

THE HEALTH OF THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE

Paul C. Light

CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE
THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WAGNER SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

March 2003

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
II. FINDING THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE	9
III. THE HEALTH OF THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE	15
APPENDIX A	33
APPENDIX B	41
APPENDIX C	62

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A nation that truly wants no child left behind must make sure that workers who care for children, youth, and families have the motivation, resources, and support to succeed. At a minimum, this workforce numbers 2.5 million, of which two-thirds serve low-income children, youth, and families. As such, the human services workforce, as low-income-serving workers will be called in this report, is almost as large as the federal government's civilian workforce.

These workers are a linchpin in honoring America's promise to help its most vulnerable citizens. They provide childcare for low-income working parents, run the after-school programs that help build self-esteem, protect children from neglect, provide alternatives for troubled juveniles, and guide the journey for low-income families from welfare to work.

As such, human services workers are America's other first responders. They often answer the first call for help from America's most vulnerable citizens, and must make some of the most difficult choices in society. They decide whether preschoolers will spend their days watching cartoons or learning, whether teenagers will spend their afternoons making trouble or building self-esteem, and whether parents will be separated from their children or given the help needed to build healthy families. These workers also determine whether juveniles will spend their time in detention or be given a second chance in community-based programs, and whether families make the transition from welfare to gainful employment.

Few jobs depend so greatly on committed, well-trained workers who have the resources to succeed. Even as human services workers strive to create more hopeful futures for their clients, they must also work to prevent the catastrophes that affect too many of the nation's

low-income children, youth, and families. They protect children from abuse, teenagers from crime, and families from despair. Their work is about more than creating vibrant futures. Human services workers must also be ready to save lives, sometimes to the point of putting their own lives at risk. And they do so with lower pay, harsher working conditions, fewer resources, and less appreciation than those who serve higher-income children, youth, and families.

As this report will show, the human services workforce is a very special workforce. Its motivation to serve the public is unrivaled among the workforces studied by the Brookings Institution's Center for Public Service over the past four years.

Unfortunately, there is a vast gulf between what these human services workers are asked to do and how they are equipped for that task. Much as they want to make a difference for the people they serve, many work under intense pressure with limited resources and rewards. Despite overwhelming evidence that even small investments in recruitment and retention generate significant gains for children, youth, and families, these workers are asked to do more with less every year. Workloads often exceed recommended limits, turnover rates among the most qualified workers are high, and human services employees describe their work as both frustrating and unappreciated.

These conclusions emerge from a first-of-its-kind national random-sample survey of 1,213 childcare, child welfare, youth services, juvenile justice, and employment and training workers, of whom two-thirds described the people they serve as low-income. The survey was conducted from June to October 2002, by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of the Brookings Institution's Center for Public Service, and was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation as part of its ongoing research on the human services workforce.

The survey reveals ample cause for concern about the health of the human services workforce:

- 81 percent of the human services workers interviewed for this study strongly or somewhat agreed that it is easy to burn out in the work they do, 70 percent also strongly or somewhat agreed they always have too much work to do, 75 percent described the work they do as "frustrating," and another 51 percent described it as "unappreciated."

DEFINING TERMS

The term "human services workforce" is used in this report to refer to workers who said they served low-income children, youth, and families in the five kinds of work covered by the study: childcare, youth services, child welfare, juvenile justice, and employment and training. These respondents composed roughly two-thirds of the overall sample.

The comparison group for this report is composed of respondents who said they served higher-income children, youth, and families in the same five kinds of work. The comparison group was selected to examine the impact of serving low-income clients.

Because of the differences in the population served, the comparison group contains a higher proportion of respondents who reported that they worked in childcare, lower proportions of respondents in child welfare, youth services, and juvenile justice, and a roughly equal proportion of respondents in employment and training. Most of the tables presented in this report control for these imbalances by comparing respondents by the kind of work they did.

- 67 percent strongly or somewhat agreed that their pay was low, and 62 percent strongly or somewhat agreed that they work long hours.
- 48 percent described their organization's hiring process as slow, 46 percent described their co-workers as somewhat or not too qualified, 42 percent said talent and achievement were not rewarded at their workplace, and 28 percent said that their best-qualified co-workers leave within a couple of years or less.
- 42 percent estimated that more than a tenth of their co-workers were not doing their jobs well, and 35 percent said their organizations did not do a good job at disciplining poor performers; asked to explain the poor performance they saw, 43 percent said the poor performers were not committed to helping people.
- 45 percent said their organizations only sometimes or rarely had enough support from the community, 38 percent said the same about having enough employees to do the job, 31 percent about access to equipment and supplies, 23 percent about access to training, and 12 percent about a safe place to work.

Despite these frustrations, these human services workers were deeply committed to helping children, youth, and families. Although they acknowledged the presence of poor performers in their workforce, the majority of these workers did not fit the stereotype of the disengaged human service workers so prevalent in recent stories about breakdowns in the system:

- 98 percent said helping people was a very or somewhat important consideration in taking their job, 93 percent said the same about serving the community, and 92 percent about the opportunity to do challenging work.
- 99 percent said the words “caring” and “helpful” described the work they did very or somewhat well, 98 percent said they accomplished a great deal or fair amount in their job, and 97 percent said they were very or somewhat proud to tell their friends and neighbors what they did for a living.
- If they were to quit their jobs, 95 percent of human services workers said they would miss the people they serve a great deal or fair amount, 84 percent said they would miss their co-workers, 84 percent refused to describe their jobs as a dead-end with no future, and 58 percent described their organization as a very good place to work.
- 40 percent said they come to work each day because they like the kind of work they do, another 20 percent focused on the common good and helping people, 14 percent focused on some combination of the two, and only 8 percent said they come to work for the paycheck, benefits, and/or job security.

These positives must be balanced against the realities of human services work today, however. According to a synthesis of current research and data on the human services workforce by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, “Human services delivery is reaching a state of crisis. Frontline jobs are becoming more and more complex while the responsibility placed on workers remains severely out of line with their preparation and baseline abilities.”¹ Much as they want to help the people they serve, many human services workers succeed against the odds, often battling high turnover, heavy workloads, and long hours to find some way to make a difference each day.

This mix of commitment and frustration helps explain why almost half of the workers interviewed for this study said they felt valued in their work, yet described their work as unappreciated. It also helps explain why

more than two-thirds said their organizations were good places to work, yet also described their work as frustrating. As further analysis suggests, the mission made their jobs valuable, and the chance to make a difference made their organizations good places for them to work, but the heavy workloads, long hours, turnover, uneven access to resources, inconsistent rewards, and a lack of community support render their jobs unappreciated and frustrating. The human services workforce pays a penalty for its commitment to helping people.

This penalty is evident in six of the seven conditions the Center for Public Service believes are essential for a healthy, productive human services workforce:

1. Although the human services workers interviewed for this study were highly motivated by the desire to improve the lives of the people they serve, respondents also reported heavy workloads, long hours, and high vulnerability to burnout.
2. Although human services workers thought highly of their colleagues, and perceived less poor performance among their peers than other public servants, they also reported high turnover among the most talented employees.
3. Although most human services workers described the hiring process at their organizations as fast and fair, a significant percentage of recent recruits reported that they intended to leave within the next five years, while recent college graduates showed little serious interest in human services careers.
4. Although a substantial majority of respondents described their organizations as very or somewhat good places to work, significant minorities reported that they do not have access to essential resources, most notably equipment and supplies, and enough co-workers.
5. Respondents reported that pay was low, and talent and achievement were not well rewarded; in addition, a substantial minority of frontline workers were highly dissatisfied, yet intended to stay for the long term.
6. Respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the respect they receive for their work, and reported serious shortages in support services from the community.

Some readers will look at the data and conclude that the human services workforce is good enough. After all, there are many areas in which this workforce is vastly more committed, satisfied, and resourced than the national samples of federal government, business, and nonprofit workers that the Center for Public Service has surveyed. Yet, the question for this report is not whether the human services workforce is better in a relative sense to other workforces. It is whether this workforce is healthy enough to achieve its mission.

The concerns are most serious among the non-supervisors who serve on the human services frontlines. Not only were frontline workers less likely than their supervisors to say they could make a difference in the lives of the people they serve, they were less likely to feel valued in their work and consistently less satisfied with their jobs. For example, 36 percent of frontline workers were either not too satisfied or not satisfied at all with their salaries, compared to just 19 percent of their supervisors, while 48 percent said talent or achievement were not well rewarded at their workplace, compared to 34 percent of their supervisors.

The frontlines also contained a small group of unhappy workers who intended to stay for ten years or more. Much as they complained about everything from burnout to low pay, a lack of equipment and supplies to unhelpful co-workers, 38 percent of frontline workers who said they were somewhat, not too, or not at all satisfied with their jobs overall also said they intended to stay in their jobs for ten years or longer. Although they constitute just one sixth of the frontline workforce today, these disillusioned workers are going to be part of the human services industry for a long time to come.

The future looks even more unhealthy when one considers the next generation of human services workers, whether those who are still deciding which career to pursue or those who only recently joined the workforce.

Among students who have yet to make final decisions about their future, interest in human services careers is too low. According to an April 2002 Center for Public Service survey of seniors majoring in liberal arts and social work, the next generation of human services workers is best characterized as uninterested, uninformed, and apprehensive about jobs in the industry. Interviewed just weeks before graduation, relatively few students reported that they had given serious consideration to the five kinds of work covered by this

research, and many viewed the hiring process as both confusing and slow.

More worrisome, graduates of the nation's top 100 colleges and universities had given less consideration to jobs in any of the five kinds of work than their peers and knew less about finding a job working with children, youth, or families. Among students who had very or somewhat seriously considered the field, top-tier graduates were far more likely to say they only intended to stay in the job one to two years.

Among younger employees with but a few years experience in the human services workforce, the intention to leave within five years is too high. According to the survey, of the 18-35 year-olds who have spent five years or less in the human services workforce, 30 percent said they intended to leave within two years, and another 13 percent within five years. These short-termers, as they will be called, were not perfect employees. They had less time in the workforce and less training before they took their jobs. But they were just as committed to serving children, youth, and families as other human services workers. Without effective retention strategies, these workers will continue to cycle through the workforce with little lasting impact on behalf of the people they serve.

Ultimately, if human services workers are truly America's other first responders, they should be treated as such. These workers must not be left behind either.

End Note

- 1 The Annie E. Casey Foundation, "The Unsolved Challenge of System Reform: The Condition of the Frontline Human Services Workforce," Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation, February, 2003, p. 1.

II. FINDING THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE

This report describes a human services workforce reaching critical condition.¹ Although some of the indicators are positive, many of the indicators are negative, and some could scarcely be worse.

The stress is particularly clear when human services workers are matched with a comparison group of children, youth, and family workers who do not serve low-income clients. Much as they should be congratulated for their desire to make a difference, human services workers paid a penalty for their commitment.

(Readers should note that the term “human services workers” is used in this report to refer to respondents who served low-income children, youth, and families in one of the five kinds of work described below. The term “comparison group” is used in this report to refer to respondents who served higher-income children, youth, and families also in one of the five kinds of work described below.)

Before turning to a detailed assessment of the human services workforce, it is useful to review the study methodology and provide a brief introduction to the workforce in general.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The human services workforce is not easy to find, particularly through membership lists of one kind or another. Many human services workers do not have the income or interest to join membership groups or subscribe to publications that might yield an easy list of poten-

tial respondents, while others work such long hours or move in and out of the workforce so quickly that they cannot be reached.

The sampling methods used for this study were designed to overcome these biases. In an effort to give every children, youth, and family worker a statistically equal chance to participate in the study, the survey sample was generated through random digit dialing (RDD). Using the RDD approach, all U.S. households with a phone had roughly the same probability of receiving an initial screening call for potential survey respondents.

Even RDD has biases, however. Not all households have telephones, nor are their members equally likely to be home when interviewers call, answer the phone when home, or stay on the phone long enough to complete an interview. Some households have more than one phone number and therefore have a greater chance of being contacted. Without census data on the number of workers in the frontline workforce, it is impossible to know whether the sample does in fact reflect the workforce as a whole.

Although RDD is an appropriate methodology for finding a representative sample of children, youth, and family workers, the approach was not without obstacles—namely, the number of calls required to find a household with an eligible respondent. Relative to the number of households with a telephone, the number of households with a member doing paid work with children, youth, or families is very small. Based on the RDD, roughly 2.4 percent of American households with at least one wage earner included someone working in childcare, child welfare, youth services, juvenile justice, or employment and training.

This relatively low incidence rate of eligible respondents increased the number of screening calls needed to generate a random sample. All totaled, Princeton Survey Research Associates made 220,000 screening calls between June and October 2002 to find the 1,432 eligible respondents. Fortunately, eligible respondents who completed the initial screening process were very likely to respond to the survey. Of the 1,432 eligible respondents, 1,213 completed the 25-minute interview, yielding a response rate of 85 percent.² Of that total, 803, or 66 percent, said the words “low-income” described the people they serve either very or somewhat well.

Respondents were selected for the sample by identifying themselves with at least one of the five kinds of work of concern to the study. The exact wording of the list was as follows:

1. Childcare, such as working in daycare centers or preschools.
2. Child welfare, such as working with families needing help or with children in foster care.
3. Youth services, such as after school programs or recreation programs for children or teens.
4. Juvenile justice, such as working with teens in trouble with the law or in juvenile detention centers.
5. Employment and training, such as working with families on welfare to help a parent with employment or job training.

Interviewers were instructed to reassure potential respondents that the examples in each category were just that, examples. Every effort was made to include any respondent who worked in childcare, child welfare, youth services, juvenile justice, and employment and training, regardless of the setting or program.

For results based on the total sample of 1,213, one can say with 95 percent confidence that the error attributable to sampling and other random effects is plus or minus 3 percentage points. Readers are urged to view this survey as a single snap-shot in time—by itself, the survey cannot speak to trends in the workforce.

The data collected from these 1,213 respondents was supplemented by in-depth interviews with 100 respondents who worked with low-income children, youth, or families, including 20 who were black or Hispanic. Approximately 20 interviews were conducted with respondents in each of the five job categories.

DESCRIBING THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE

Human services workers share some common ground with children, youth, and family workers more generally, but their work is clearly shaped by the population they serve. Table 1 provides a basic description of the human services workforce compared to a smaller sample of higher-income-serving workers, while table 2 shows the sectors in which the human services workforce can be found.

Work Life

Life in the human services workforce is undeniably stressful. Workloads are heavier for human services workers than in the comparison group, and long hours are more common.

Much of the stress comes from working conditions. Human services workers were much more likely than their peers to describe their jobs as both frustrating and unappreciated, which in turn, helps explain their greater tendency to report lower job satisfaction and higher turnover among their most qualified co-workers. They were also more likely to describe their clients as untrustworthy or irresponsible.

Demographics

The human services workforce is mostly female, mostly white, and highly educated. Compared with their higher-income-serving peers, however the average human services worker is slightly more likely to be male, a member of a minority group, and more educated. Both groups are roughly the same age.

The major difference between the two groups of workers is on household income. Even though they are more likely to work full-time, human services workers are much more likely to live in households making less than \$30,000 per year than the comparison group. As table 3 shows, human services workers appear to contribute less to household income than their colleagues in the comparison group no matter what the educational level. Although one cannot be sure that it is the human services salary that pulls down total household income, table 3 suggests that human services work is not as enriching in income as it is in the chance to make a difference.

DISSATISFIED FOR THE LONG TERM?

The survey revealed a group of human services frontline workers who expressed little or no satisfaction with their jobs overall, but intended to stay in the field for ten years or longer. Among frontline workers who said they intended to continue doing human services work for more than ten years, 70 percent were very satisfied with their jobs, while 30 percent were either somewhat satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all.

The impact of these intentions is particularly striking when the two groups of human services frontline workers are compared. Although the less satisfied workers are similar to their long-staying peers in age, race, education, and income, they were strikingly less happy with virtually every aspect of their jobs, including pay, benefits, security, opportunity for advancement, and chance to accomplish something worthwhile.

Unfortunately for their clients, these workers also reported that they got less on-the-job training, were more likely to express dissatisfaction with the opportunities to develop new skills, and were twice as less likely than their very satisfied, long-staying peers to say they always have access to the training needed to do their jobs well (25 percent versus 56 percent).

Table 1: The Human Services Workforce

	Human services workers (N=803)	Comparison group (N=346)
WORK LIFE		
Respondent works in single-employee business or as self-employed worker who works alone	9%	16%
Works in multi-employee business or as self-employed worker who works with at least one co-worker	19	31
Works in nonprofit or religious agency	31	29
Works in government	46	29
Respondent's job involves more than one of the five kinds of work	42	33
Respondent works full time	88	72
Works more than one job	23	23
Respondent has spent five years or less in current job	55	56
Has spent five years or less in children, youth, and family workforce	31	32
Respondent intends to stay in job five years or less	31	43
Intends to stay more than ten years	49	36
Respondent belongs to a labor union	23	14
"Frustrating" describes respondent's work very or somewhat well	75	65
"Unappreciated" describes work very or somewhat well	51	36
Respondent strongly agrees he/she always has too much work to do	39	31
Strongly agrees that he/she works long hours	39	40
DEMOGRAPHICS		
Male	18	14
Female	82	86
White/White Latino	77	84
Black/Black Latino	16	8
Asian	*	1
Other	5	6
18-29	24	23
30-39	25	30
40-49	29	24
50 and over	21	22
Respondent did not finish high school	2	2
High school graduate	16	19
Attended vocational school	2	2
Some college	22	27
Associate degree	6	5
College graduate	28	25
Post-graduate training	24	19
Household income under \$30,000 year	26	16
Respondent is a supervisor	27	27
POPULATION SERVED		
Respondent works mainly with children	45	67
Teens	19	13
Families	16	8
Children and teens	5	3
All of the above	15	8
"Disadvantaged" describes clients very well	34	6
"Deserving" describes clients very well	54	54
"Trustworthy" describes clients very well	31	60
"Responsible" describes clients very well	24	56
Respondent believes most people can be trusted	59	65
Respondent believes people are poor because of a lack of effort on their part	37	44

* Less than 1%

Views of the Population Served

Human services employees were much less likely to see their clients as either trustworthy or responsible. But that did not diminish their view of their clients as “deserving,” nor did it affect their belief that most people are poor because of circumstances beyond their control. As a whole, these workers seemed to express a basic realism regarding the task they face everyday alongside a fundamental belief that their clients deserve help. That is all part of the stress—a commitment to helping deserving clients does not necessarily mean those clients will either appreciate or respond to the help.

SOURCES OF FRUSTRATION

Although human services workers described their work as helpful, caring, and responsible, more than three-quarters found their work frustrating. Much of the frustration came from factors related to the job, not the clients.

Regression analysis suggests that frustration grows with an increased perception of having too much work to do, working long hours, and receiving low pay. Frustration with work was also associated with a lack of appreciation from employers for bearing the heavy workloads—that is, as satisfaction with recognition for working extra long hours decreased, frustration with work increased. Frustration also rose when workers felt they were not valued in the work they did, when they reported a lack of opportunity for advancement, and when they felt they did not accomplish something worthwhile at work.

Table 2: Where the Jobs Are by Sector

	Total	Childcare	Child Welfare	Youth Services	Juvenile Justice	Employment and Training
Single-employee business/self-employed*	11%	18%	3%	4%	2%	2%
Multi-employee business**	23	27	16	16	11	19
Nonprofit and religious agencies	30	29	31	38	33	36
Government	33	23	47	41	51	40

*Includes only business owners with no other employees and self-employed who said they did not work with anyone else.

**Includes all other employees of businesses, including business owners with at least one other employee and self-employed with at least one other co-worker

Table 3: Household Income and Education

	Percentage making less than \$30,000 per year in household income			
	High school degree	Some college	College graduate	Post-graduate
Human services workers	41%	39%	22%	6%
Comparison group	21	22	10	3

End Notes

- 1 The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the Center for Public Service team in conducting the research that underpins this report: deputy director Judith Labiner, research analyst William Fanaras, outreach manager Gina Russo, and center manager Sherra Merchant. In addition, the author also acknowledges the work of the Princeton Survey Research Associates team that collaborated on every aspect of the project: vice president Mary McIntosh, senior analyst Kimberly Hewitt, and the rest of the group. Finally, this project could not have been completed without the encouragement and ideas of Janice Nittoli, senior program officer at the Annie E. Casey Foundation who participated in all facets of the project.
- 2 The first 893 of the 1,213 survey respondents were identified and interviewed through two telephone calls. The first call was designed to determine whether anyone in a given household worked in a paying job with children, youth or families, but not as a teacher. The second call was designed to determine whether anyone in the household worked at least quarter time in the five jobs of concern to the study, and, if so, to ask the member of the workforce to complete an interview.

These first 893 respondents were selected through over 180,000 telephone calls. Of these calls, roughly 60 percent were made to working numbers. Of those numbers, 54,000 households were willing to answer the initial

screening questions, and just over 4,600 reported that there was an adult in the household who worked with children or youth, other than teaching. Up to 20 calls were later made to contact that household member.

Almost all of the 4,600 households who reported having a family member who worked with children, youth, or families were reached and 902 respondents were eligible for the survey given their specific job in the five kinds of work covered by the study. Of those eligible, almost all (893) were willing to complete the telephone interview.

In an effort to increase the number of completed interviews, the remaining 320 respondents were both identified and interviewed in one telephone call. As in the earlier phase of the study, the initial call was designed to determine whether anyone in the household met the initial screening criteria. If the initial criteria were met, the interviewer tried to reach the potential respondent immediately for an interview. Comparisons between the first and second groups of respondents shows no statistical bias in the contact approach.

Of the roughly 38,000 phone numbers dialed in this second phase, roughly 65 percent were to working phones, and over 7,000 were answered by someone willing to respond to the initial screening questions. This process generated 530 eligible respondents, of whom 320 (60 percent) completed the survey.

III. THE STATE OF THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE

The strength of the human services workforce rests on its deep commitment to helping children, youth, and families. The human services workers interviewed for this report were highly motivated not just by interest in their work, but because they wanted to serve their clients and communities. As a juvenile justice worker explained in one of the long interviews conducted with the human services workforce, “what we do now for one child makes a difference in everybody’s life—there’s a ripple effect.” A child welfare worker said virtually the same thing: “If I can affect this one kid, then maybe he grows up and has a family of his own, and does things differently. I can’t change everything, but if I can affect one child at a time, if I can make a difference in this one child, then maybe I can make a difference in how he will live the rest of his life.”

The question is not whether the workforce is motivated, however, but whether it is healthy enough to do its job. The answer involves seven basic measures of a healthy human services workforce. First, it should be motivated above all by the chance to make a difference for its communities and country. Second, it should provide jobs that can be done. Third, it should be composed of high-performing workers today. Fourth, it should be able to recruit and retain high-performing workers for tomorrow. Fifth, it should be given the resources needed to succeed. Sixth, it should be rewarded for a job well done. And, seventh, it should have the respect and confidence of the people it serves.

By these measures, the human services workforce is nearing “critical condition.” Only one of the seven indicators produced a “healthy” diagnosis, three produced “at risk” flags, and three placed the workforce in “critical condition.”

1. A healthy workforce should come to work motivated by the chance to accomplish something worthwhile

KEY INDICATORS: Why did workers join the workforce, why do they come to work each day?

COMMENT: Human services workers reported that they were highly motivated by the desire to improve the lives of the people they serve, the chance to accomplish something worthwhile, and the opportunity to serve the community

DIAGNOSIS: Healthy

2. A healthy workforce should not be asked to do the impossible

KEY INDICATORS: How do workers describe their jobs, how heavy are their workloads, how likely is burnout?

COMMENT: Although human services workers said they can and do make a difference, they also reported heavy workloads, long hours, and high vulnerability to burnout

DIAGNOSIS: In Critical Condition

3. A healthy workforce should have the training and talent to achieve its mission

KEY INDICATORS: How well trained is the workforce, how do workers rate the quality and performance of their co-workers, and how long do the most talented employees stay?

COMMENT: Although human services workers rated their co-workers as helpful and committed, and saw less poor performance among their peers than other public servants, they reported high turnover among the most talented employees

DIAGNOSIS: At Risk

4. A healthy workforce should be able to recruit and retain talented workers for the future

KEY INDICATORS: Does the hiring process work, how long do recent recruits intend to stay, and what do young Americans think about joining the human services workforce?

COMMENT: Although human services workers rated the hiring process at their organizations as fast and fair, recent recruits reported that they intended to leave within the next five years, and recent college graduates showed little serious interest in human services careers

DIAGNOSIS: In Critical Condition

5. A healthy workforce should be given the resources to succeed

KEY INDICATORS: Do workers have access to key resources such as information, equipment and supplies, a safe place to work, and the authority to do their jobs?

COMMENT: A substantial majority said their organizations were very or somewhat good places to work, but significant minorities of human services workers reported that they do not have access to essential resources, most notably equipment and supplies, and enough co-workers

DIAGNOSIS: At Risk

6. A healthy workforce should reward its employees for a job well done

KEY INDICATORS: How satisfied are workers with tangible rewards such as pay and benefits, is talent rewarded, are long hours and superior work recognized, how satisfied are they with intangible rewards such as respect, appreciation, and the opportunity to grow?

COMMENT: Respondents reported that pay was low, talent and achievement were not well rewarded; in addition, a substantial minority of frontline workers were highly dissatisfied, yet intended to stay for the long term

DIAGNOSIS: In Critical Condition

7. A healthy workforce should have the respect and confidence of the people it serves

KEY INDICATORS: Does the public have confidence in the workforce, do workers have confidence in their own organizations, and do they feel respected?

COMMENT: Workers expressed dissatisfaction with the respect they received for their work, and reported serious shortages in support services from the community; however, despite doubts about their own organization’s ability to spend money wisely, they trusted their organizations to do the right thing overall, and were very proud of the work they did

DIAGNOSIS: At Risk

The following pages will explore each diagnosis in order, offering more detailed evidence on the impending crisis in the human services workforce.

1. The Motivation to Serve: Healthy

Measured by its commitment to mission, the human services workforce is healthy. Its members took their jobs in the workforce for the chance to accomplish something worthwhile for the people they serve, and come to work each day for the same reason. As one childcare worker explained:

“My mom raised four children on welfare and we struggled. I said when I was very small that when I get older, I’m going to help people. And that’s what I’ve done. I’ve had opportunities to work in upper-middle-class and upper-class childcare facilities, but I’ve always continued to work in housing projects and work with drug- and alcohol-affected children because ...I knew I had a lot to offer. I wanted to be in a place where I thought what I had to offer would do the most good.”

This commitment to mission shows in table 4. Human services workers were not only significantly more likely than the comparison group to say they took their current job for the opportunity to help people, serve the community, job security, and benefits than the comparison group, they were significantly less likely to focus on flexible hours or a convenient location.

The fact that few human services workers took their jobs for the pay does not mean they are satisfied with the compensation. As we shall see later, 69 percent of human services workers strongly or somewhat agree that their pay is low. When asked to describe her pay and benefits, one childcare worker answered: “We’re a nonprofit organization, so we don’t get any benefits at all and our pay is pretty low compared to some. I think if you’re taking care of somebody’s children, you

Table 4: Very Important Considerations in Taking Current Job

	Human services workers	Comparison group
Opportunity to help children, youth, and families	87%	81%
Opportunity to serve the community	65	56
Opportunity to do challenging work	61	58
Flexible hours or a convenient location	49	57
Job security	45	32
Public respect	38	34
Benefits such as health insurance and vacation time	37	23
Salary	15	17

should be paid a lot. That’s one of the most important roles. We deserve that. We don’t get paid very much. We’d probably make more working at Taco Bell.”

In addition, interest in job security and benefits among human services workers varied by sector: 53 percent of human services employees in government said benefits were a very important consideration in taking their current job, compared to 35 percent in nonprofits, 23 percent in multi-employee businesses, and just 7 percent in single-employee businesses. As we shall see shortly, satisfaction with benefits also varied greatly by sector. As one nonprofit employee noted: “I have no benefits because I can’t afford them. They cost too much, which is frustrating because I have two college degrees and I still can’t pay for insurance on my own son. So I’m sort of in the same group of people that I’m working with.”

Human services workers not only said they joined the workforce to serve people, they also said they came to work each day for the same reason. Asked an open-ended question about why they come to work each day, almost three-quarters of the human services workforce focused on the nature of the job itself, the common good, or some combination of the two.

1. 40 percent focused on the nature of the job itself, including interesting work, the opportunity to help

children, youth, and families, and pure enjoyment—for example, “joyful to be around the children,” “it’s my choice, this is what I am trained to do, and exactly where I need to be,” “I can’t imagine doing anything else, it inspires me,” “it’s been my dream, it’s what I have always wanted to be, I have always wanted to work with children,” or “it’s rewarding, getting hugs from children is the best thing.”

2. 20 percent focused on the common good, including helping society in general, making a difference in the lives of the people served, and shaping the future—for example, “I think it makes a difference in the lives of the children I work with,” “because I have hope,” “someone has to deal with at-risk kids and help them get their lives together,” “if I can touch one life and make a difference, it is worth going to work,” “to ensure that all children receive an education,” “it’s my way of giving back,” “to help people and the community,” or “for the kids.”
3. 14 percent focused on a combination of the nature of the job and the common good.
4. 8 percent focused on the compensation, including the pay, family needs, convenience, and benefits—for example, “it allowed me to raise my kids and be at home with them,” “I need the income,” “because I have children I need to care for,” or “to give my son a better upbringing.”
5. 8 percent focused on a combination of compensation and the nature of the job.
6. 3 percent focused on a combination of compensation and the common good.
7. 1 percent focused on their personal work ethic—for example, “it’s my job, I have to get things done,” “the understanding that a job needs to be done everyday,” or “to keep busy.”

The percentages may actually understate the depth of commitment among human services workers. Almost a quarter of human services workers used the word “enjoy” in their answer—for example, “I enjoy working with kids” or “I enjoy helping people.” Another sixth used the word “love” in their explanation—for example, “I have a love for children,” “I love what I do, I get a tremendous amount of growth, I learn some-

thing new about myself through their eyes, teenagers are just amazing,” “I love it, I love working with the children, interacting, how they make you see the world differently,” and “I love the children, it’s fun.”

Moreover, even workers who said they came to work solely for the compensation often had a far more personal reason for working. A substantial minority of those who said they came to work for the money or benefits also mentioned the opportunity to take care of their own children—for example, “I could raise my kids and do my job at the same time,” “I have small children of my own and I want to be with them,” “it allows me to stay home with my daughter,” or “to support my children and set an example.”

Despite these broad commitments to the work and the common good, table 5 shows significant differences between groups of low-income workers by job and sector. For example, childcare workers were more likely than their human services peers in the other four jobs to come to work for the nature of the job (e.g., interesting work), while juvenile justice workers put more emphasis than other human services workers on compensation (e.g., pay and benefits). At the same time, nonprofit human services workers were more likely to come to work for the common good (making a difference for society) than workers in other settings, while single-employee business-owners put the greatest emphasis on compensation, and workers in multi-employee businesses put significantly greater focus on the nature of the job.

As table 6 shows, the human services workforce is more dedicated to the common good and more interested in the work than any of the other workforces surveyed by the Center for Public Service. As one juvenile justice worker explained in the long interviews, “what gets you up in the morning is knowing there is chance that you might help someone.” Or as a youth services employee said, “It’s rewarding because I like doing it. I don’t get paid well, and I love what I do. It’s not about money...I am motivated to do my job regardless of the circumstances surrounding things that are going on.” A child welfare worker offered a much more personal explanation for her service to the community, “I always look at the people I serve as if I am only a few steps away from where they are, believe it or not. And I would hope that if I was in their situation, and I lived in this community that I would be able to access the services that I provide easily.”

Table 5: Reasons for Coming to Work Each Day by Sector and Population Served

	Compensation	Nature of the Job	Common Good
Total human services workers	8%	40%	20%
Total comparison group	11	50	12
Human services single-employee business owners	21	39	11
Comparison group single-employee business owners	16	44	11
Human services multi-employee business workers	7	47	13
Comparison group multi-employee business workers	14	53	7
Human services nonprofit workers	5	39	29
Comparison group nonprofit workers	4	61	14
Human services government workers	10	36	20
Comparison group government workers	13	35	17
Human services childcare workers	8	46	18
Comparison group childcare workers	10	56	10
Human services child welfare workers	8	35	23
Comparison group child welfare workers	11	37	14
Human services youth services workers	5	39	25
Comparison group youth services workers	8	54	14
Human services juvenile justice workers	12	38	20
Comparison group juvenile justice workers	8	40	20
Human services employment and training workers	7	34	25
Comparison group employment and training workers	8	43	17

Note: Numbers do not sum to 100 percent because the table does not include respondents who mentioned a combination of reasons

Table 6: Reasons for Coming to Work Each Day for Workers Across the Sectors

	Federal Government, 2001 (N=1,051)	Federal Government, 2002 (N=673)	Business, 2001 (N=1,005)	Nonprofit, 2002 (N=1,140)	Higher-Income-Serving Children, Youth, and Family, 2002 (N=346)	Human Services, 2002 (N=803)
Compensation	31%	41%	47%	16%	11%	8%
Nature of the job	31	28	30	41	50	40
Work Ethic	13	10	15	11	1	1
Common Good	6	4	5	10	12	20

See Appendix A for the details on these surveys

Note: Numbers do not sum to 100 percent because the table does not include respondents who mentioned a combination of reasons

2. Asking the Possible: In Critical Condition

A highly motivated workforce will not be satisfied for long if it cannot do its job. The work cannot be so intense that it produces burnout and stress, nor the workloads so heavy that quality suffers. By these measures, human services jobs often border on the impossible.

This is not to argue that human services jobs do not allow workers to make a difference. To the contrary, the vast majority of human services workers were very satisfied with the opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile. They also strongly agreed that they can and do make a difference in the lives of the people they serve.

Nor is it to argue that human services jobs have no meaning. Regardless of their role as supervisors or frontline workers, human services workers saw their days in much the same way.¹ Given a list of words to describe the work they do each day, 88 percent of the human services workers interviewed for this study said the word “responsible” described their work very well, 86 percent said the same about “caring,” and 82 percent said the same about the word “helpful.” In addition, 88 percent said their jobs greatly involved helping children, youth, and families, while 33 percent said their jobs involved a great deal of protecting the public.

Nor is it even to argue that human services jobs are dead-ends with no future. The vast majority of human services workers flatly rejected that view of their work.

Rather, human services jobs offer the opportunity to make a difference under very challenging conditions. Human services workers were less likely than the comparison group (55 percent versus 68 percent) to strongly agree that the work they do is fun, and more likely (39 percent to 31 percent) to say they always have too much work to do.

As table 7 shows, human services workers were less likely to say their work is fun and more likely to report heavier workloads than the comparison group. Although not all of the differences are statistically significant, the human services worker is disadvantaged in every case. These are tough jobs to begin with, but increase in difficulty when the client base is low-income.

The long interviews with human services workers gave a deeper sense of the frustrations embedded in human

VALUED BUT UNAPPRECIATED

The survey revealed substantial numbers of human services workers who agreed that they felt valued in their work and described their organizations as very or somewhat good places to work, yet also said that the words “unappreciated” and “frustrating” described their work very or somewhat well.

At first glance, the findings could not be more contradictory. How could 45 percent say they felt valued in their work, yet also unappreciated? How could 71 percent say their organizations were very or somewhat good places to work, yet describe their work as frustrating?

The explanation may reside in what respondents were thinking about when they were asked the questions. Using factor analysis to search for relationships across an assortment of questions simultaneously, it appears that respondents were thinking broadly about the opportunity to make a difference when they answered the two questions about feeling valued and being in a good place to work. They seemed to be saying that “this is a good place to be if I want to make a difference in people’s lives.”

Factor analysis also suggests that respondents were thinking broadly about workloads, burnout, and the commitment and helpfulness of their co-workers when they answered the questions about being unappreciated and frustrated in their work. Hence, being valued and working at a good place can be seen as expressions of the commitment to mission, while feeling unappreciated and frustrated can be seen as expressions of the difficulties in doing so under intense workload pressure. They seemed to be saying “these working conditions make it much too difficult to serve the people I care about.”

services work. Asked to describe the people or children she served, a juvenile justice worker answered “challenged.” She explained: “Many of them have learning disabilities, are disadvantaged and are poor problem solvers. They get roughed up in the criminal justice system and don’t know how to make good choices. One poor choice leads really to a series of poor choices. So helping them find their way out of those situations is pretty challenging.”

Table 7: Nature of the Job by Sector and Population Served

	Strongly agree that work is fun	Strongly agree that I always have too much work to do
Total human services workers	55%	39%
Total comparison group	68	31
Human services single-employee business owners	71	36
Comparison group single-employee business owners	75	31
Human services multi-employee business workers	60	34
Comparison group multi-employee business workers	69	30
Human services nonprofit workers	56	35
Comparison group nonprofit workers	73	22
Human services government workers	48	47
Comparison group government workers	50	44
Human services childcare workers	69	36
Comparison group childcare workers	76	24
Human services child welfare workers	44	43
Comparison group child welfare workers	59	39
Human services youth services workers	56	38
Comparison group youth services workers	72	34
Human services juvenile justice workers	42	43
Comparison group juvenile justice workers	48	40
Human services employment and training workers	52	48
Comparison group employment and training workers	60	45

It is not easy to help clients find their way to more hopeful futures when human services organizations get in the way. As one state government juvenile justice worker argued, “There are many times when the bureaucratic requirements in my work take away from the actual interface with the people I’m trying to serve. I was really drawn to this work in order to work with people, not with paper.” An employment and training worker agreed: “The paperwork is phenomenal. I have a manual that’s 10,000 pages of rules that you have to follow and know. It not only involves this state, but the federal government. It’s just lots of red tape.” “Right now I work for a government agency,” said a child welfare worker, “and the most frustrating thing is the politics involved with the agency. It’s just getting through the politics and red tape to get the services that’s frustrating. No matter how hard I try, the door often closes, and sometimes the harder you try, it closes more.”

3. The Training and Talent to Achieve: At Risk

This study used several measures to assess the quality and performance of the human services workforce today. Is the workforce well trained? How do workers rate their colleagues? How many workers are not doing their jobs well? How long do the best-qualified people stay? Although many of the answers are positive, the human services workforce suffers from substantial turnover problems, particularly among young, recent recruits, and generates little enthusiasm among young Americans. For these reasons, the workforce is rated at risk.

Preparing for Work As a whole, human services workers said they were just as well trained for their jobs as the comparison group. However, the workforce shows less preparation the further one drills down through the sample. As table 8 shows, frontline workers were less prepared for their jobs when they started,

received less formal or informal on-the-job training, and saw their overall training as less adequate.

Quality of Co-Workers Human services workers felt very positive about their co-workers. Asked to rate the overall quality of the workforce, 54 percent of human services workers said their co-workers were very qualified, 43 percent said somewhat qualified, and only three percent said not qualified at all.

Human services workers were just as likely as the comparison group to say their co-workers were open to new ideas, willing to help other workers learn new skills, concerned about achieving their organization’s mission, and committed to the people they serve. “When I get up in the morning, it’s not so bad to go to work,” said a child welfare worker in the long interviews, “because I know that I’m surrounded by nurturing colleagues and people who generally tend to care about their work as well.” A state government youth services worker said: “I really love my fellow colleagues

because they are so clear about things that have to be done. They don’t quit because things are very difficult, and they have a really great sense of humor when things get really difficult. Those are some incredible gifts.”

Despite these positives, human services workers saw considerable unhappiness in their midst: 23 percent rated morale among their co-workers as somewhat or very low, compared to 13 percent of the comparison group, while only 22 percent rated morale as very high, compared to 33 percent of the comparison group.

Performance The study used a very simple question to rate the performance of the human services workforce: “Just your best guess, what percent of the people you work with do not perform their jobs well?”

By this measure, the workforce contains a relatively small, but nonetheless troubling minority of poor performers. On average, human services workers estimated that 17 percent of their co-workers were not doing

Table 8: Training for the Job in the Human Services Workforce

	Supervisors (N=187)	Frontline Workers (N=506)
How much training have you had for the job?		
Great deal	76%	61%
Fair amount	20	32
Not too much	2	5
None at all	2	2
How much training did you have at school?		
Great deal	52	41
Fair amount	36	37
Not too much	5	13
None at all	7	9
How much training do you get on the job?		
Great deal	63	52
Fair amount	28	36
Not too much	8	11
None at all	1	2
How adequate is your training to do your job?		
More than adequate	44	37
Adequate	51	57
Less than adequate	5	5
Not adequate at all	1	1

their jobs well, contrasted with 16 percent in the comparison group. This one percentage point difference is largely caused by the number of workers who said there were no poor performers at their workplace: 14 percent of human services employees said there were no poor performers among their co-workers, contrasted with 23 percent of the comparison group of children, youth, and family workers. (See Appendix A for the figures on other national samples of workers.)

Even more troubling, when asked to explain the poor performance they had just reported, 43 percent of human services workers said their poorly-performing co-workers were not committed to helping people, 23 percent said the poor performers had too much work to do, 10 percent said the poor performers did not have the training to do their jobs well, and 10 percent said they were not qualified to do their jobs.

Performance is very much in the eye of the beholder. Thus, human services supervisors and frontline work-

ers had different views on both quality and performance. Frontline workers rated their co-workers as more qualified and saw fewer poor performers in their organizations, while supervisors had a more negative view. Thus, 57 percent of frontline workers said the people they work with were very qualified, compared to 43 percent of supervisors. In addition, 39 percent of frontline workers estimated that five percent or fewer of their co-workers were not doing their jobs well, compared to 29 percent of supervisors.

The question is which beholder has the most accurate perception. On the one hand, supervisors have the broader organizational perspective to rate all workers as a group. On the other hand, frontline workers are closer to the day-to-day performance. It could be, therefore, that both perspectives are accurate--that is, that supervisors are right about their organizations as a whole, but frontline workers are right about the small numbers of workers with whom they serve. However, the tendency of workers to project their own perform-

Table 9: Perceived Quality of Departures

	Best leave within a couple of years	Best often or sometimes leave field entirely when they go
Total human services workers	28%	43%
Total comparison group	17	34
Human services multi-employee business workers	36	42
Comparison multi-employee business workers	24	34
Human services nonprofit workers	35	48
Comparison group nonprofit workers	11	33
Human services government workers	18	39
Comparison group government workers	10	37
Human services childcare workers	33	46
Comparison group childcare workers	18	28
Human services child welfare workers	26	44
Comparison group child welfare workers	19	42
Human services youth services workers	29	43
Comparison group youth services workers	18	33
Human services juvenile justice workers	31	44
Comparison group juvenile justice workers	17	34
Human services employment and training workers	28	53
Comparison group employment and training workers	18	36

Note: Single-employee business owners were not asked these questions because they do not have co-workers and, therefore, do not have a hiring process per se

ance onto co-workers suggests that supervisors must be given the benefit of the doubt in making broad judgments about how well human services organizations are doing, which suggests the presence of a substantial minority of frontline workers who need to improve.

Turnover Human services workers were significantly more likely than the comparison group to report that the best-qualified people often stay a couple of years or less, and significantly more likely to say that those people often or sometimes left the children, youth, and family services altogether. The turnover was greatest among multi-employee business and nonprofit workers. As table 9 shows, the human services penalty exists across the board.

Asked about their own intentions to stay or leave, human services workers split into two groups: (1) 31 percent said they intended to stay in their jobs five years or less, and (2) 49 percent said they would stay more than ten years. The short-term workforce is heavily concentrated in childcare, where two in five respondents said they would only stay for five years or less, while the long-term workforce is heavily concentrated in child welfare and youth services.

The short- and long-term human services workforces held very different views of both their work and workloads. The long-term workforce was significantly less likely to describe their jobs as dead-ends and more likely to describe the work they do as fun. Although both workforces were equally likely to say they always had too much work to do, and that it was easy to burn out in their jobs, the long-term workers were also significantly more likely to say they can make a difference in the lives of the people they serve. As a child welfare worker noted, “I just enjoy watching the people that I work with succeed, watching them grow as a person and reach their ultimate goal.”

The two also had different motivations to serve. Long-term workers were more likely than short-term workers to say they took their current job for the benefits and job security, as well as the opportunity to do challenging work and serve the community. As one youth services employee said of her decision to stay, “It’s my life. It’s not my economic living. I could make a better living I’m sure someplace else.” An employment and training employee made a similar case: “I feel what I do is important to the children of our future. I adore my work place and my co-workers

THE INTENTION TO LEAVE

Age is significantly correlated with the intention to stay or leave, with younger and older human services workers the most likely to say they will leave within five years or less, and middle-aged workers the most likely to stay. But removing age from the equation, the question is what might motivate workers to stay a bit longer.

Regression analysis, a statistical technique, shows higher intent to stay among workers who:

1. Rated their training as more than adequate for the job
2. Said their work was fun
3. Did not describe their work as frustrating
4. Reported higher overall job satisfaction

Interestingly, workers who reported greater access to mentoring were actually less likely to stay. This finding suggests that mentoring may have been a form of micro-management for some employees.

and as long as I’m happy getting up and going to work in the morning, I can’t see leaving there. It makes me a better person.” Pressed on whether there was anything that would make her change her mind, her answer was absolutely not.

However, even highly committed workers can burn out. As one childcare worker described her intention to leave: “It’s highly stressful, and you go home thinking about these kids, and wake up thinking about these kids. I mean, when it’s a very frustrating day, you think about it, especially when you become attached to these kids you go home and you talk to your spouse about the kids, you wake up and these kids are on your mind. I mean the only reason you come back is that you try to help the kids.”

4. Recruiting and Retaining Talented Workers for the Future: In Critical Condition

Human services workers described the hiring process as simple and very fair, but slow. Even though almost half of human services workers said the process was slow, it is considerably better than the federal government’s, which overwhelming numbers of federal employees rate as both slow and confusing.

However, the recruitment challenge facing human services organizations appears to be much greater than the federal government's, if only because the jobs have such a high potential for stress and burnout. Even small delays and confusion in the hiring process can produce failure, which, in turn, raises the stress and burnout level for the current workforce, which, in turn, raises the costs of small delays and confusion. Moreover, many potential recruits view the hiring process with a mix of confusion and concern. Too few young Americans are interested in joining the human services workforce, and too many recent recruits show every intention of leaving.

Students The lack of interest in joining is clearly the message from an April, 2002, survey of 1,015 about-to-graduate college seniors. The telephone survey was restricted to all bachelor of arts majors and social work majors, and was conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of the Center for Public Service. Half of the sample came from the nation's top 100 colleges and research universities as ranked by *U.S. News & World Report*, while the other half were drawn at random from colleges and universities all across America.

According to the survey, the children, youth, and family service is in a talent war that it cannot win without significant changes in how it recruits, develops, and rewards its workforce. (Appendix C contains a complete breakdown of all items on the questionnaire by college rank.) The survey revealed both the promise and the difficulty embedded in recruiting the next generation of human services workers.

On the one hand, students who gave very serious consideration to joining the children, youth, and family service workforce did so because they want to help people. Ninety-two percent of the seniors who were interested in one or more of the five kinds of work covered by this study said the most important consideration in picking a job was the chance to help people, compared to just 64 percent of their disinterested peers. Students who gave very serious consideration to joining the children, youth, and family service were also more likely than their peers to say they expected to be assigned challenging work, given meaningful work, and receive training and acquire new skills.

However, most students did not know how to get a job in the children, youth, and family service. Only 16

percent of students at the nation's top 100 schools said they knew a great deal about finding a job in the children, youth, and family service, compared to 20 percent at other schools. Even students who gave serious consideration to one or more of the five jobs were not particularly knowledgeable about finding a job—32 percent said they knew a great deal about finding a job, compared to just 11 percent among those who had no interest in the children, youth, and family service.

Moreover, students viewed the process for entering the children, youth, and family service as confusing and slow, regardless of their school or interest in a career. Even students who had the most interest in a children, youth, and family service job saw the hiring process as difficult: 45 percent described it as confusing, and 71 percent described it as slow.

Finally, students were sharply divided on how long they wanted to stay in the field. Among students who said they were very or somewhat interested in one or more of the children, youth, and family service jobs, 57 percent said they would stay in the service for five years or less, while 30 percent said they would stay more than ten years. The short-termers, as they might be called, put a greater emphasis on the nature of the work, while the long-termers focus more on helping people and job security.

The lack of interest and willingness to stay were even more pronounced among graduates of the nation's top 100 colleges and universities. They were consistently less likely than their peers to have given very or somewhat serious consideration to jobs in child welfare (25 percent versus 30 percent), juvenile justice (14 percent versus 18 percent), youth services (37 percent versus 48 percent), childcare (21 percent versus 32 percent), and employment and training (23 percent versus 25 percent), and were also less likely to say they knew a great deal or fair amount about finding a job (61 percent versus 68 percent). Most importantly, among top-tier graduates who said they had very or somewhat seriously considered one or more of the five kinds of work covered by this study, 50 percent said they intended to stay in the job only one or two years, compared to 22 percent of their peers.

To the extent that interest among top-tier students can be taken as a measure of quality, the human services workforce is not winning its fair share of the nation's most talented graduates.

Recent Recruits This reluctance to join is paralleled by a lack of interest in staying among the recent recruits interviewed in the survey of human services workers. Among 18-34 year olds who had been doing human services work for five years or less, 30 percent said they intended to leave within two years, and another 13 percent within five. As table 10 shows, the intention to leave was almost as serious among recent entrants between the ages of 35 and 50, among whom 40 percent said that they would leave within five years.²

These short-termers do not appear to have entered the workforce intending to leave so quickly. In fact, the young, short-termers were actually less likely than the young, long-termers to say security and benefits were very important considerations in taking their jobs, and just as likely to emphasize the opportunity to help children, youth, and families (85 percent versus 89 percent). Although the majority of the short-termers (56 percent) worked with children, mostly in child-care, all five jobs covered by this study contained at least some young, short-termers.

The research question here is why these workers intend to leave. Table 11 suggests that the answers are in how their organizations work.

These dissatisfactions appear to be rooted in training, time on the job, and education. The short-termers were less likely than the long-termers to say they had received a great deal of training for their jobs (41 percent versus 70 percent), and less likely to say they received a great deal of training in school (28 percent versus 49 percent).

The short-termers were also less likely to have been in their current job very long: 62 percent had been in their positions for two years or less, compared to 43 percent of the long-termers. And they were less educated than their peers: 38 percent said they had a college degree and post-graduate work, compared to 61 percent of the long-termers.

5. The Resources to Succeed: At Risk

The human services workforce reported three different kinds of resource shortages that put it at risk. The first involves information, equipment and supplies. Human services workers in government and nonprofits were significantly more likely than their peers in businesses of any kind to report that they only sometimes or

Table 10: Intent to Leave Among Recent Human Services Recruits

Intend to Leave	18-34 years old (N=158)	35-50 years old (N=70)
Within two years or less	30%	9%
In three to five years	13	31
In six to ten years	11	14
In more than ten years	44	36

rarely have enough access to information, equipment and supplies.

The second involves a safe place to work. Significant numbers of human services workers said they do not have a safe place to work. Whereas 90 percent of single-employee business owners said they always had a safe place to work, only 62 percent of nonprofit workers and 55 percent of government workers agreed.

Not surprisingly given their job description, juvenile justice workers were by far the most likely to say they only sometimes or rarely had a safe place to work. “It’s a challenge to get in and out of the office,” said a juvenile justice worker. “I’ve had a gun pulled on me a couple of times; I’ve had people try to steal my briefcase out of my hand. I’ve had them come in two or three at a time, and so far none of it’s worked. But it’s a challenge.” Another juvenile justice worker agreed. “The work environment is not the most pleasant thing in the world. It’s a prison. I mean, basically you look around and kids are locked in their rooms, very small cells—they call them rooms—barbed wire and locked doors.”

The third shortage involves basic organizational support. Access to training was uneven, with business workers again reporting the greatest level of support, and childcare workers the most likely to say they always have the training they need. Access to enough workers was spread relatively equally across jobs and sectors, but the percentages still reflect the human services penalties reported earlier, particularly in childcare and the nonprofit sector. Among childcare workers, 31 percent said they always have enough co-workers to do their jobs well, compared to 48 percent of childcare workers in the comparison group; among nonprofit workers, 27 percent said they always had enough staff,

Table 11: Differences between Short- and Long-Termers, age 18-34

	Intend to stay five years or less (N=103)	Intend to stay more than ten years (N=159)
Agreed that their jobs were a dead-end with no future	26%	5%
Strongly agreed the work they do is fun	46	69
Accomplished a great deal in their jobs	58	72
Would miss their co-workers a great deal if they quit	35	62
Saw their co-workers as very qualified	32	53
Said the most qualified people stay in their jobs a couple of years or less	58	33
Always have adequate supervision	39	58
Always have authority to make routine decisions	41	56
Always have access to training	37	51
Always have enough co-workers	20	36
Very proud to tell friends and neighbors what they do	62	87
Very satisfied with their jobs	47	73
Very satisfied with job security	50	72
Very satisfied with benefits such as health insurance and vacation time	22	47
Very satisfied with the opportunity for advancement	20	40
Very satisfied with the opportunity to develop new skills	41	60
Very satisfied with the opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile	60	79

compared to 42 percent of their peers in the comparison group. “We see a lot of people,” said a child welfare worker, “and a lot of times we can’t help everybody because of staffing.”

These resource shortages provoked a fair number of complaints in the longer interviews about funding for human services programs. Asked what could make her job as a childcare worker better, one respondent answered “having a more appropriate space for our children. I think if we had more of a voice, our whole early education department would get more appropriate space.” Asked why she was frustrated with her job, a second childcare worker answered “because you can’t help them all. You’re limited to the resources that are available. Again, I go right back to the state for not mandating kindergarten. There is so much pressure on these kids today to do well, and if they get started at a disadvantaged point, they struggle.”

As above, nonprofit workers paid a double penalty for their service, first by joining a sector that has been

historically under-supplied, then by choosing to serve low-income children, youth, and families. They appear willing to pay the penalty for the chance to make a difference.

6. Rewards for a Job Well Done: In Critical Condition

The human services workforce reported shortages in both tangible rewards such as pay and opportunities to advance, and intangible rewards such as recognition for superior work and long hours.

Tangible Rewards Many human services workers were dissatisfied with their pay, benefits, and security. Asked whether their pay was low, for example, human services workers were significantly more likely than the comparison group to strongly agree, 39 percent versus 33 percent. And asked how much talent and achievement were rewarded in their workplace, human services workers were significantly more likely than their comparison group peers to answer not too much

or not at all, 42 percent versus 31 percent. As table 12 shows, the human services penalty appears again.

Once again, frontline workers differed with their supervisors. They were less satisfied with pay (36 percent were not too satisfied or not satisfied at all versus 19 percent of supervisors), job security (10 percent versus 5 percent), benefits (22 percent versus 11 percent), the opportunity for advancement (30 percent versus 17 percent), and the opportunity to develop new skills (14 percent versus 10 percent).

The question is how human services workers at any level could be so unhappy with their pay, yet so satisfied with their jobs overall. One answer is that they accept a “public service” discount wherever they happen to work. In a sense, the human services workforce is a self-exploiting workforce. They know they could make more in other jobs, recognize that their pay is low, yet accept the result because they are working for

the greater good. As a youth services worker explained: “By the time they leave, I can see that they somehow take a little more pride in who they are. It helps me to have more peace.”

This commitment makes the human services workforce both admirable and easily exploitable. Society must know these workers will take lower pay to do their jobs and will tolerate higher levels of stress even in unsafe workplaces, yet still come to work the next day to do it over again for the mission and love of the job. The risk is that the workforce may not show up one day, that the labor shortage will produce a vicious cycle in which turnover increases, workloads rise, and turnover increases even more. It is one thing to exploit the human services workforce during a labor surplus of the kind produced by the baby boom; quite another to expect continued recruitment success in a labor shortage of the kind the U.S. economy will experience far into the future.

Table 12 Satisfactions by Sector and Job

	Strongly agree pay is low	Talent rewarded to a great or fair extent
Total human services workers	39%	57%
Total comparison group	33	64
Human services single-employee business owners	43	N/A
Comparison group single-employee business owners	22	N/A
Human services multi-employee business workers	38	72
Comparison group multi-employee business workers	34	67
Human services nonprofit workers	46	60
Comparison group nonprofit workers	38	65
Human services government workers	33	49
Comparison group government workers	29	59
Human services childcare workers	47	60
Comparison group childcare workers	32	71
Human services child welfare workers	37	54
Comparison group child welfare workers	23	59
Human services youth services workers	39	60
Comparison group youth services workers	32	61
Human services juvenile justice workers	44	53
Comparison group juvenile justice workers	28	47
Human services employment and training workers	33	62
Comparison group employment and training workers	30	64

SOURCES OF SATISFACTION

Overall job satisfaction depends on a mix of tangible and intangible benefits, as well as working conditions and actual impacts. Regression analysis suggests that a very high percentage of the variation in overall job satisfaction among human services workers can be explained by eight questions asked in the survey. Satisfaction increased when workers:

1. Said their co-workers were more qualified for their jobs.
2. Strongly rejected the notion that their job is a dead-end with no future.
3. Strongly agreed that the work they do is fun.
4. More frequently trusted their workplaces to do the right thing.
5. Strongly agreed that they felt valued in the work they did.
6. Said they had more than adequate training to do their jobs.
7. Said their organizations did a very good job at helping people.
8. Strongly agreed that they accomplished something worthwhile at work.

When compared against higher-income-serving workers, these results suggest that job satisfaction among human services workers involves a broader view of how their organizations are working—e.g., whether co-workers are qualified, or if the organization is doing a very good job of helping people. Job satisfaction also involves a greater degree of self-evaluation—e.g., whether respondents are adequately trained to do their jobs. Although both groups paid attention to whether their organizations can be trusted, comparison group workers paid more attention to their own job, and less to the organization as a whole.

Intangible Rewards The human services workforce found its greatest satisfactions in intangible benefits such as public respect, the opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile, pride, and appreciation. Unfortunately, on many of the intangible benefits, human services workers trailed the comparison group:

- Human services workers were significantly less likely than their peers to be very satisfied with the respect they get for the type of work they are doing, 43 percent versus 56 percent.

- They were less likely to be very satisfied with the opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile, 69 percent versus 75 percent.
- They were less likely to strongly agree they can make a difference in the lives of the people they serve, 81 percent versus 88 percent.
- Similarly, they were less likely to say they actually accomplished something worthwhile in their job, 66 percent versus 73 percent.

As already noted, a significant number of human services workers said the word “unappreciated” describes the work they do in their job. All totaled, 51 percent said the word describes their work very or somewhat well, viewed against just 36 percent of the comparison group. It is not only one of the largest differences between the two workforces in the entire survey, but it speaks to a general sense among human services workers about being under-valued in their work, whether by their own supervisors, their organizations, the communities they serve, or society as a whole.

As before, the penalty was most observable among human services frontline workers. Human services frontline workers were less likely to say they can make a difference in the lives of the people they serve (23 percent either said they only somewhat agreed or disagreed versus 16 percent of their supervisors), and less likely to feel valued in their work (54 percent said they strongly agreed they were valued versus 66 percent of their supervisors). Moreover, 31 percent of frontline workers said they were only somewhat proud, not too proud, or not at all proud to tell friends and neighbors what they did, compared to 21 percent of supervisors.

7. The Respect of the People Served: At Risk

The final characteristic of a healthy workforce involves the respect of the people it serves. Although some of this feedback will come through day-to-day contact with children, youth, or families, particularly among childcare, youth services, and perhaps employment and training workers, it should also show up in broader surveys.

Unfortunately, there is very little information available about what the public in general, or the clients in specific, feel about the children, youth, and family workforce. According to a public opinion survey conducted on behalf of the Center for Public Service in

Table 13: Confidence in the People who Serve

	Great deal	Fair amount	Not too much or none at all
People who work in the federal government in Washington	7%	58%	33%
People who work with children, youth, or families	27	54	15
People who work in private business	12	65	15

Note: Sample size=986. Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample.

early May, 2002, there is considerable confidence in people who serve children, youth, and families. (The survey results are presented in Table 13.)

The only problem is that one cannot know just who respondents were thinking about when they answered the question: teachers? doctors? childcare workers? Although public confidence is clearly robust, it would take a much deeper survey to discover the real attitudes toward the human services workforce addressed in this study.

As noted above, human services workers were just as proud as the comparison group to tell friends and neighbors what they did for a living. Moreover, they were generally satisfied with the public respect they received for the work they did. There are troubling patterns within the answers, however, particularly for human services workers in government. Only 34 percent of government workers were very satisfied with the public respect, 49 percent were somewhat satisfied, and 16 percent were not too satisfied or not satisfied at all. By comparison, single-employee business owners were the most satisfied (57 percent said they were very satisfied), followed by multi-employee business workers (49 percent), and nonprofit workers (44 percent). At the same time, childcare and employment and training workers were the most satisfied, while juvenile justice and child welfare workers were the least satisfied, in part because of the concentrations of the former jobs in business and the latter in government.

The workers had various explanations for the lack of respect. Asked what she saw as frustrating about her work, a child welfare worker answered: “Two things: one, the funding, the other is misinformation or the lack of information or understanding in the community as a whole. They only think we do one thing, and

that’s to take in people who have been abused, but it is much, much bigger than that....It’s a subject that people don’t like to talk about.”

Moreover, human services workers reported serious problems getting support from the community: 45 percent said they only sometimes or rarely get adequate support services from the community, compared to 35 percent of the comparison group.

There were also troubling patterns in organizational trust. Although human services workers frequently showed greater trust in their organizations than federal, business, and nonprofit employees, they were less likely than the comparison group to say their organizations did a good job running programs. Table 14 shows the more general level of trust in one’s organization to do the right thing.

Not surprisingly given their earlier views, human services frontline workers were less trusting of their organizations. They were less likely than their supervisors to say their organizations did a very good job running their programs and services (55 percent versus 65 percent), and spending money wisely (42 percent versus 53 percent). They were also less likely to trust their organizations overall: 16 percent said they trusted their organizations only some of the time, compared to 10 percent of their supervisors.

CONCLUSION

The human services workforce faces two very different futures. One involves a slow, but steady erosion of talent due to inaction and continued under-investment, even disinvestment, in the industry’s human capital. Age, stress, and burnout will continue to work their

Table 14: Trust by Sector and Population Served

	Trust organization just about always	Trust organization most or only some of the time
Total human services workers	51%	49%
Total comparison group workers	57	41
Human services single-employee business owners	78	18
Comparison group single-employee business owners	78	17
Human services multi-employee business workers	56	42
Comparison group multi-employee business workers	55	42
Human services nonprofit workers	52	48
Comparison group nonprofit workers	65	34
Human services government workers	41	59
Comparison group government workers	32	68
Human services childcare workers	59	40
Comparison group childcare workers	68	30
Human services child welfare workers	44	56
Comparison group child welfare workers	46	55
Human services youth services workers	46	53
Comparison group youth services workers	51	47
Human services juvenile justice workers	36	64
Comparison group juvenile justice workers	52	48
Human services employment and training workers	45	56
Comparison group employment and training workers	47	50

Note: Numbers do not sum to 100 percent because of respondents who answered don't know or refused to answer at all.

will on the current generation of workers, even as they discourage the next generation from entering the field. It is the future the nation faces if it continues to ignore the kind of data presented in this report, a future inherited through inaction.

The other future involves a recommitment to the workforce, and to the children, youth, and families it serves. This more hopeful future involves long-overdue investments in recruitment and retention, organizational capacity, and both tangible and intangible rewards for a job well done. It also involves a commitment to providing enough workers to answer every call for help in time to make a difference. This is the future the nation faces if it is to honor its promises to help its most vulnerable citizens, but requires a clear commitment to action at all levels of government and society.

Although one survey cannot establish a trend, this survey suggests serious cause for concern about America's other first responders. With demand rising and a talent war in progress, it is not clear just how long the human services frontlines can hold.

End Notes

- 1 Unless otherwise noted in the report, readers should assume that the attitudes of supervisors and frontline workers were not statistically different.
- 2 There were too few recent entrants among workers over 50 years of age for analysis.

APPENDIX A: HEALTH OF THE GOVERNMENT, NONPROFIT, FOR-PROFIT, AND HUMAN SERVICES SECTORS

Prepared by Princeton Survey Research Associates for the Brookings Institution

Nonprofit Sector

N= 1140 Nonprofit Workers

Interview dates: October 29, 2001 – January 2, 2002

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

For Profit Sector

N=1005 Workers in For-Profit Businesses

Interview dates: May 11, 2001 – June 10, 2001 (500 Interviews);

January 4, 2002 – January 22, 2002 (505 Interviews)

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

Human Services

N=803 Human Services Workers

Interview dates: June 18, 2002 – October 30, 2002

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

Federal Government

N=1051 Federal Government Workers

Interview dates: February 7, 2001 – June 1, 2001

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

Q1 To what extent are the people you work with (Insert)—to a great extent, somewhat, not too much or not at all?

List items were rotated

	Great Extent	Somewhat	Not too Much	Not at all	Don't Know	Refused
b open to new ideas						
NONPROFIT	46%	43%	8%	1%	1%	0%
FOR PROFIT	36	48	11	4	1	1
HUMAN SERVICES	43	44	9	4	1	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	33	49	12	5	*	*
c willing to help other employees learn new skills						
NONPROFIT	67	26	4	1	1	*
FOR PROFIT	51	33	10	3	2	1
HUMAN SERVICES	57	34	6	2	1	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	52	36	8	4	*	*
d concerned about achieving your organization's mission[§]						
NONPROFIT	72	23	3	1	1	*
FOR PROFIT	56	31	8	3	1	1
HUMAN SERVICES	61	31	5	2	1	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	63	28	5	3	1	*

[§] Human Services respondents were asked about their workplace's mission

* Less than 1%

Q2 I'm going to read some statements people make about their job. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with them. The first|next is:

List items were rotated

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know	Refused
c My job is a dead-end with no future						
NONPROFIT	7	12	22	58	*	*
FOR PROFIT	12	14	20	54	*	0
HUMAN SERVICES	4	11	20	64	1	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	13	15	24	47	1	0
d It is easy to burn out in my job^{§∞}						
NONPROFIT	41	32	15	12	*	*
FOR PROFIT						
HUMAN SERVICES	50	31	9	9	1	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT						
e I always have too much work to do[∞]						
NONPROFIT	36	34	19	10	*	*
FOR PROFIT						
HUMAN SERVICES	39	31	20	9	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT						

§ Human Services respondents were asked "It is easy to burn out in the work I do"

∞ For Profit and Federal Government respondents were not provided with these statements

* Less than 1%

Q3 Overall, how satisfied are you with (Insert)—very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not too satisfied, not satisfied at all?

List items were rotated

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not Satisfied at All	Don't Know	Refused
a your job overall[†]						
NONPROFIT	58	37	4	1	*	0
FOR PROFIT	44	46	7	4	*	0
HUMAN SERVICES	65	30	3	1	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	49	40	7	3	0	0
b your salary[§]						
NONPROFIT	24	53	16	7	*	*
FOR PROFIT	29	50	12	9	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	23	47	16	13	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	35	52	7	5	0	*
c your job security[§]						
NONPROFIT	61	32	4	3	*	*
FOR PROFIT	51	37	6	5	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	60	31	4	4	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	66	28	3	2	*	*

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not Satisfied at All	Don't Know	Refused
d your job benefits, such as health insurance and vacation time[∞]						
NONPROFIT	50	33	8	7	2	*
FOR PROFIT	46	31	11	11	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	39	31	9	12	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	66	28	3	2	*	*

§ Not applicable to 1 Human services respondent (Items B and C)

∞ Not applicable to 15 Human services respondents (Item D)

† In the nonprofit survey, respondents were read 'your job'

* Less than 1%

Q4 How would you rate the overall morale of the people you work with—is it very high, somewhat high, somewhat low or very low?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Very high	22	20	22	14
Somewhat high	52	52	55	46
Somewhat low	20	20	17	30
Very low	5	6	6	11
Don't know	1	1	1	*
Refused	*	*	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q5 How satisfied are you with (Insert)—are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not too satisfied or not satisfied at all?

List items were rotated

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not Satisfied at All	Don't Know	Refused
a your opportunity for advancement						
NONPROFIT	27	45	17	7	4	*
FOR PROFIT	30	43	14	10	2	*
HUMAN SERVICES	29	39	13	12	5	1
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	24	43	17	15	1	*
b your opportunity to develop new skills						
NONPROFIT	48	39	9	3	*	*
FOR PROFIT	43	39	11	6	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	48	39	7	5	1	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	36	42	12	9	*	*
c the public respect for the type of work you are doing						
NONPROFIT	49	35	11	4	1	*
FOR PROFIT	39	44	10	5	3	0
HUMAN SERVICES	43	45	8	4	1	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	36	45	11	7	1	1

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not Satisfied at All	Don't Know	Refused
d your opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile						
NONPROFIT	66	30	3	1	*	0
FOR PROFIT	41	45	9	4	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	69	27	2	1	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	47	42	7	4	*	0

* Less than 1%

Q6 Just your best guess, what percent of the people you work with do not perform their jobs well?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Mean	19	25	17	24
Zero percent	11	11	14	5
1 – 10 percent	38	30	41	38
11 – 20 percent	15	16	15	15
21 – 30 percent	15	14	11	15
More than 30%	17	26	16	26
Don't Know	3	3	3	2
Refused	1	1	*	*

* Less than 1%

Q7 And which one of these reasons best explains that poor performance?

Among those who say 1% or more are performing poorly

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
They do not have the training to do their jobs well	25	23	10	16
Your organization/workplace does not ask enough of them	28	28	7	37
They are not qualified for their jobs	30	32	10	31
They are not committed to helping the people they serve [§]			43	
They have too much work to do [§]			23	
Don't know	15	15	6	12
Refused	2	2	*	3
N=	968	856	562	977

[§] Not asked of nonprofit, for profit, or federal government employees

* Less than 1%

Q8 Which of the following pairs of words best describe the hiring process for new people for your organization? Does (Insert first word) or (Insert second word) best describe the hiring process?

	First Word	Second Word	Don't Know	Refused
a Confusing/Simple				
NONPROFIT	23	72	5	*
FOR PROFIT	21	75	4	*
HUMAN SERVICES	26	67	6	1
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	57	37	6	*

	First Word	Second Word	Don't Know	Refused
b Fast/Slow				
NONPROFIT	44	50	5	*
FOR PROFIT	53	42	4	1
HUMAN SERVICES	46	48	6	1
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	18	79	3	*
c Fair/Unfair				
NONPROFIT	90	6	3	*
FOR PROFIT	90	7	3	*
HUMAN SERVICES	85	12	2	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	75	21	4	1

* Less than 1%

Q9 And how good a job does your organization do disciplining poor performing employees at your level in the organization—very good, somewhat good, not too good or not good at all?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Very good	15	22	20	9
Somewhat good	37	30	40	21
Not too good	30	28	24	32
Not good at all	14	15	12	35
Don't know	4	4	4	3
Refused	*	1	*	*

* Less than 1%

Q10 To what extent, does your organization have (Insert). Does it always, often, sometimes or rarely (have)?

List items were rotated

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Don't Know	Refused
a access to the information needed to do its job well						
NONPROFIT	40	39	18	2	1	*
FOR PROFIT	51	28	17	3	*	0
HUMAN SERVICES	50	33	14	2	*	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	40	34	22	3	*	0
b the technological equipment needed to do its job well[§]						
NONPROFIT	37	34	24	4	1	0
FOR PROFIT	45	31	19	5	*	0
HUMAN SERVICES	40	29	24	7	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	36	34	24	6	*	0
d access to the training needed to do its job well						
NONPROFIT	32	36	25	6	1	0
FOR PROFIT	40	28	22	9	1	*
HUMAN SERVICES	45	30	18	5	*	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	30	30	29	11	*	0

[§] Human Services respondents were asked about “the equipment and supplies needed”

* Less than 1%

Q11 All in all, how good a job does your organization do (Insert)—a very good, somewhat good, not too good or not at all good job?

List items were rotated

	Very Good	Somewhat Good	Not Too Good	Not Good at All	Don't Know	Refused
a running its programs and services						
NONPROFIT	56	39	3	1	1	*
FOR PROFIT	44	47	6	1	2	0
HUMAN SERVICES	59	36	4	1	1	*
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	41	48	9	2	1	0
b helping people						
NONPROFIT	73	24	2	1	1	0
FOR PROFIT	51	38	6	3	2	*
HUMAN SERVICES	68	30	1	1	0	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	51	38	8	3	1	*
d spending its money wisely						
NONPROFIT	44	38	11	4	2	0
FOR PROFIT	36	41	13	6	4	*
HUMAN SERVICES	47	37	9	5	2	0
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	22	43	22	11	2	*

* Less than 1%

Q12 When you tell your friends and neighbors where you work, do you feel very proud of the organization you work for, somewhat proud, not too proud or not proud at all?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Very proud	67	54	72	51
Somewhat proud	29	39	25	40
Not too proud	3	4	1	5
Not proud at all	*	3	1	3
Don't know	*	*	1	1
Refused	*	*	0	*

* Less than 1%

Q13 Do you trust your organization to do the right thing just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Always [§]	44	37	51	25
Most of the time	41	42	36	45
Only some of the time	15	21	13	30
Don't know	*	1	1	*
Refused	*	0	0	*

[§] Human Services respondents were asked "just about always"

* Less than 1%

D1 Sex (Observed)

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Male	32	56	18	54
Female	68	44	82	46

D2 What is your age?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
18-29	11	27	24	5
30-39	23	27	25	22
40-49	33	25	29	31
50-59	26	15	17	34
60-69	5	5	4	5
70 or older	1	*	*	*
Don't know	0	0	0	0
Refused	1	1	*	2

* Less than 1%

D3 Are you of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban or some other Latino background?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Yes	6	6	8	4
No	93	93	92	95
Don't know	*	*	*	0
Refused	*	1	0	1

* Less than 1%

D4 What is your race? White, African-American or black, Latino or Hispanic, Asian or some other race?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
White	84	83	77 [§]	81
Black or African-American	7	5	16 [∞]	11
Latino or Hispanic [†]	4	3		1
Asian	1	2	*	1
Other	3	6	5	4
Don't know	*	*	*	*
Refused	1	1	1	1

§ Human services survey included white Latinos in this figure

∞ Human services survey included black Latinos in this figure

† Human services survey respondents were not provided with this possible response.

* Less than 1%

D5 What was the last grade or class you completed in school?

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
None, or grade 1-8	0	1	*	0
High school incomplete (grades 9-11)	1	8	2	1
High school graduate (grade 12 or GED certificate)	12	30	16	22
Business, technical or vocational school after high school	4	7	2	3
Some college, no four-year degree	19	27	22	29
College graduate	28	22	28	27
Post-graduate training or professional schooling	34	6	24	19
Don't know	*	0	0	*
Refused	*	*	0	*

D6 Last year, what was your total household income from all sources before taxes? Just stop me when I get to the right category.

	NON PROFIT	FOR PROFIT	HUMAN SERVICES	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Less than \$10,000	1	1	3	*
\$10,000 to under \$20,000	3	6	9	1
\$20,000 to under \$30,000	11	12	14	4
\$30,000 to under \$40,000	13	16	14	9
\$40,000 to under \$50,000	14	13	13	11
\$50,000 to under \$75,000	23	19	21	30
\$75,000 to under \$100,000	15	12	13	18
\$100,000 or more	11	12	7	16
Don't know	2	2	2	1
Refused	8	6	4	8

* Less than 1%

APPENDIX B: HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE AND THE COMPARISON GROUP

Prepared by Princeton Survey Research Associates for the Brookings Institution

N= 803 Human Services Workers

346 Comparison Group Workers

Interview dates: June 18, 2002-October 30, 2002

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

Q1 On average, how much of your day do you spend working directly with children, teens or families—all, most, half, in between half and a quarter, a quarter, or less than a quarter?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
All	54%	55%
Most	23	23
Half	17	16
In between half and a quarter	6	5
A quarter	0	0
Less than a quarter	0	0
Don't know	*	0
Refused	*	0

* Less than 1%

S3 There are a number of jobs that involve working with children, teens or families. I'm going to read you a list of some of the different types of work people do that involve children, teens and families. Does your job involve (Insert), or not? And what about (Insert)?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Refused
a childcare, such as working in daycare centers or preschools				
HUMAN SERVICES	42	58	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	64	36	0	0
b child welfare, such as working with families needing help or with children in foster care				
HUMAN SERVICES	41	58	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	20	79	1	0
c youth services, such as after school programs or recreation programs for children or teens				
HUMAN SERVICES	39	60	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	32	68	*	0
d juvenile justice, such as working with teens in trouble with the law or in juvenile detention centers				
HUMAN SERVICES	17	83	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	7	93	0	0

Yes No Don't Know Refused

e employment and training, such as working with families on welfare to help a parent with employment or job training

HUMAN SERVICES	27	73	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	24	75	1	0

* Less than 1%

Q2 Do you mainly work with children, teens or families?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Children	45	67
Teens	19	13
Families	16	8
All of the above	15	8
Children and Teens	5	3
Don't know	0	0
Refused	0	*

* Less than 1%

Q3 Now thinking about the [people you serve| families of the children you serve]. How well do the following words describe the [people you serve| families of the children you serve]. The first is (Insert). Does this word describe them very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not well at all? What about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

	Very well	Somewhat well	Not too well	Not well at all	Don't Know	Refused
a low income						
HUMAN SERVICES	50	50	0	0	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	0	0	45	55	0	0
b disadvantaged						
HUMAN SERVICES	34	42	10	11	3	*
COMPARISON GROUP	6	11	29	52	1	*
c deserving						
HUMAN SERVICES	54	34	4	2	5	1
COMPARISON GROUP	54	28	4	3	11	0
d trustworthy						
HUMAN SERVICES	31	47	13	5	3	*
COMPARISON GROUP	60	31	3	3	3	0
e responsible						
HUMAN SERVICES	24	49	17	8	2	*
COMPARISON GROUP	56	31	8	3	2	0

* Less than 1%

Q4a Do you run your own business or organization?

Based on those NOT working in childcare

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	6	15
No	94	83
Don't know	0	2
Refused	0	0
N=	467	125

Q4b Do you run your own business or organization, such as a day care center from your home?

Based on those working in childcare

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	23	28
No	77	72
Don't know	0	0
Refused	0	0
N=	336	221

Q5 How many people do you employ?

Based on those who own a business or organization

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Zero	63	63
1-5	28	33
6 or more	9	5
Don't know	1	*
Refused	*	*
N=	104	80

* Less than 1%

Q6 Are you self-employed?

Based on those who DO NOT own a business or organization

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	4	6
No	96	94
Don't know	0	*
Refused	0	0
N=	699	266

* Less than 1%

Q7 How many OTHER people, if any, do you work with?

Based on those who are self-employed

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Zero	23	31
1-5	29	38
6 or more	42	31
Don't know	3	0
Refused	3	0
N=	31	16

Q8 Do you work for a business, nonprofit organization, a religious institution or government?

Based on those who are NOT self-employed or DO NOT own a business

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Business	13	27
Nonprofit organization	34	22
A religious institution	4	19
Government	46	29
Don't know	3	4
Refused	*	0
N=	668	250

* Less than 1%

Q9 Do you work for local, state or the federal government?

Based on those working in government

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Local	46	53
State	43	36
Federal	9	7
Don't know	2	4
Refused	0	0
N=	305	72

Q10 Roughly how many people work in your organization?

Based on those who work for a business, nonprofit, religious institution, or government, or don't know or refused

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
0-10	15	20
11-20	10	16
21-50	20	27
51-100	15	7
101-200	10	7
201-500	13	8
More than 500	12	8
Don't know	5	6
Refused	*	*
N=	668	250

* Less than 1%

Q11 I'm going to read some statements people make about their jobs. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each statement. The first|next is (Insert). Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

List items were rotated

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know	Refused
a My job is a dead-end with no future.						
HUMAN SERVICES	4	11	20	64	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	8	10	18	62	1	*
b It is easy to burn out in the work I do.						
HUMAN SERVICES	50	31	9	9	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	48	31	10	11	*	0
c I always have too much work to do.						
HUMAN SERVICES	39	31	20	9	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	31	30	25	13	1	0
d The work I do is fun.						
HUMAN SERVICES	55	38	5	2	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	68	27	3	2	0	0
e I can make a difference in the lives of the people I serve.						
HUMAN SERVICES	81	17	2	*	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	88	10	1	1	0	0
f I feel valued in the work I do.						
HUMAN SERVICES	60	31	6	4	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	70	23	4	3	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q13 When you were making the decision to take your current job, how important were each of the following in your decision? Was the (Insert) a very important consideration in your decision, somewhat important, not too important, or not a consideration at all in your decision? And what about (Insert)?

	A very important consideration	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not a consideration at all	Don't Know	Refused
a salary						
HUMAN SERVICES	15	49	22	14	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	17	40	23	20	0	0
b benefits, such as health insurance and vacation time						
HUMAN SERVICES	37	27	10	25	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	23	21	12	42	1	0
c job security						
HUMAN SERVICES	45	32	8	16	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	32	26	13	29	0	0
d public respect for the type of work you'd be doing						
HUMAN SERVICES	38	31	13	18	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	34	32	12	22	1	0

	A very important consideration	Somewhat important	Not too important	Not a consideration at all	Don't Know	Refused
e opportunity to help children, teens and families						
HUMAN SERVICES	87	11	*	1	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	81	15	1	3	1	0
f opportunity to do challenging work						
HUMAN SERVICES	61	31	3	4	*	*
COMPARISON GROUP	58	29	6	7	*	0
g flexible hours or a convenient location						
HUMAN SERVICES	49	29	9	12	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	57	29	5	8	1	*
h opportunity to serve the community						
HUMAN SERVICES	65	28	3	4	*	*
COMPARISON GROUP	56	31	5	8	1	0

* Less than 1%

Q15 To what extent does your job involve (Insert)—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

List items were rotated

	A great deal	A fair amount	Not too Much	Not at all	Don't Know	Refused
a protecting the public						
HUMAN SERVICES	33	30	21	14	2	*
COMPARISON GROUP	25	25	21	26	3	0
b helping children, teens and families						
HUMAN SERVICES	88	10	1	*	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	80	16	3	*	*	0

* Less than 1%

Q16 To what extent do you feel you accomplish something worthwhile in your job—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	66	73
A fair amount	32	24
Not too much	2	3
Not at all	*	*
Don't know	0	*
Refused	*	0

* Less than 1%

Q17 Does the word (Insert) describe the work you do in your job—very well, somewhat well, not too well or not well at all? How about (Insert)?

	Very well	Somewhat well	Not too well	Not well at all	Don't Know	Refused
a helpful						
HUMAN SERVICES	82	17	1	*	0	*
COMPARISON GROUP	84	13	*	2	*	0
b caring						
HUMAN SERVICES	86	13	*	1	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	92	7	1	*	*	0
c responsible						
HUMAN SERVICES	88	11	*	*	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	92	7	*	0	*	0
d frustrating						
HUMAN SERVICES	29	46	15	10	0	0
COMPARISON GROUP	22	43	19	16	0	0
e unappreciated						
HUMAN SERVICES	15	36	20	28	1	*
COMPARISON GROUP	11	25	20	43	1	0

* Less than 1%

Q18 If you were to quit your job, how much would you miss (Insert)? Would you miss them a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all? And how about (Insert)?

	A great deal	A fair amount	Not too Much	Not at all	Don't Know	Refused
a the people you serve or help						
HUMAN SERVICES	68	27	3	1	*	*
COMPARISON GROUP	70	23	5	2	0	0
b your coworkers						
<i>Based on those who work with other people</i>						
HUMAN SERVICES	50	34	10	5	1	*
COMPARISON GROUP	48	36	11	3	2	1

* Less than 1%

Q19 How much training have you had to do your job—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or none at all?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	65	61
A fair amount	29	33
Not too much	5	5
Not at all	1	1
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q20 How much training did you get at school—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or none at all?

Based on those who had training

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	43	45
A fair amount	36	28
Not too much	11	12
Not at all	10	14
Don't know	*	1
Refused	0	0
N=	789	344

* Less than 1%

Q21 And how much training did you get on the job through either formal or informal instruction—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or none at all?

Based on those who had training

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	55	52
A fair amount	33	33
Not too much	9	10
Not at all	2	4
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0
N=	789	344

* Less than 1%

Q22 In total, how adequate do you feel your training is to do your job? Is it more than adequate, adequate, less than adequate, or not adequate at all?

Based on those who had training

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
More than adequate	40	47
Adequate	54	46
Less than adequate	5	6
Not adequate at all	1	1
Not applicable	*	1
Don't know	0	*
Refused	0	0
N=	789	344

* Less than 1%

Q23 How much mentoring or guidance do you receive from a senior person where you work—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or none at all?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	27	21
A fair amount	35	34
Not too much	21	22
Not at all	16	21
Don't know	1	2
Refused	*	0
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q24 Do you need to be licensed or certified to do your job?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	64	59
No	35	40
Don't know	*	1
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q25 And to what extent are the people you work with (Insert)—to a great extent, somewhat, not too much or not at all? How about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

Based on those who work with other people

	A great extent	Somewhat	Not too much	Not at all	Don't Know	Refused	N=
a open to new ideas							
HUMAN SERVICES	43	44	9	4	1	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	49	39	8	3	1	*	270
b willing to help other workers learn new skills							
HUMAN SERVICES	57	34	6	2	1	*	680
COMPARISON GROUP	55	34	3	4	2	1	270
c concerned about achieving your workplace's mission							
HUMAN SERVICES	61	31	5	2	1	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	62	27	4	3	3	*	270
d committed to helping the people they serve							
HUMAN SERVICES	71	24	3	1	*	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	71	22	3	1	2	*	270

* Less than 1%

Q26 How would you rate the overall morale of the people you work with—is it very high, somewhat high, somewhat low, or very low?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very high	22	33
Somewhat high	55	52
Somewhat low	17	8
Very low	6	5
Don't know	1	1
Refused	0	*
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q27 Just your best guess, what percent of the people you work with do not do their job well?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Zero	14	23
1-5	23	24
6-10	18	16
11-20	15	7
21-30	11	9
More than 30 percent	16	16
Don't know	3	4
Refused	*	1
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q28 And which ONE of these reasons best explains their poor performance?

List items were rotated

Based on those who said 1% or more of coworkers are performing poorly

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
They do not have the training to do their jobs well	10	14
Your workplace does not ask enough of them	7	9
They are not qualified to do their job	10	7
They are not committed to helping the people they serve	43	43
They have too much work to do it well	23	16
Don't know	6	10
Refused	*	1
N=	562	192

* Less than 1%

Q29 Which of the following pairs of words best describe the hiring process for new people at your work-place? Does (Insert first word) or (Insert second word) best describe the hiring process? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

Based on those who work with other people

	First word	Second word	Don't Know	Refused	N=
a confusing/simple					
HUMAN SERVICES	26	67	6	1	680
COMPARISON GROUP	17	76	6	1	270
b fast/slow					
HUMAN SERVICES	46	48	6	1	680
COMPARISON GROUP	51	42	7	1	270
c fair/unfair					
HUMAN SERVICES	85	12	2	*	680
COMPARISON GROUP	88	7	3	1	270

Q30 Overall, is where you work a very good place to work, somewhat good, somewhat bad or very bad place to work?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very good	58	66
Somewhat good	38	30
Somewhat bad	3	3
Very bad	1	1
Don't know	*	*
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q31 Overall, are the people you work with very qualified, somewhat qualified, not too qualified, or not qualified at all to do their job?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very qualified	54	59
Somewhat qualified	43	36
Not too qualified	3	1
Not qualified at all	*	0
Don't know	*	3
Refused	0	*
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q32 To what extent is talent or achievement rewarded at your workplace? Is it rewarded a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	16	20
A fair amount	41	44
Not too much	31	20
Not at all	11	11
Don't know	*	4
Refused	*	*
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q33 On average, how long do the best-qualified people stay at your workplace—do they stay a couple of years or less, or do they stay longer than that?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A couple of years or less	28	17
Longer than that	69	76
Don't know	3	7
Refused	*	1
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q34 When qualified people leave, how often do they leave to do a very different type of work? Do they often, sometimes, rarely or never leave to do different work?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Often	14	14
Sometimes	29	20
Rarely	42	43
Never	9	13
Don't know	6	9
Refused	*	1
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q35 And how good a job does your workplace do disciplining poor performing employees—very good, somewhat good, not too good or not good at all?

Based on those who work with other people

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very good	20	21
Somewhat good	40	38
Not too good	24	20
Not good at all	12	12
Don't know	4	8
Refused	*	1
N=	680	270

* Less than 1%

Q36 To what extent do you have (Insert) to do your job well? Do you always, often, sometimes or rarely have this? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated (g and h were always asked last)

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Not applicable	Don't Know	Refused	
a access to the information needed								
HUMAN SERVICES	50	33	14	2	*	*	0	
COMPARISON GROUP	61	23	12	2	1	0	0	
b the equipment and supplies needed								
HUMAN SERVICES	40	29	24	7	1	*	0	
COMPARISON GROUP	54	26	14	5	1	0	0	
c access to the training needed								
HUMAN SERVICES	45	30	18	5	1	*	0	
COMPARISON GROUP	49	25	16	6	4	1	0	
d a safe work place								
HUMAN SERVICES	64	24	10	2	*	*	0	
COMPARISON GROUP	79	14	5	1	1	0	0	
e adequate support services from the community								
HUMAN SERVICES	22	30	32	13	2	1	0	
COMPARISON GROUP	31	27	23	12	6	1	0	
f enough other co-workers and staff								
<i>Based on those who work with other people</i>								
HUMAN SERVICES	28	33	28	10	1	1	0	N=680
COMPARISON GROUP	35	29	19	12	4	*	*	N=270
g adequate supervision								
<i>Based on those who do not own a business or organization</i>								
HUMAN SERVICES	49	28	15	5	2	*	0	N=699
COMPARISON GROUP	53	21	14	4	7	1	0	N=266
h authority to make routine decisions								
<i>Based on those who do not own a business or organization</i>								
HUMAN SERVICES	50	26	18	5	*	1	0	N=699
COMPARISON GROUP	63	23	9	3	1	*	0	N=266

* Less than 1%

Q37 When you tell your friends and neighbors what you do, do you feel very proud, somewhat proud, not too proud or not proud at all?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very proud	72	71
Somewhat proud	25	26
Not too proud	1	1
Not proud at all	1	1
Don't know	1	1
Refused	0	0

Q38 All in all, how good a job does your workplace do (Insert)—a very good, somewhat good, not too good or not at all good job? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

Based on those who work with other people

	Very good	Somewhat good	Not too good	Not at all good	Don't Know	Refused	N=
a running its programs and services							
HUMAN SERVICES	59	36	4	1	1	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	69	27	1	2	*	*	270
b helping people							
HUMAN SERVICES	68	30	1	1	0	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	74	23	2	*	*	0	270
c serving the community							
HUMAN SERVICES	65	32	2	1	*	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	68	29	1	1	1	0	270
d spending its money wisely							
HUMAN SERVICES	47	37	9	5	2	0	680
COMPARISON GROUP	51	34	7	4	4	0	270

* Less than 1%

Q39 Do you trust your workplace to do the right thing just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Just about always	51	57
Most of the time	36	30
Only some of the time	13	11
Don't know	1	1
Refused	0	1

Q40 Overall, how satisfied are you with (Insert)—very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all	Not applicable	Don't Know	Refused
a your job							
HUMAN SERVICES	65	30	3	1	0	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	71	26	1	1	0	1	0
b your salary							
HUMAN SERVICES	23	47	16	13	*	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	25	50	16	8	1	0	0
c your job security							
HUMAN SERVICES	60	31	4	4	1	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	68	22	5	3	1	1	0
d your job benefits, such as health insurance and vacation time							
HUMAN SERVICES	39	31	9	10	10	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	29	27	7	12	23	1	*

* Less than 1%

Q41 And how satisfied are you with (Insert)—are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, not too satisfied or not satisfied at all? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all	Don't Know	Refused
a your opportunity for advancement						
HUMAN SERVICES	29	39	13	12	5	1
COMPARISON GROUP	31	38	9	10	9	3
b your opportunity to develop new skills						
HUMAN SERVICES	48	39	7	5	1	*
COMPARISON GROUP	49	37	5	6	1	*
c the respect you get for the type of work you are doing						
HUMAN SERVICES	43	45	8	4	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	56	33	6	4	*	*
d your opportunity to accomplish something worthwhile						
HUMAN SERVICES	69	27	2	1	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	75	21	1	2	1	0
e the recognition you get when you work extra long hours or do a superior job						
HUMAN SERVICES	31	37	16	14	1	*
COMPARISON GROUP	36	36	15	10	2	1

* Less than 1%

Q42 When you think about your job, how much satisfaction do you get from your job overall—a great deal, a fair amount, not too much, or none at all?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
A great deal	62	68
A fair amount	33	29
Not too much	4	2
None at all	1	1
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q43 I'm going to read some statements people make about their jobs. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree with each statement. The first/next is (Insert). Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

List items were rotated

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't Know	Refused
a the pay is low						
HUMAN SERVICES	39	30	19	12	*	0
COMPARISON GROUP	33	32	18	17	0	0
b I work long hours						
HUMAN SERVICES	39	24	20	16	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	40	23	18	19	0	0
c it is frustrating to serve people						
HUMAN SERVICES	13	31	21	35	1	0
COMPARISON GROUP	12	30	18	40	1	0

* Less than 1%

Q44 Which best describes your position at your workplace—Are you a supervisor or an employee?

Based on those who do not own a business or organization

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Supervisor	27	27
Employee	72	73
Don't know	1	1
Refused	*	0
N=	699	266

* Less than 1%

Q45 Are you a senior-level, middle-level or junior-level supervisor (manager)?

Based on those who those who are supervisors

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Senior-level	39	52
Middle-level	41	35
Junior-level	19	7
Don't know	1	6
Refused	0	0
N=	187	71

Q46 Are you a senior-level, middle-level or junior-level employee?

Based on those who those who are employees

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Senior-level	27	27
Middle-level	44	44
Junior-level	22	22
Don't know	7	6
Refused	1	1
N=	506	193

Q47 Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Most people can be trusted	59	65
Can't be too careful	38	32
Depends	3	2
Don't know	*	1
Refused	*	0

* Less than 1%

Q48 And in your opinion, which is generally more often to blame if a person is poor—lack of effort on his or her own part, or circumstances beyond his or her control?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Lack of effort	37	44
Circumstances beyond his/her control	54	46
Don't know	8	7
Refused	1	3

Q49 Do you consider yourself to be part of a profession, or not?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	95	92
No	5	7
Don't know	*	1
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q51 Are you a member of a professional association or not?

Based on those who consider themselves part of a profession

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	52	47
No	47	52
Don't know	1	1
Refused	0	0
N=	759	320

Q52 For how many years have you been working at your current job?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Less than a year	7	6
1-2 years	23	25
3-5 years	25	25
6-10 years	19	16
11-20 years	19	18
More than 20 years	7	10
Don't know	0	0
Refused	0	0

Q53 And for how many years have you been doing this type of work?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Less than a year to 2 years	12	10
3-5 years	19	22
6-10 years	24	25
11-20 years	28	29
More than 20 years	17	14
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q54 Do you work full-time or part-time? Full time is 30 hours a week or more.

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Full-time	88	72
Part-time	12	28
Refused	0	0

Q55 Do you work more than one job for pay?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	23	23
No	77	77
Don't know	*	*
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q56 How long do you think you'll be doing this type of work?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
1 to 2 years	13	17
3 to 5 years	18	26
6 to 10 years	17	17
More than 10 years	49	36
Don't know	4	4
Refused	0	0

Q57 Are you a member of a union?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	23	14
No	77	86
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q58 In total, how many years have you been working for pay?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Less than a year to 2 years	2	1
3-5 years	5	10
6-10 years	17	16
11-20 years	34	35
More than 20 years	41	37
Don't know	1	*
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

D1 Record respondent's sex

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Male	18	14
Female	82	86

D2 What is your age?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
18-29	24	23
30-39	25	30
40-49	29	24
50-59	17	16
60-69	4	5
70 or older	*	1
Don't know	0	0
Refused	1	1

* Less than 1%

D3 Are you of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban or some other Latino background?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Yes	8	10
No	92	90
Don't know	*	*
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

D4 What is your race? White, African-American or black, Asian or some other race? (If Hispanic/Latino ask:) Are you white Latino, black Latino or some other race?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
White/white Latino	77	84
Black or African-American/black Latino	16	8
Asian	*	1
Other	5	6
Don't know	*	1
Refused	1	*

* Less than 1%

D5 What was the last grade or class you completed in school?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
None, or grade 1-8	*	0
High school incomplete (grades 9-11)	2	2
High school graduate (grade 12 or GED certificate)	16	19
Business, technical or vocational school after high school	2	2
Some college, no four-year degree	22	27
AA degree or Child Development Associate degree (CDA)	6	5
College graduate (BS, BA or other four-year degree)	28	25
Post-graduate training or professional schooling after college (e.g., toward a master's degree or PhD, law or medical school)	24	19
Don't know	*	0
Refused	0	0

* Less than 1%

D6 Last year, what was your total household income from all sources before taxes? Just stop me when I get to the right category.

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Less than \$10,000	3	3
\$10,000 to under \$20,000	9	4
\$20,000 to under \$30,000	14	9
\$30,000 to under \$40,000	14	14
\$40,000 to under \$50,000	13	16
\$50,000 to under \$75,000	21	23
\$75,000 to under \$100,000	13	14
\$100,000 or more	7	9
Don't know	2	3
Refused	3	6

D8 Finally, in general, would you describe your political views as very conservative, conservative, moderate, liberal or very liberal?

	HUMAN SERVICES	COMPARISON GROUP
Very conservative	7	8
Conservative	28	37
Moderate	35	33
Liberal	18	14
Very liberal	7	5
Don't know	4	2
Refused	1	1

APPENDIX C: COLLEGE SENIORS AND THE HUMAN SERVICES WORKFORCE

Prepared by Princeton Survey Research Associates for the Brookings Institution

Results based on N=1015 college seniors; 503 from top schools, 512 from other schools¹

Interview dates: April 4, 2002 – April 28, 2002

Margin of error is plus or minus 3 percentage points for results based on the full sample

Q1 Have you already gotten a job?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED ²	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	32%	28%	33%
No	67	71	67
Don't know	1	*	1
Refused	0	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q2 What will you be doing in your new job? (precoded open-end)

Among those who have already gotten a job

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Gave response	98	100	98
Don't know	2	0	2
Refused	0	0	0
N=	310	143	167

Q3 Have you started to look for a job?

Among those who have not gotten a job

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	74	84	74
No	25	16	26
Don't know	1	0	1
Refused	0	0	0
N=	699	358	341

Q4 Have you had any job interviews?

Among those who have not gotten a job

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	36	42	35
No	64	58	65
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	699	358	341

* Less than 1%

Q5 How important is each of the following in your decision about where to work after you graduate. Is the (Insert) a very important consideration, somewhat important, not too important, or not a consideration at all in your decision about where to work? And what about (Insert)?

List items were randomized

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a salary			
A very important consideration	32	24	32
Somewhat important	55	58	55
Not too important	9	14	9
Not a consideration at all	4	5	4
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
b benefits, such as health insurance and vacation time			
A very important consideration	63	46	65
Somewhat important	31	43	30
Not too important	4	7	4
Not a consideration at all	1	5	1
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0
c job security			
A very important consideration	62	38	64
Somewhat important	30	43	29
Not too important	5	13	4
Not a consideration at all	3	6	3
Don't know	*	1	0
Refused	0	0	0
d opportunity for advancement			
A very important consideration	60	48	61
Somewhat important	30	36	30
Not too important	6	10	6
Not a consideration at all	3	6	3
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
e opportunity to learn new skills			
A very important consideration	66	58	67
Somewhat important	29	36	28
Not too important	5	5	4
Not a consideration at all	*	1	*
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

f public respect for the type of work you'd be doing			
A very important consideration	47	24	49
Somewhat important	37	49	37
Not too important	10	18	10
Not a consideration at all	5	9	5
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	*	*	0

g opportunity to help people			
A very important consideration	70	54	71
Somewhat important	25	36	24
Not too important	3	7	3
Not a consideration at all	1	3	1
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0

h opportunity to do interesting work			
A very important consideration	84	82	84
Somewhat important	15	16	15
Not too important	*	1	*
Not a consideration at all	*	1	*
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

i opportunity to do challenging work			
A very important consideration	62	64	62
Somewhat important	35	31	36
Not too important	2	3	2
Not a consideration at all	*	1	*
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0

j opportunity to repay college loans			
A very important consideration	49	30	50
Somewhat important	16	18	16
Not too important	6	10	6
Not a consideration at all	28	41	27
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	*	*	*

* Less than 1%

Q6 In your job search how much consideration have you given to working for (Insert)? Have you given this very serious consideration, somewhat serious consideration, not too serious consideration, or no consideration at all? How about (Insert)?

List items were randomized

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a a nonprofit organization			
Very serious consideration	18	26	18
Somewhat serious consideration	30	32	29
Not too serious consideration	20	16	21
No consideration at all	31	25	31
Don't know	*	1	*
Refused	0	0	0
b the federal government			
Very serious consideration	13	15	13
Somewhat serious consideration	27	22	28
Not too serious consideration	21	21	21
No consideration at all	38	41	38
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
c state or local government			
Very serious consideration	20	13	20
Somewhat serious consideration	26	20	26
Not too serious consideration	19	25	19
No consideration at all	35	42	35
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
d a business			
Very serious consideration	31	33	30
Somewhat serious consideration	34	32	34
Not too serious consideration	13	14	13
No consideration at all	21	20	21
Don't know	1	*	1
Refused	*	*	*

* Less than 1%

Q7 How well informed are you about jobs and career opportunities in (Insert)—very informed, somewhat informed, not too informed, or not informed at all? And what about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a Child welfare, such as working with families needing help or with children in foster care			
Very informed	13	10	13
Somewhat informed	37	29	38
Not too informed	32	33	32
Not informed at all	18	28	17
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
--	-------------------	----------------	------------------

b Juvenile justice, such as working with youth in trouble with the law or in juvenile detention centers

Very informed	7	6	7
Somewhat informed	28	20	29
Not too informed	36	32	36
Not informed at all	28	41	27
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0

c Youth services, such as after school programs or recreation programs for children

Very informed	20	16	21
Somewhat informed	43	32	43
Not too informed	19	26	19
Not informed at all	18	26	17
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

d Childcare, such as working in day care centers or preschools

Very informed	18	8	19
Somewhat informed	34	28	35
Not too informed	23	30	22
Not informed at all	25	33	24
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q8 How seriously have you considered working in (Insert)—very seriously, somewhat seriously, not too seriously, not seriously at all? And what about working in (Insert)?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
--	-------------------	----------------	------------------

a Child welfare

Very seriously	9	11	9
Somewhat seriously	21	14	21
Not too seriously	26	23	26
Not seriously at all	44	52	43
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0

b Juvenile justice

Very seriously	4	3	4
Somewhat seriously	14	11	14
Not too seriously	29	23	30
Not seriously at all	52	63	52
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0

c Youth services

Very seriously	12	12	12
Somewhat seriously	35	25	36
Not too seriously	18	19	18
Not seriously at all	35	45	34
Don't know	*	*	0
Refused	0	0	0

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
--	-------------------	----------------	------------------

d Childcare

Very seriously	11	5	12
Somewhat seriously	19	16	20
Not too seriously	23	23	23
Not seriously at all	47	56	46
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

e a job that helps people on welfare find employment

Very seriously	5	4	5
Somewhat seriously	20	19	20
Not too seriously	26	23	26
Not seriously at all	49	54	48
Don't know	1	0	1
Refused	0	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q9 How much do you know about finding a job working with children, youth or families? Do you know a great deal, a fair amount, not too much or nothing at all about this?

Among those who are very seriously or somewhat seriously considering working with children, youth or families

67

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
A great deal	20	16	20
A fair amount	48	45	48
Not too much	24	32	24
Nothing at all	9	7	9
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0
N=	562	256	306

Q10 Which of the following pairs of words best describe what you think the hiring process would be like for a job working with children, youth or families? Does (Insert first word) or (Insert second word) best describe what you think the hiring process would be like? How about (Insert first word) or (Insert second word)?

Among those who are very seriously or somewhat seriously considering working with children, youth or families

List items were rotated

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a confusing/simple			
Confusing	42	44	42
Simple	51	49	51
Don't know	7	6	7
Refused	1	1	1
N=	562	256	306

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
b fast/slow			
Fast	26	25	26
Slow	69	71	69
Don't know	5	4	5
Refused	*	0	*
N=	562	256	306

c fair/unfair			
Fair	86	89	86
Unfair	10	7	10
Don't know	4	3	4
Refused	*	*	0
N=	562	256	306

* Less than 1%

Q11 If you take a job working with children, youth or families, how long do you think you'll stay in the job—
1 to 2 years, 3 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, or more than 10 years.

Among those who are very seriously or somewhat seriously considering working with children, youth or families

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
1 to 2 years	23	50	22
3 to 5 years	34	25	35
6 to 10 years	8	5	8
More than 10 years	30	14	31
Don't know	4	5	4
Refused	*	*	0
N=	562	256	306

* Less than 1%

Q12 There are a number of reasons why people do not seriously consider working with children, youth or families. For each of the following statements please tell me if this is a major reason, a minor reason, or not a reason at all that you're not seriously considering working with children, youth or families.

Among those who are not too seriously or not seriously at all considering working with children, youth or families

List items were rotated

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a The pay and benefits are poor.			
A major reason	25	30	25
A minor reason	32	36	32
Not a reason at all	41	33	41
Don't know	2	2	2
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
b The work isn't very interesting or enjoyable.			
A major reason	10	17	10
A minor reason	22	28	22
Not a reason at all	67	53	68
Don't know	*	1	0
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

c The work isn't rewarding.			
A major reason	2	3	2
A minor reason	18	15	18
Not a reason at all	79	80	79
Don't know	1	1	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

d Children, youth and families are hard to work with.			
A major reason	9	15	8
A minor reason	32	31	32
Not a reason at all	58	52	59
Don't know	1	1	*
Refused	*	*	*
N=	449	246	203

e I don't enjoy working with children, youth or families.			
A major reason	9	15	9
A minor reason	22	23	22
Not a reason at all	67	61	68
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	*	0	*
N=	449	246	203

f The professional opportunities are limited.			
A major reason	24	28	23
A minor reason	31	32	31
Not a reason at all	44	39	44
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

g I don't have the skills or training to work with children, youth or families.			
A major reason	30	31	30
A minor reason	32	35	32
Not a reason at all	38	34	38
Don't know	*	*	0
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
h It isn't highly respected work in our society.			
A major reason	5	7	4
A minor reason	22	21	22
Not a reason at all	73	72	73
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

i Children, youth and families have too many problems.			
A major reason	5	7	5
A minor reason	26	23	26
Not a reason at all	68	70	68
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

j Children, youth and families don't appreciate the help they get.			
A major reason	4	2	4
A minor reason	17	14	18
Not a reason at all	78	83	77
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	449	246	203

* Less than 1%

Q13 Have you ever done volunteer work?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	90	94	90
No	10	6	10
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	*	0	*

* Less than 1%

Q14 For how many organizations have you done volunteer work?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
1	15	9	15
2	22	21	22
3	25	22	25
4	11	14	11
5	12	16	12
6 to 10	11	13	11
More than 10	3	4	3
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

Q15 Overall, how would you rate your experience doing volunteer work? Was it very positive, somewhat positive, not too positive or not positive at all?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Very positive	74	66	74
Somewhat positive	26	33	25
Not too positive	*	1	*
Not positive at all	*	*	*
Don't know	*	*	0
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

* Less than 1%

Q16 And overall to what extent were your skills and talents used by the organization(s) for which you did volunteer work—very much, a fair amount, not too much or not at all?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Very much	28	19	28
A fair amount	51	53	51
Not too much	18	24	17
Not at all	3	5	3
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

* Less than 1%

Q17 Did your volunteer work make you more likely to consider working in the nonprofit sector after graduation, less likely or did it have no effect on your career plans?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
More likely	34	37	34
Less likely	8	8	8
No effect	58	55	58
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

* Less than 1%

Q18 [Was your volunteering experience/were any of your volunteering experiences] a requirement for graduation or not?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	17	9	18
No	82	91	82
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

* Less than 1%

Q19 Have you ever done volunteer work with children, youth or families?

Among those who have volunteered

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	81	79	81
No	18	21	18
Don't know	*	1	*
Refused	0	0	0
N=	930	471	459

* Less than 1%

Q20 Have you ever had a paying job, excluding babysitting, that involved working with children, youth or families?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	51	46	52
No	48	54	48
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	0	0	0

* Less than 1%

Q21 Overall, how well do the following words describe your previous [volunteering and/or work] experiences with children, youth or families. Does the word (Insert) describe your [volunteering and/or work] experiences with children, youth or families very well, somewhat well, not too well, or not well at all? And what about (Insert)?

Among those who have volunteered or worked with children, youth or families

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a frustrating			
Very well	9	5	10
Somewhat seriously	22	25	21
Not too well	24	35	23
Not well at all	44	33	45
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	*	0	*

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
b rewarding			
Very well	76	71	77
Somewhat seriously	22	26	22
Not too well	1	3	1
Not well at all	*	*	*
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0
c bureaucratic—too many rules and regulations			
Very well	13	9	13
Somewhat seriously	32	33	32
Not too well	25	30	25
Not well at all	29	27	29
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	0	0	0
d disorganized			
Very well	10	11	10
Somewhat seriously	33	37	33
Not too well	22	26	21
Not well at all	34	25	35
Don't know	1	*	1
Refused	0	0	0
e interesting			
Very well	74	66	74
Somewhat seriously	22	30	22
Not too well	2	3	1
Not well at all	2	1	2
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	*	0	*
f fulfilling			
Very well	77	71	78
Somewhat seriously	21	26	20
Not too well	1	2	1
Not well at all	1	1	*
Don't know	*	0	*
Refused	*	0	*

* Less than 1%

Q22 People have different job expectations. To what extent do you expect to (Insert)—to a great extent, a moderate extent, not too much, or not at all? And how about (Insert)?

List items were rotated

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
a be treated as a professional by managers			
Great extent	78	70	79
Moderate extent	20	25	19
Not too much	1	3	1
Not at all	*	1	*
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	*	*	0
b be promoted quickly			
Great extent	21	17	21
Moderate extent	55	53	55
Not too much	16	20	16
Not at all	7	8	7
Don't know	1	1	1
Refused	0	0	0
c be assigned challenging work			
Great extent	60	59	60
Moderate extent	35	37	35
Not too much	3	3	3
Not at all	1	1	1
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	*	*	0
d be given meaningful work			
Great extent	68	64	69
Moderate extent	29	32	29
Not too much	2	3	2
Not at all	1	1	1
Don't know	*	*	0
Refused	0	0	0
e be recognized and rewarded for high performance and productivity			
Great extent	43	39	43
Moderate extent	41	49	41
Not too much	12	9	12
Not at all	3	3	3
Don't know	1	*	1
Refused	0	0	0
f participate in decisions that affect the way work is performed			
Great extent	47	41	48
Moderate extent	45	42	45
Not too much	6	13	5
Not at all	2	4	1
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
g receive training and acquire new skills			
Great extent	67	58	67
Moderate extent	30	35	30
Not too much	2	5	2
Not at all	1	1	1
Don't know	*	*	*
Refused	0	0	0

* Less than 1%

D1 Respondent's sex

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Male	34	39	34
Female	66	61	66

D2 What is your age?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
18-22	59	91	57
23-25	23	7	24
26-30	8	1	8
31-50	9	1	10
Over 50	1	0	1
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	*	0	*

* Less than 1%

D3 In general, would you describe your political views as very conservative, conservative, moderate, liberal or very liberal?

Very conservative	3	2	3
Conservative	28	14	29
Moderate	36	25	37
Liberal	23	37	22
Very liberal	7	19	6
Don't know	2	1	2
Refused	1	1	1

D4 Are you of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban or some other Latino background?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Yes	4	4	4
No	95	95	95
Don't know	*	*	0
Refused	*	*	*

* Less than 1%

D5 What is your race? White, African-American or black, Asian or some other race? (If Hispanic/Latino)
 Are you white Latino, black Latino or some other race?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
White/white Latino	86	84	87
Black or African-American/black Latino	6	4	6
Asian	3	5	3
Other	4	5	4
Don't know	*	1	0
Refused	1	1	1

* Less than 1%

D6 What is your major?

	TOTAL WEIGHTED	TOP SCHOOLS	OTHER SCHOOLS
Gave response	100	100	100
Don't know	0	0	0
Refused	0	0	0

End Notes

- 1 Top schools = Top 50 universities and top 50 liberal arts colleges as rated by *U.S. News & World Report*. Other schools list does not include community colleges, medical schools, religious universities, or technical schools.
- 2 The total column is weighed, top school and other schools columns are not weighted.