependent children that increased the need for placement of children (Abbott, 1938).

The Children's Bureau, the culmination of advocacy by settlement house and public health workers, anti-child labor advocates, and other progressive reformers, represented the first foray by the U.S. federal government to address the general welfare of a broad group of Americans. Much of the Bureau's early emphasis was on the health status of children, and in 1921 it assumed administration of the first federal grant-in-aid to the states. Although the Bureau's health-related work provoked vitriolic opposition from the medical establishment that led to the grants' repeal in 1927, its Maternal and Infant Hygiene program logged many successes (Chepaitis, 1972; Combs-Orme, 1988; Rodems et al., 2011). In 1935 Children's Bureau was able to expand on its experience in working with states to administer new grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act, including landmark programs for child welfare services in rural areas.

The long history of voluntary societies dedicated to child welfare ensured that older urban areas of the U.S. were well supplied by 1935 with private protective and placement agencies. County child welfare boards and state child welfare departments also had been established during the preceding two decades in many states, including Minnesota in 1917 and Alabama in 1919 (Abbott, 1938). However, as the federal Social Security Act was debated, most rural areas remained badly underserved. In response, Social Security Act. 49 United States Statutes 633 (1935) charged the Children's Bureau to cooperate with state departments to provide protection and care, especially in rural areas, for children who were dependent, neglected, homeless, or at risk for delinquency. Congress initially made one and a half million dollars per year available for grants to states to establish or extend child welfare services (Abbott, 1938; Eliot, 1936).

By 1936, the rural child welfare plans of 41 states had been approved and funded by the Children's Bureau (Eliot, 1936). The wording of Title V was broad enough to allow considerable flexibility, and the Children's Bureau quickly supported states' use of the grants to enable present or prospective child welfare staff to attend graduate schools of social work (Child Welfare Division, 1938). Although Perry and Ellett (2008) observe that "little is known about the number of social workers or social work graduates (from professional schools) that assumed positions within child welfare settings" during this period (p. 147), anecdotal examples do exist. Washington State reported to the Bureau in 1938 that it was funding 16 employees to attend graduate school and that staff in Seattle were being allowed time to attend classes during work hours. Washington also had used Title V funds to establish a center to train new child welfare staff, most of whom had completed some graduate-level social work education, for four-month periods (Child Welfare Division, 1938). The same year, Kansas also listed among its funding objectives educational leaves for staff interested in preparing to work in public child welfare positions, and Tennessee noted "scholarships in recognized schools of social work for the special training of child welfare workers" and had five staff members pursuing degrees at the University of Chicago or Tulane University (Child Welfare Division, 1938, p. 660).

The Children's Bureau's longstanding ties with social work and social work education evolved from decades of stable professional leadership

rooted in the settlement house movement and promoted from within its own ranks. Its initial Chief, Julia Lathrop (1912–1921) had been a Hull House resident and had spearheaded establishment of the first juvenile court and the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy before her appointment to the Bureau. Grace Abbott, the second Chief who led the Bureau for 15 years (1921–1934), shared the Hull House background and ultimately became a professor at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration. At the time the Social Security Act was passed, the Chief was Katherine Lenroot (1934–1951) who had been with the Bureau since 1914. She had attended the New York School of Social Work, and she served as President of the National Conference of Social Work in 1935. Physician Martha Eliot, a Bureau veteran who also had practiced as a medical social worker, chaired the National Conference of Social Work in 1949 and served as Bureau Chief from 1951 to 1956. She was followed by Katherine Oettinger (1957–1968), a social work graduate of Smith College and former Dean of the Boston University School of Social Work. Abbott and Oettinger are among those honored as National Association of Social Workers Foundation (2011), and the biographies of the first four Bureau Chiefs appear in the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Mizrahi, 2008).

In the context of the Bureau's leadership, it is unsurprising that programs enacted as amendments to the Social Security Act and administered by the Bureau continued to support social work education and professionalization in public child welfare. These included Section 426 of Title IV-B, passed in 1962 (see Zlotnik, 2003) and Section 707 in the amendments enacted in 1967 (see Austin, Antonyappan, & Leighninger, 1996). Due in part to politically motivated weakening of the Children's Bureau during the Nixon administration, funding under Section 707 was phased out after 1974 (Austin et al., 1996; Ferguson, 1972).

During this challenging time at the Bureau and in the federal government, a combination of political and workforce issues resulted in removal of social work qualifications from many positions in public child welfare (see Perry & Ellett, 2008). However, even during this difficult period for the child welfare field, the Bureau funded and provided support for Regional Child Welfare Training Centers that offered educational stipends to prospective public agency staff (Vinokur-Kaplan, 1987), and some states used block grants under Title XX of the Social Security Act to offer similar opportunities.

The Children's Bureau has had a remarkable record of survival through periods of change, and passage of Title IV-E, enacted as part of the Child Welfare and Adoption Assistance Act of 1980, has assured the Bureau of an ongoing central role in funding education for social work practice in public child welfare. Schools of social work, in collaboration with state child welfare agencies, can be funded through Title IV-E for curriculum development, classroom instruction, and field instruction that are related to the mission of child welfare. Curriculum development around specific child welfare content has been stressed as a way to assure quality child welfare services (Pecora, 1989; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2003). Today, hundreds of IV-E partnerships throughout the country are spending millions of federal dollars to educate Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) and Master of Social Work (MSW) students for careers in the field (Cheung, Taylor, & Vohra-Gupta, 2007; Faller, 2010; Smith, 2002).

The federal commitment to increase the number of social workers within public child welfare reflects a long-standing perception that employing qualified social workers improves child welfare service delivery (Smith, 2002). Unfortunately, there is insufficient evaluation research measuring the effectiveness of partnerships between schools of social work and state child welfare agencies in meeting goals related to services to clients. The need for program evaluation, including stronger methods and well-targeted questions, has been a theme in the literature for some time (Wells, 1994; Zlotnik, 1997) and has been re-emphasized recently (Faller, 2010; Rubin, 2011; Smith, 2002; Zlotnik, DePanfilis, Daining, & Lane, 2005b). In addition, the federal government is becoming increasingly interested in outcomes of educational programs, and some states are implementing reporting systems.

3. Review of the literature

This literature review extends the historical overview to target peer-reviewed research articles addressing the impact of social work education on the field of child welfare. Many of these emphasize the effects of a social work degree on aspects of child welfare practice (Albers, Reilly, & Rittner, 1993; Barbee, Antle, Sullivan, Huebner, & Rox, 2009; Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1987; Burmham, 1997; Dhopper, Royse, & Woolfe, 1990; Fox, Burnham, Barbee, & Yankeelov, 2000; Fox, Miller, & Barbee, 2003; Franke, Bagdasaryan, & Furman, 2009; Gansle & Ellett, 2002; Hopkins, Mudrick, & Rudolph, 1999; Jones, 2002; Lieberman, Hornby, & Russell, 1988; Moran, Frans, & Gibson, 1995; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Olsen & Holmes, 1982; Robin & Hollister, 2002; Rycraft, 1990; Vinokur-Kaplan, 1991). Another large group of studies focuses on retention of child welfare staff (Balfour & Neff, 1993; Cicero-Reese & Black, 1998; Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Ellett, 2001; Ellett, Ellett, & Rugutt, 2003; Ellett, Ellis, Westbrook, & Dews, 2007; Fox et al., 2003; Jones, 2002; Landsman, 2001; Lewandowski, 1998; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; O'Donnell & Kirkner, 2009; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Robin & Hollister, 2002; Rosenthal & Waters, 2006; Rycraft, 1994; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2003; Strand & Dore, 2009; Vinokur-Kaplan, 1987; Weaver, Change, Clark, & Rhee, 2007; Williams, Nichols, Kirk, & Wilson, 2011; Yankeelov, Barbee, Sullivan, & Antle, 2009). Additional emphases in the literature include the development, identification and evaluation of necessary competencies in traineeship programs (Cahn, 1997; Hodges, Morgan, & Johnston, 1993) and the differences in practice between BSW- and MSW-level child welfare workers (Alperin, 1996; Olsen & Holmes, 1982).

Many different variables appear in the literature assessing the impact of social work education on child welfare practice. Our search for such terms included "social work degree", "professional development", "child welfare" and "retention". This review includes only studies in which having a social work degree was a variable and that are otherwise most relevant to the concepts in our evaluation report, presented in Section 4. Studies in four general areas appear here: Service delivery; job performance and preparedness; social work values, and retention. The most applicable findings appear in the balance of this section.

3.1. Service delivery

The most desirable way to compare the effectiveness of social workers to that of other degreed workers in child welfare practice is to determine whether social workers produce better outcomes for clients. Unfortunately, this type of study design is rare, and some of the literature is dated. Barbee et al. (2009) explored client outcomes by comparing BSW child welfare workers educated in a Title IV-E program with non-social workers and found promising results at each stage of service. The authors report that children whose caseworker held a social work degree were more likely to have their situations investigated, to have their abuse substantiated, to be placed in the home of a relative, to have fewer moves during foster care, to experience more visits with family while in care, and to be placed in adoptive homes.

Earlier research reported child welfare workers with undergraduate (BSW) degrees are most efficient in linking clients with resources (Olsen & Holmes, 1982) and more likely than workers without social work degrees to be employed in public agencies, to be engaged in work with communities, and to spend more time completing home visits and paperwork (Alperin, 1996). Limited studies suggest that social workers with graduate (MSW) degrees may be more successful than non-social workers in delivering substantive services (Olsen & Holmes, 1982) and in dealing with families where multiple problems are evident (Albers et al., 1993). Staff members with social work educations are reported by Olsen and Holmes (1982) to be more effective than staff with degrees in other fields in providing substitute care, environmental services, supportive services, and in planning for ongoing contact between children in foster care and their families. Concerning effectiveness in permanency planning, Albers et al. (1993) report that social-work-trained child welfare workers were more likely than were those with other degrees to make permanent plans for foster children within three years.

3.1.1. Job performance and preparedness

The literature also suggests differences between social workers and non-social workers in terms of job performance and preparedness. In older studies, MSWs have reported the highest levels of perceived preparedness to carry out job tasks (Lieberman et al., 1988) and have been rated by supervisors as highest in overall performance rating, when compared to all non-MSW staff with training and years of experience controlled (Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1987; Dhopper et al., 1990). When given a hypothetical new employee applicant, supervisors have rated the MSW degree as likely to produce the best-prepared employee for the job and to require the least amount of supervision and training (Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1987).

In an evaluation of the partnership between a child welfare agency and university in Florida, most of the Title IV-E stipend graduates responded that they had effectively used in practice the skills acquired in MSW programs. Two-thirds perceived that they were able to change the agency efficiently, and all of the respondents reported experiencing personal changes in the educational process, such as knowledge acquisition, ethics awareness, coping skills, and assertiveness (Burmham, 1997). Administrators reported that the child welfare agency benefited from the partnership and saw the MSW-employees as advocates for family preservation and family-based services (Burmham, 1997).

More recently, social work graduates of specialized child welfare programs have repeatedly been found to have significantly higher scores than workers without social work degrees on measures of job-related competencies and skill (Fox et al., 2000; Franke et al., 2009; Gansle & Ellett, 2002; Hopkins et al., 1999; Jones, 2002; Jones & Okamura, 2000; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Robin & Hollister, 2002).

However, another way to measure job performance is to examine performance evaluations of workers, and Perry (2006a, 2006b) found neither BSW-degreed workers nor social-work-educated supervisors to have better performance evaluations than their non-social-work counterparts. Similarly, Rosenthal and Waters (2006) found no relationship between performance evaluations and having participated in IV-E funded educational programs. Therefore, evidence concerning a link between social work education and job performance is somewhat mixed.

3.2. Social work values

In assessing the impact of values and worker attitudes on the management of a human service agency, Moran et al. (1995) conclude that social work students score higher than business students in placing value on social justice, individual freedom, human nature, and collective identity. When age, gender, and study design were controlled, the same researchers report also social workers to be more effective managers in human service organizations because they tended to hold values and to possess personal qualities important to the job (Moran et al., 1995). In another study, social workers demonstrated higher levels of sensitivity and confidence when working with clients than employees who did not hold a social work degree (Hopkins et al., 1999). MSWs had the highest mean scores on a measure of specific professional values when compared with BSWs, who ranked second, followed by BA/BSs and MA/MSs, although these results did not reach statistical significance (Dhopper et al., 1990).

3.3. Staff retention and commitment

Findings are mixed concerning the effects of social work degrees on retention and satisfaction of staff. Several studies during the past decade have found that being a Title IV-E stipend graduate who obtained either a BSW or an MSW has a positive relationship with job retention in child

welfare (Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Ellett, 2001; Fox et al., 2003; Jones, 2002; Lewandowski, 1998; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Robin & Hollister, 2002; Rosenthal & Waters, 2006; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2003) or job performance ratings (Sharma et al., 1997). A study of MSW Title IV-E graduates in California showed that organizational commitment was the most consistent predictor of whether MSWs remained employed in public child welfare after satisfying the time commitment related to their educational stipends (O'Donnell & Kirkner, 2009).

Perry (2006a, 2006b) critiques the design of some studies in which workers educated in Title IV-E training programs were compared to non-social workers not involved in IV-E programs, which may skew the findings because of the specialized nature of those programs. Nonetheless, Ellett (2001) reports that child welfare workers with social work degrees have express intentions to stay within child welfare agencies and do have higher rates of retention. In another study, MSWs had the lowest rates of job separation (Okamura & Jones, 2000). Although Landsman (2001) found child welfare workers who have MSWs to be more likely than those with other degrees to express intent to remain employed in the field, Weaver et al. (2007) found MSWs were more likely to intend to leave but were not more likely actually to do so. Child welfare workers cite lack of possible alternative job placements within the agency, working conditions, resources, and the relationship with their immediate supervisor as among their primary reasons for low job satisfaction or the intent or decision to leave (Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Mor Barak et al., 2001; Samantrai, 1992; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2003; Strand & Dore, 2009; Strolin-Goltzman, 2010). However, a recent study by McGowan, Auerbach, and Strolin-Goltzman (2009) that used structural equation modeling to test such previously identified factors concludes that career satisfaction contributes positively and the paperwork burden negatively to intention to stay.

While many studies show social work education to affect retention positively within child welfare agencies, a few studies report social work degrees to have negative effects on retention (Ellett et al., 2003; Weaver et al., 2007; Yankeelov et al., 2009). For example, Yankeelov et al. (2009) found that MSWs were more likely to leave their agencies and that BSWs did not stay longer than other bachelors-level workers. Weaver et al. (2007) found that MSWs expressed the highest intention to leave, although the difference was not statistically significant. In spite of the knowledge that has been generated in this area, the literature on retention of child welfare workers and social workers remains somewhat inconclusive (DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008); a more thorough discussion of this point can be found elsewhere in the literature (Weaver et al., 2007).

4. Context of the evaluation study

Title IV-E programs are based on the underlying assumption that having a social work degree will enhance child welfare practice. Although research has shown the impact of a social work degree on child welfare work in areas such as values, job performance, and preparedness and skills, empirical studies are needed to explore the effects of a social work degree on practice within organizations over time. The study presented in this paper is the first prospective, longitudinal study to examine the issues of retention and perceptions of competency and preparedness. As we note in the Introduction (Section 1), this study sought to answer the following question: What are the differences and similarities over time between social workers and non-social workers within a public child welfare agency concerning job retention and perceptions of job readiness, ongoing use of training, and relationship with peers and supervisors?

Texas has a long history of schools of social work contributing to the development of the child welfare workforce. Prior to the proliferation of Title IV-E stipend programs in the mid-1990s, the state used Title XX dollars to provide educational stipends to child welfare workers. Initially, only MSW programs at three public universities in the state had IV-E stipends programs. Texas Department of Family and Protective Services

(TDFPS), along with the established MSW stipend programs, subsequently encouraged and assisted universities with BSW programs to develop additional stipend opportunities. Since early 2000 many have done so, and there currently are 12 stipend programs throughout the state.

Each university sets its own rate for stipends based on the tuition, fees, and book cost at the particular institution, and employees and non-employee stipend students receive different levels of stipends. Employees enroll in courses part-time, while non-employees attend full-time. Variation in the proportion of stipends provided to employees and non-employees also exists among universities. The BSW programs are solely for non-employees, while the MSW programs provide more stipends to employees than non-employees. The period of employment required to pay the state back for a stipend is set by TDFPS.

5. Methods

An evaluation of the Texas Child Protective Services professional development training program was developed by authors of this article; it began in November 2001 and ended in August 2010. In Texas, child welfare workers are referred to as child protective service (CPS) workers and practice in all programs and stages of service, from investigations through family-based services and adoptions. Although Title IV-E funded programs have a strong presence in Texas schools of social work and many students benefit from Title IV-E support, this study compares perceptions of CPS staff with and without social work degrees, regardless of past participation in IV-E stipend programs. One reason to avoid distinguishing IV-E students is that the majority of social work programs in the state receives IV-E funds and infuses child welfare content throughout the curriculum, with the result that social work students in Texas are widely exposed to curriculum that has been affected by IV-E programming.

5.1. Participants

Public child welfare workers in each of the eleven CPS regions in Texas are surveyed at completion of basic skills development (BSD) job training and then followed throughout their certification process until they are eligible for advanced certification (3 years from date of hire). As a requirement of graduation from BSD all workers fill out the initial survey, subsequent surveys are a part of the certification application. This study reports survey and follow-up data for an initial group of 9,981 CPS employees whose demographics are reported in the results section.

5.2. Procedures

The evaluation employs survey data of the CPS workers from three different occasions: After completion of BSD; at the time of eligibility for CPS Specialist Certification, which occurs after 18 months of employment, and at Advanced Specialist Certification after 3-years with the agency. All new employees in Texas are administered the survey and an exam at the completion of BSD. The 18-month and 3-year surveys are voluntary components of applications for certification. Information regarding employment status is collected from the state on a monthly basis. The state informs the researchers of employees who leave the agency, allowing researchers to track the retention of workers.

5.3. Measures

Surveys were developed by a team of researchers, and content validity was established through the input from CPS trainers, supervisors, and administrators from the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (TDFPS). The measures have changed slightly during the evaluation, resulting in some missing data. Data reported here includes all individuals who completed BSD from November 2001

through August 2010. Each survey measures both specific components of the training model, as well as perceptions regarding skill, knowledge, organizational culture, support, attitudes and experiences as a worker. The self-report survey reflects the workers' own perception of their experiences. The survey is comprised of open-ended items that require a numerical response (i.e. "How many days were you in a unit prior to attending BSD?") and items that are scored on a four-point Likert scale indicating the amount of agreement to the particular statement (i.e. "I am capable of assessing sexual abuse cases;" "I understand the foster care system"). Demographic data are also collected in the initial survey and include gender, ethnicity, degree, relationship status, dependents, and income. Excluding demographics, the BSD survey has 51 items, the 18-month survey has 34 items, and the 3-year survey has 31 items. The BSD survey includes more items than the other surveys because it also measures fidelity to the training model, classroom experiences, and on-the-job training experiences.

For this analysis, the independent variable is academic degree, which has two levels: social work degree and no social work degree. Dependent variables are perception of competency, support of supervisor and peers, organizational climate, and retention. The measurement of workers who leave and stay is done through the exit report that TDFPS provides, including the exact date of departure for each employee.

5.4. Data analysis

Data analysis includes descriptive and inferential statistics, including independent-samples t-tests and chi-squares. As indicated above, there was a total of 116 possible items for analysis from the three surveys. With length and reader burden in mind, we present only significant results in the tables and in Section 6.

6. Results

Three thousand eighty-six (N = 3086) social workers and 6814 non-social workers completed the BSD graduation survey, a completion rate of 100%. The social work and non-social work graduates were demographically very similar. Eighty-three percent (83%) of those with a social work degree (N = 2561) and 79% (N = 5393) of non-social-work-degreed respondents were female. Forty-four percent of the social workers were white (N = 1352), followed by Black (27%, N = 817), Hispanic (25%, N = 772) and other (4%, N = 123). Similarly, 43% of the non-social-work-degreed respondents were white (N = 2918), followed by Black (29%, N = 1961), Hispanic (24%, N = 1645) and other (4%, N = 245). Twelve percent (12%) (N = 365) of respondents who had a social work degree held an MSW, while 13% (N = 893) of the non-social-work-degreed respondents had a graduate degree (see Table 1).

Chi-square analyses reveal that only gender, degree, and major are significant demographic differences between the groups. Non-social workers were more likely to be male than social workers ($x^2 = 154.15$, p<.001). Obviously, degree ($x^2 = 5.043$, p<.001) and major ($x^2 = 9.342$, p<.000) emerged as significant differences.

Independent samples t-tests also revealed that social workers scored significantly higher on the BSD exam (t = −2.52, p<.05) and had more prior, related work experience (t = −5.07, p<.001) than non-social workers. Social workers had an average of almost half a year more human service practice experience than non-social workers. Social workers also were significantly more likely than were non-social workers to report that they knew about community resources, content that was not covered in BSD (t = −2.86, p<.01). These findings are reflected in Table 2.

6.1. Perceptions of workers during their first three years on the job

6.1.1. BSD survey

The sample size for particular questions on the BSD survey ranged from 5,961 to 9,290, due to changes in the evaluation instrument over the duration of the survey. Several significant variables emerged in relation to the experiences and perceptions of workers. Overall, social workers were significantly more satisfied with their experiences in BSD and rated themselves as having stronger assessment skills than their non-social work counterparts.

Social workers rated their supervisors during BSD significantly higher than did non-social workers in terms of facilitating their learning (t = −3.68, p<.001) and increasing their enthusiasm (t = −3.68, p<.001). They also thought their peer trainers/mentors increased their enthusiasm significantly more than did non-social workers (t = −2.90, p<.01). Unit workers, those grouped with under one supervisor, had a significant effect on the learning and enthusiasm of social workers. Social-work-degreed respondents, more than non-social workers, rated unit workers as significantly increasing their enthusiasm in BSD (t = −2.78, p<.01) and during OJT (t = −3.91, p<.001), as well as facilitating their learning in OJT (t = −3.25, p<.001). Social workers also reported greater satisfaction than non-social workers with the materials and structure of BSD. Social work respondents rated the CWLA Field Guides as more useful (t = −4.56, p<.001), the facilities more conductive to learning (t = −2.50, p<.05), the materials as more adequate (t = −4.49, p<.001), and the activities as enhancing learning more (t = −4.16, p<.001). They also thought the trainers were more prepared (t = −2.31, p<.05) and responsive (t = −2.74, p<.01).

Overall, social workers reported gaining more knowledge and skill than did non-social workers.

(t = −3.77, p<.001), and this is perhaps one of the most important findings of this part of the evaluation. Social workers felt more capable than did non-social workers in assessing sexual abuse

Table 1
Respondent characteristics.

	Social work degree		Non social work degree	
	N	%	N	%
Social work and non social work respondents	3086	31	6814	69
Gender***				
Male	521	17	1412	21
Female	2561	83	5393	79
Ethnicity				
Black	817	27	1961	29
Hispanic	772	25	1645	24
White	1352	44	2918	43
Other	123	4	245	4
Degree ***				
BA/BS			5805	85
BSW	2721	88		
MA/MS			893	13
MSW	365	12		
Ph.D.			23	.3
Other			93	1.4
Major of highest degree***				
Social work	3086	100		
Psychology/counseling			1894	29
Sociology/criminal justice			2111	32
Other (business, political science, education, humanities, medical-related			2409	37

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Table 2
Respondent characteristics.

	Social workers			Non social workers		
	Mean	Mdn	Range	Mean	Mdn	Range
Exam score*	85.4	87	28–99	85.0	86	33–99
Years social work experience***	2.3	.3	0–40	1.9	.00	0–35
Knowledge of community resources*	10.9	10	0–100	9.4	6.0	0–103

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

(t = − 5.714, p<.001), physical abuse (t = − 2.88, p<.01), neglect (t = − 3.11, p<.01), substance abuse (t = − 3.79, p<.001), and domestic violence (t = − 4.98, p<.001). Social workers reported being better able to create service plans (t = − 4.45, p<.001) and to understand the foster care system (t = − 4.51, p<.001) than did their colleagues with other degrees.

Social workers also reported being more satisfied than did non-social workers with several aspects of the job, including the client caseload (t = − 7.35, p<.001), paperwork load (t = − 5.10, p<.001), computer workload (t = − 4.31, p<.001), educational opportunities (t = − 6.57, p<.001), promotional and career opportunities (t = t = − 4.24, p<.001), training opportunities (t = − 4.73, p<.001), and organizational support (t = − 3.93, p<.001). Respondents with social work degrees also felt more valued as professionals (t = − 1.97, p<.05) and found their jobs more desirable (t = − 2.92, p<.01) than those without social work degrees.

6.1.2. 18-month survey

Several variables emerged as significant at the time of the 18-month survey, when the sample size for non-social workers is 2260 and that of social workers is 951. The reduction in numbers of participants at the 18-month point is primarily a reflection of turnover in staff. In contrast to the BSD survey, several of the variables at the time of this survey indicated that non-social workers were more satisfied and felt more capable than their social-work-degreed colleagues. Social workers were still more satisfied at 18-months' tenure with the educational opportunities provided to them (t = − 2.59, p<.05), but non-social workers reported more satisfaction with organizational support (t = 2.14, p<.05). In contrast to results from the BSD survey, non-social workers perceived themselves as more capable than social workers in their ability to assess physical abuse (t = 1.97, p<.05), neglect (t = 2.59, p<.05), substance abuse (t = 2.41, p<.05), domestic violence cases (t = 2.42, p<.05) and in their ability to save and submit case information in IMPACT, Texas' statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS) (t = 2.42, p<.05). They also were more satisfied with several aspects of the supervisory relationship, including the emotional support they received from their supervisors (t = 2.37, p<.05), the supervisors' availability (t = 2.59, p<.05), the ability of supervisors to assist with locating resources (t = 2.23, p<.05), and the supervisors' guidance on workload management (t = 2.61, p<.05). Respondents with non-social work degrees were more satisfied with the paperwork load (t = 3.16, p<.01), as well as their resources for doing their job (t = 2.89, p<.01). They also were more likely than social workers to report planning to be working with CPS for the next six month (t = 2.19, p<.05).

6.1.3. Three-year survey

The sample size at this follow-up is 274 for social workers and 820 for non-social workers, and there are several significant findings. Response rate is due to the fact workers have not reached the three year mark, therefore not eligible to take the three year survey. Consistent with the BSD and 18-month surveys, social workers report more satisfaction with their educational opportunities (t = − 2.87, p<.05). They are also more satisfied with co-worker support (t = − 2.42, p<.05). On the other hand, non-social workers report more satisfaction with the personnel benefits (t = 2.32, p<.05) than social workers. Differences also emerged between social workers and non-social workers in relation to their commitment to social work and child welfare. Social workers were committed to the profession of social work, but reported they would like to explore a child welfare career outside of CPS (t = − 3.72, p<.001), as well as a social work career outside of child welfare (t = − 3.07, p<.01). On the other hand, non-social workers were more likely to report that they see CPS as a long-term career (t = 2.08, p<.05), but they were also more likely to report the desire to explore a non-social work career than social workers (t = 7.13, p<.001). These findings a summarized on Table 4.

6.1.4. Staff retention

Finally, analysis was performed to determine the retention of social workers and non-social workers at the 3-year mark. Of all respondents, 45% were still employed with CPS at the time of this analysis (N = 4483) and 55% left or had been terminated. Social workers were significantly more likely to remain employed with the agency than non-social workers ($x^2 = 63.265$, p<.001): Fifty-one percent (51%, N = 1574) of social workers were employed with CPS, while only 43% (N = 2894) of non-social workers remained employed. We should note here that three years exceeds any work commitment undertaken by IV-E stipend students, so participation in that program by some social work employees would not be the determining factor in their retention (Table 3).

6.1.5. Summary

In summary, significant differences were found between the experiences and perceptions of social workers and those of non-social workers in job training, the job itself, and retention. During BSD and at its completion, social workers were more satisfied overall with their experience and felt more capable in their assessment skills and knowledge than did non-social workers. They were more satisfied with the training model, including the materials they were given, the trainer, and the structure of training. They reported greater satisfaction with their supervisors, peer trainers/mentors and unit workers. They also felt more capable of assessing maltreatment than did non-social workers, and they were more satisfied with the paperwork, caseload, and opportunities available at CPS.

By the time of the 18-month survey, most of these findings reverse, and it is non-social workers who report more satisfaction and perceptions of capability. Although social workers are more satisfied with the educational opportunities at CPS after 18 months, non-social workers report being more capable of assessment, more satisfied with their supervisors, and more satisfied with the job itself.

At the 3-year survey, no differences in self-perceptions about capability or knowledge remained. Non-social workers were more likely to see CPS as a long-term career, but they were also more likely to report wanting to explore a non-social work career. Social workers, on the other hand, were more committed to the profession of social work and to the field of child welfare, although they were more likely than non-social workers to want to explore a child welfare career outside CPS. In spite of the differences in intentions concerning future employment, social workers were retained at significantly higher rates than non-social workers. Fifty one (51%) of social workers was still employed with the agency, while 43% of non-social workers remained employed.

6.2. Study limitations

The findings reported here must be interpreted within the limitations of the study itself. Except for the data about staff retention, this study is based on the self-reported perceptions of individual child welfare workers that are not corroborated by secondary sources. Another limitation derives from the large number of respondents of almost 10,000 at the stage of the BSD survey. In such a large population, some variables will show statistically significant differences by educational background, even when mean differences are small, as is the case in this study for many variables.

7. Discussion

Many of the perceptions, experiences, and plans reported in Section 6 above and discussed further in this section appear to reflect the different realities encountered by degreed social workers and non-social workers employed in child welfare settings. The social workers are more satisfied with almost all aspects of the BSD training experience, which may be both more familiar and easier for them because of prior university courses and field placements.

Table 3
Perception of knowledge and skills.

	Social workers		Non social workers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
BSD evaluation				
My supervisor facilitated learning.***	3.30	.77	3.27	.89
My supervisor helped me be enthusiastic.***	3.33	.78	3.27	.83
Peer trainer/mentor helped me be enthusiastic. **	3.24	.80	3.30	.8
Unit workers helped me be enthusiastic. **	3.23	.78	3.16	.78
CWLA Field Guides were useful.***	3.09	.72	3.00	.85
Facilities were conducive to learning.*	3.37	.63	3.33	.63
Trainers were prepared. *	3.48	.61	3.45	.64
Trainers were responsive. **	3.58	.56	3.55	.59
Materials were adequate. ***	3.39	.70	3.32	.71
I gained knowledge and skill.***	3.45	.62	3.40	.64
Activities in BSD enhanced learning.***	3.40	.88	3.33	.71
Unit workers facilitated learning in OJT.**	3.39	.67	3.34	.70
Unit workers helped my enthusiasm in OJT.***	3.27	.76	3.20	.78
Job I am going in to is desirable.**	3.40	.65	3.36	.64
Job position is first choice*	3.31	1.1	3.27	.84
I am capable of assessing sexual abuse cases.***	3.28	.61	3.19	.64
I am capable of assessing physical abuse cases.**	3.46	.53	3.42	.53
I am capable of assessing neglect cases.**	3.46	.53	3.42	.53
I am capable of assessing substance abuse cases.***	3.42	.56	3.36	.56
I am capable of assessing domestic violence cases.***	3.44	.81	3.37	.56
I am able to create service plans which meet my needs.***	3.32	.65	3.25	.66
I understand the foster care system.***	3.05	.68	2.97	.70
I am satisfied with the salary/pay.***	2.47	.86	2.35	.84
I am satisfied with the benefits.***	3.27	.64	3.18	.67
I am satisfied that I have a manageable client caseload.***	2.80	.84	2.63	.85
I am satisfied that I have a manageable paperwork load.***	2.74	.84	2.62	.84
I am satisfied that I have a manageable computer workload.***	2.94	.76	2.85	.77
I am satisfied with the educational opportunities.***	3.27	.69	3.14	.72
I am satisfied with the promotion and career opportunities.***	3.28	.67	3.20	.67
I feel valued as a professional.*	3.14	.77	3.09	.91
I am satisfied with the training opportunities.***	3.38	.58	3.30	.59
I am satisfied with the organizational support.***	3.18	.714	3.10	.72
18-month survey				
I am capable of assessing physical abuse cases.*	3.57	.51	3.61	.50
I am capable of assessing neglect cases.*	3.58	.51	3.63	.49
I am capable of assessing substance abuse cases.*	3.55	.53	3.60	.52
I am capable of assessing domestic violence cases. *	3.50	.54	3.55	.52
I am capable of saving and submitting case documentation in IMPACT*	3.62	.68	3.68	.61
I have used at least one learning point from the Risk Assessment Training*	3.59	.55	3.63	.52
I have received emotional support from my supervisor.*	3.59	.60	3.65	.60
My supervisor is available to me.*	3.67	.54	3.72	.51
My supervisor is a resource for me.*	3.69	.54	3.73	.51
My supervisor provides me guidance on managing my workload.**	3.61	.60	3.67	.56
I plan to stay with CPS for the next 6 months.*	3.67	.54	3.71	.52
I am satisfied that I have a manageable paperwork load.**	2.43	.84	2.53	.86
I am satisfied with the educational opportunities.*	3.18	.67	3.11	.71
I am satisfied that I have the resources to do an adequate job.**	2.91	.75	2.99	.72
I am satisfied with the organizational support. *	3.00	.67	3.06	.70
3-year survey				
I am satisfied with the benefits.*	3.02	.61	3.12	.63
I am satisfied with the co-worker support. *	3.54	.52	3.45	.65
I am satisfied with the educational opportunities. **	3.20	.65	3.05	.76
CPS is where I see my long-term career.*	2.81	.85	2.93	.81
I would like to explore a social work career outside of child welfare.**	2.32	.78	2.16	.77
I would like to explore a non social work career.***	1.68	.75	2.06	.78
I would like to explore a child welfare career outside CPS.***	2.28	.78	2.08	.73

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Table 4
Employment status.***

	Social workers		Non social workers	
	N	%	N	%
Those who stay	1574	51	2894	43
Those who leave	1505	49	3907	57

Eighteen months later, scores in several areas favor non-social workers. The social workers express significantly more alienation from the work setting and less likelihood of continued employment in public child welfare. When confronted with the realities of social work practice in that setting, the social work professionals appear to experience more self-doubt and dissatisfaction than do their non-social work peers. Their disaffection may arise from disappointed expectations concerning working conditions or being able to "make a difference" in the lives of children and their families. Many authors explore similar themes concerning what Lipsky (1980) calls "the dilemmas of the individual in public services" (Garvey, 1993; Hasenfeld, 2000).

At the three-year mark, differences in confidence between the social workers and non-social workers are no longer evident, and the differences that remain primarily concern career plans. These plans and intentions seem to mirror realities of the job market that make different opportunities available to those with and without degrees in social work.

However, despite their interest in and greater opportunities for employment in other types of social agencies, social workers are more likely than non-social workers to still be employed in public child welfare positions after three years. Although we did not explore opportunities for promotion as a factor in retention, they may play a role in the decisions of experienced social workers to remain employed with the state. Some of the other specific differences we found in this study are discussed below in the context of similar findings reported in the literature.

Social workers in this study reported that they knew more about community resources than did non-social workers. This finding at least partially supports previous research that has found social workers are more effective in linking clients with community resources (Olsen & Holmes, 1982. Social workers in this study also had higher exam scores at the completion of BSD, which is consistent with previous research that has found social workers who have graduated from specialized programs to have higher scores on measures of job-related competencies and skill (Fox et al., 2000; Franke et al., 2009; Gansle & Ellett, 2002; Hopkins et al., 1999; Jones, 2002; Jones & Okamura, 2000; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Robin & Hollister, 2002). Lieberman et al. (1988) found MSWs reported the highest levels of perceived preparedness to perform job tasks, and their finding was supported in this study at the BSD phase.

Like prior research that has found social workers to be more successful in service delivery with foster care (Alperin, 1996) and with substitute care and supportive services (Albers et al., 1993; Olsen & Holmes, 1982), social workers in this study reported a better understanding of the foster care system than did non-social workers. This finding is important, given the complexity of the foster care system and its importance to children and families involved in public child welfare, but it is perhaps not surprising in light of Folaron and Hostetter's (2007) finding that courses essential for child welfare practice are included in 80% of social work programs.

Prior research has also found child welfare workers with a MSW are better at delivering substantive services (Olsen & Holmes, 1982), as well as being more skilled in working with multi-problem families (Albers et al., 1993). Social workers at the first iteration of this survey felt more skilled at creating service plans than those without social work degrees. This finding is consistent with research that has shown that social work programs teach students how to organize information in a clear and concise manner, while only 90% of human services programs and 42% of social science programs do so (Folaron & Hostetter, 2007).

The role of the supervisor was perceived differently by social workers and non-social workers. Social workers in this study used their supervisor less than non-social workers for providing guidance on workload management. In addition, non-social workers felt their supervisor was more of a resource to them than did social workers, which is consistent at least in part with prior research (i.e., Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1987). One interpretation of this is that the social work degree in provides the necessary foundation for child welfare work and thereby reduces the need for supervisory assistance. Folaron and Hostetter (2007) found that the curricula of social work programs train students in the critical skills needed for child welfare work, including case management, documentation, and child welfare knowledge. Perhaps this makes them less reliant on their supervisors for day-to-day work.

Many variables in this study have not been examined sufficiently in prior research. Unit co-workers facilitated learning and increased enthusiasm among social workers more than among non-social workers. Social workers were more positive than non-social workers about their time in the field prior to classroom training, and they considered themselves more capable of creating service plans that met the goals of permanency and safety. Perhaps social workers are able to assess families more appropriately during their pre-training education because they are more familiar with the knowledge essential for child welfare work (i.e. Folaron & Hostetter, 2007). Social workers were also more satisfied with the educational opportunities that were offered to them than were non-social workers at all three iterations of this survey.

Examination of the effects of a social work degree on retention is an important contribution of this study because findings from prior research have been mixed (see DePanfilis & Zlotnik, 2008). Consistent with some previous research, social workers had a higher rate of retention (Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Ellett, 2001; Fox et al., 2003; Jones, 2002; Lewandowski, 1998; Okamura & Jones, 2000; Robin & Hollister, 2002; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2003). However, in contrast with Ellett's (2001) findings, social workers who stayed were not more likely to plan on being with CPS for the next six months. While Perry (2006a) has criticized prior research that shows a social work degree from a specialized program to have a positive but skewed effect on retention, this study did not distinguish between participants and non-participants in IV-E programs. Therefore, in this study, a social work degree, not the presence of a specialized program, showed a positive effect on retention, although many of the respondents did participate in IV-E programs. The social work respondents in this study were significantly more committed than non-social workers to the profession of social work and the field of child welfare, which is consistent with other research (Weaver et al., 2007; Zlotnik, DePanfilis, Lane, et al., 2005a).

7.1. Conclusions

As we discuss in Section 2. Schools of social work have a long history of partnering with the U.S. Children's Bureau and public child welfare organizations to develop a strong social work presence in the workforce. The proliferation of Title IV-E programs has led to recent increases in the numbers of social workers employed in child welfare, in Texas and elsewhere (Cheung et al., 2007; Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick, 2008).

This study builds upon previous research to conclude that CPS social workers in Texas are more likely at the time of initial testing to report being knowledgeable about community resources; they perceive their training as more beneficial, and they report a more sophisticated understanding of the foster care system. The study concludes that social workers are more likely to remain employed at CPS for at least three years and to express strong commitments to the profession of social work and the field of child welfare. While research is needed to determine the overall contributions of social workers to child welfare practice, it is clear that the long-standing collaboration among the Children's Bureau, the state child welfare department, and schools

of social work are having positive effects on the child welfare workforce in Texas, particularly in the area of staff retention.

References

Abbott, G. (1938). *The Child and the State,* Vol. II. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Albers, E. C., Reilly, T., & Rittner, B. (1993). Children in foster care: possible factors affecting permanency planning. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 10*(4), 329–341.

Alperin, D. E. (1996). Graduate and undergraduate field placements in child welfare: is there a difference? *The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work, 2*(1), 109–124.

Austin, M. J., Antonyappan, J. M., & Leighninger, L. (1996). Federal support for social work education: Section 707 of the 1967 Social Security Act Amendments. *Social Service Review, 70,* 83–97 Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/30012591

Balfour, D. L., & Neff, D. M. (1993). Predicting and managing turnover in human service agencies: A case study of an organization in crisis. *Public Personnel Management, 22,* 473–486.

Barbee, A., Antle, B., Sullivan, D., Huebner, R., & Rox, S. (2009). Recruiting and retaining child welfare workers: Is preparing social work students enough for sustained commitment to the field? *Child Welfare, 88*(5), 69–86.

Booz-Allen, A., & Hamilton, H. (1987). *The Maryland social work services job analysis and personal qualifications study.* Silver Springs, MD: National Association of Social Work.

Burmham, M. (1997). FIU evaluates its Title IV-E partnership. *Partnerships for Child Welfare, 5*(3), 3 January.

Cahn, K. (1997). Evaluating the impact of creative partnerships. *Partnerships for Child Welfare, 5*(4), 2 14.

Chepaitis, J. B. (1972). Federal social welfare progressivism in the 1920s. *Social Sevice Review, 26,* 213–229.

Cheung, M., Taylor, T., & Vohra-Gupta, S. (2007). *National survey of IV-E stipends and paybacks.* Houston, TX: Graduate College of Social Work, University of Houston.

Cicero-Reese, B., & Black, P. (1998). Research suggests why child welfare workers stay on the job. *Partnerships for Child Welfare, 5*(5), 5–8 February.

Combs-Orme, T. (1988). Infant mortality and social work: Legacy of success. *Social Service Review, 62,* 83–102.

DePanfilis, D., & Zlotnik, J. (2008). Retention of front-line staff in child welfare: A systematic review of research. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*(9), 995–1008.

Dhopper, S. S., Royse, D. D., & Woolfe, L. C. (1990). Does social work education make a difference? *Social Work, 35*(1), 57–61.

Dickinson, N. S., & Perry, R. E. (2002). Factors influencing the retention of specially educated public child welfare workers. *Evaluation Research in Child Welfare, 15*(3/4), 89–103.

Eliot, M. M. (1936). Progress in maternal and child welfare under the Social Security Act. *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health, 12,* 1155–1162.

Ellett, A. J. (2001). Human caring, self-efficacy beliefs and professional organizational culture correlates of employee retention in child welfare. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 61, 3350A-3351-A. (UMI No. 9984330).

Ellett, A., Ellett, C., & Rugutt, J. (2003). *A study of personal and organizational factors contributing to employee retention and turnover in child welfare in Georgia: Final project report.* School of Social Work: University of Georgia.

Ellett, A. J., Ellis, J. I., Westbrook, T. M., & Dews, D. (2007). A qualitative study of 369 child welfare professionals' perspectives about factors contributing to employee retention and turnover. *Children and Youth Services Review, 29,* 264–281.

Faller, K. C. (2010). *Recruitment and Retention of Child Welfare Professionals Program.* Ann Arbor; Michigan: University of Michigan.

Ferguson, D. H. (1972). The 25th anniversary of UNICEF with implications for the United States. *Social Service Review, 26*(2), 170–192.

Folaron, G., & Hostetter, C. (2007). Is social work the best educational degree for child welfare practitioners. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 1*(1), 65–83.

Fox, S., Burnham, D., Barbee, A., & Yankeelov, D. (2000). School to work social work that is — Maximizing agency/university partnerships in preparing public child welfare workers. *The Journal of the National Staff Development and Training Association, 1*(1), 13–20.

Fox, S., Miller, V., & Barbee, A. (2003). Finding and keeping child welfare workers: Effective use of training and professional development. In K. Briar-Lawson, & J. Zlotnik (Eds.), *Charting the impacts of university-child welfare collaboration* (pp. 67–814). New York: Haworth Press.

Franke, T., Bagdasaryan, S., & Furman, W. (2009). A multivariate analysis of training, education and readiness for public child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31,* 1330–1336.

Gansle, K., & Ellett, A. (2002). Child welfare knowledge transmission, practitioner retention and university-community impact: A study of Title IV-E child welfare training. *Journal of Health and Social Policy, 15*(3/4), 69–88.

Garvey, G. (1993). *Facing the bureaucracy: Living and dying in a public agency.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hasenfeld, Y. (2000). Organizational forms as moral practices: The case of welfare departments. *Social Service Review, 74,* 329–351.

Hodges, V. G., Morgan, L. J., & Johnston, B. (1993). Educating for excellence in child welfare practice: A model for graduate training in intensive family preservation. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 7,* 31–48.

Hopkins, K. M., Mudrick, N. R., & Rudolph, C. S. (1999). Impact of university/agency partnerships in child welfare organizations, workers and work activities. *Child Welfare, 28*(6), 749–773.

Jones, M. B. (1993). The decline of the American orphanage, 1941–1980. *Social Service Review*, 67, 463.

Jones, L. (2002). A follow-up of a Title IV-E program's graduates' retention rates in a public child welfare agency. *Evaluation Research in Child Welfare*, 15(3/4), 39–51.

Jones, L., & Okamura, A. (2000). Reprofessionalizing child welfare services: An evaluation of a Title IV-E training program. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10(5), 607–621.

Landsman, M. (2001). Commitment in public child welfare. *Social Service Review*, 75(3), 387–419.

Lewandowski, C. A. (1998). Retention outcomes of a public child welfare long-term training program. *Professional Development: International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education*, 1, 38–46.

Lieberman, A. A., Hornby, H., & Russell, M. (1988). Analyzing the educational backgrounds and work experiences of child welfare personnel: A national study. *Social Work*, 33, 485–489.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services.* New York: Russell Sage.

McGowan, B. G., Auerbach, C., & Strolin-Goltzman, J. S. (2009). Turnover in the child welfare workforce: A different perspective. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 35(3), 228–235.

Mizrahi, T. (2008). *Encyclopedia of social work,* 20th edition. In L. E. Davis (Ed.), New York: Oxford/NASW Press.

Mor Barak, M., Nissly, J., & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social workers and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and metanalysis. *Social Service Review*, 75(3), 625–661.

Moran, J., Frans, D., & Gibson, P. (1995). A comparison of beginning MSW and MBA students on their aptitudes for human service management. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 31(1), 95–105.

National Association of Social Workers Foundation (2011). NASW Social Work Pioneers. Retrieved from http://www.naswfoundation.org/pioneers/default.asp#o

O'Donnell, J., & Kirkner, S. (2009). A longitudinal study of factors influencing the retention of Title IV-E Master's Social Work graduates in public child welfare. *Journal of Public Child Welfare*, 3(1), 64–86.

Okamura, A., & Jones, L. (2000). Re-professionalizing child welfare services: An evaluation of an IV-E training program. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 10, 607–621.

Olsen, L., & Holmes, W. M. (1982). Educating child welfare workers: the effects of professional training on service delivery. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 18(1), 94–102.

Pecora, P. (1989). Improving the quality of child welfare services: Needs assessment for staff training. *Child Welfare*, 68(4), 403–419.

Perry, E. (2006a). Do social workers make better child welfare workers than non social workers? *Research on Social Work Practice*, 16, 392–405.

Perry, E. (2006b). Education and child welfare supervisor performance: Does a social work degree matter? *Research on Social Work Practice*, 16, 591–604.

Perry, R. E., & Ellett, A. J. (2008). Child welfare: Historical trends, professionalization, and workforce issues. In K. M. Sowers, & C. N. Dulmus (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of social work and social welfare, vol. 1* (pp. 143–184). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Robin, S., & Hollister, C. (2002). Career paths and contributions of four cohort of IV-E funded MSW child welfare graduates. *Journal of Health and Social Policy*, 15(3), 53–67.

Rodems, E. S., Shaefer, H. L., & Ybarra, M. (2011). The Children's Bureau and passage of the Sheppard-Towner Act of 1921: Early social work macro practice in action. *Families in Society*, 92(4), 358–363.

Rosenthal, J. A., & Waters, E. (2006). Predictors of child welfare worker retention and performance. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 32(3), 67–85 Stable url: dx.doi.org/10.1300/J079v32n03_04

Rubin (2011). Comparing social worker and non social worker outcomes. A Research Review. Unpublished manuscript: The University of Texas at Austin, School of Social Work.

Rycraft, J. (1990). The survivors: A qualitative study of the retention of public child welfare workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign.

Rycraft, J. (1994). The party isn't over: The agency role in the retention of public child welfare caseworkers. *Social Work*, 39(1), 75–80.

Samantrai, K. (1992). Factors in the decision to leave: Retaining social workers with MSWs in public child welfare. *Social Work*, 37, 354–458.

Scannapieco, M., & Connell-Carrick, K. (2003). Do collaborations with schools of social work make a difference for the field of child welfare? Practice, retention and curriculum. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 7(1/2), 35–51.

Scannapieco, M., & Connell-Carrick, K. (2008). *Basic Skills Development Annual Report: Department of Family and Protective Services.* Texas Protective Services Training Institute.

Sharma, J., McKelvey, J., Hardy, R., Epstein, M. H., Lomax, R. G., & Hruby, P. J. (1997). Job satisfaction of child welfare workers in an urban setting: Status and predictors. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, 6, 209–219.

Smith, B. (2002). Evaluating federally-funded child welfare training partnerships: A worthwhile challenge. *Journal of Health and Social Policy*, 15(4/5), 189–201.

Social Security Act. 49 United States Statutes 633 (1935). *Title V, Part 3.* Reprinted in. In G. Abbott (Ed.), *The Child and the State, vol. II.* (pp. 646–647)Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Strand, V. C., & Dore, M. M. (2009). Job satisfaction and a stable child welfare workforce: Implications for staff retention. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 391–397.

Strolin-Goltzman, J. (2010). Improving turnover in public child welfare: Outcomes from an organizational intervention. *Children & Youth Services Review*, 32, 1388–1395.

Vinokur-Kaplan, D. (1987). Where did they go? A national follow-up of child welfare trainees. *Child Welfare*, LXVI(5), 411–421.

Vinokur-Kaplan, D. (1991). Job satisfaction among social workers in public and voluntary child welfare agencies. *Child Welfare*, LXX(1), 81–91.

Weaver, D., Change, J., Clark, S., & Rhee, S. (2007). Keeping public child welfare workers on the job. *Administration in Social Work*, 31(2), 5–25.

Child Welfare Division (1938). Child welfare services in rural areas provided under the Federal Social Security Act, Title V, Part 3. In G. Abbott (Ed.), *The Child and the State, vol. II.* (pp. 648–665)Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wells, S. (1994). Child protective services: Research for the future. *Child Welfare*, 73(5), 431–447.

Williams, S. E., Nichols, Q. I., Kirk, A., & Wilson, T. (2011). A recent look at the factors influencing workforce retention in public child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 157–160.

Yankeelov, P., Barbee, A., Sullivan, D., & Antle, B. (2009). Individual and organizational factors in job retention in Kentucky's child welfare agency. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(5), 547–554.

Zlotnik, J. (1997). Results of CSWE Title IV-E survey. *Partnerships for Child Welfare*, 5, 3–4.

Zlotnik, J. L. (2003). The use of Title IV-E training funds for social work education: An historical perspective. *Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment*, 7(1/2), 5–20.

Zlotnik, J. L., DePanfilis, D., Daining, C., & Lane, M. M. (2005b). *Retaining competent child welfare workers: Lessons from research.* Washington, DC: Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research.

Zlotnik, J., DePanfilis, D., Lane, M., Daining, C., Summers, L., & Wechsler, J. (2005a). *Factors Influencing Retention of Child Welfare Staff: A Systematic Review of Research.* Baltimore, MD: The Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research, University of Maryland School of Social Work.

Further reading

Cheung, M., & Taylor, T. (2005). National Survey of IV-E Stipends & Paybacks. Retrieved from: http://www.uh.edu/ocp/cwep title IVE.htm

Dunham, A. (1940). The development of child welfare programs. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 212, 216–222 Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1024444

Notes and comments: The future of the Children's Bureau. (1969). Social Service Review, 23, 460–461.