



2020

Using the Civic Voluntarism Model to Compare the Political Participation of US and Swiss Social Workers

Jason Ostrander

Sacred Heart University, ostranderj@sacredheart.edu

Tobias Kindler

Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences

Janelle K. Bryan

Sacred Heart University, bryanj3@sacredheart.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/socwk_fac



Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ostrander, J., Kindler, T., & Bryan, J. (2020). Using the civic voluntarism model to compare the political participation of US and Swiss social workers. *Journal of Policy Practice and Research*, 1-16. Doi: 10.1007/s42972-020-00020-z

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Work at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Social Work Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu, lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu.

Sacred Heart University

From the Selected Works of Jason Ostrander

2021

Using the Civic Voluntarism Model to Compare the Political Participation of US and Swiss Social Workers

Jason Ostrander, *Sacred Heart University*

Tobias Kindler, *Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/jason-ostrander/82/>

Using the Civic Voluntarism Model to Compare the Political Participation of
US and Swiss Social Workers

Jason Ostrander, PhD, MSW
Sacred Heart University, School of Social Work
5151 Park Avenue, Fairfield, CT 06825
Tel: (203) 396-6338
ostranderj@sacredheart.edu

Tobias Kindler, M.Sc. Social Work
FHS St.Gallen, University of Applied Sciences, Department of Social Work
Rosenbergstrasse 59, 9000 St.Gallen
Tel: +41 71 226 18 96
tobias.kindler@fhsg.ch

Janelle Bryan, PhD, MSW
Sacred Heart University, School of Social Work
5151 Park Avenue, Fairfield, CT 06825
bryanj3@sacredheart.edu

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jason Ostrander, PhD, MSW,
Assistant Professor, Sacred Heart University, School of Social Work, 5151 Park Avenue,
Fairfield, CT 06825, email: ostranderj@sacredheart.edu

Abstract

Purpose

Various international and national social work ethical principles call social workers to participate in politics, although not all social workers in the United States and Switzerland embrace politics in their professional practice. A growing body of social work literature addresses social workers' participation in politics. This article presents a comparative study of political participation, political efficacy, and political ideology among social workers in the United States and Switzerland.

Methods

This study used two separate cross-sectional surveys to better understand the political participation, political efficacy, and political ideology of social workers in the United States (n=3033) and Switzerland (n=1242).

Results

The results indicate that US social workers are more politically active and have a higher internal sense of political efficacy than Swiss social workers. Regarding political ideology, the Swiss participants position themselves more clearly on the left wing than their US colleagues.

Conclusion

As one of few international practice comparison pieces, this article aims to further stimulate research on political activity of social workers. For this purpose, starting points is by further developing the political efficacy of social workers and further educating social workers during and after social work education about engaging in justice related activities to better society and the lives of their clients.

Keywords: Civic Voluntarism Model, policy practice, macro social work, political participation, civic participation, international comparison, Switzerland, United States of America

Using the Civic Voluntarism Model to Compare the Political Participation of US and Swiss Social Workers

A growing body of social work literature addresses social workers' participation in politics, both in the United States and across the globe. Although political participation has been an integral part of the social work profession starting from the Progressive Era in the United States (Stern & Axinn, 2017), social workers direct involvement crests and falls according to broader national and international forces, such as war, movements away from democratic governments, capital earnings over fair labor laws and practices, and inequitable social and economic policies. Currently, a renewed effort to integrate politics into social work practice internationally appears to be overlooked in the United States, where social workers seem reluctant to challenge political actors and systems of power as part of their practice—although such challenge is central to social work values and ethics (Ostrander, 2017). Political participation is an ethical standard of the US National Association of Social Workers (NASW) (2017) and the Swiss Association of Social Workers, AvenirSocial (2010) Code of Ethics, as well as the International Federation of Social Workers (2018) mission statement, and the Council on Social Work Education's (2015) Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards. These professional, ethical, and values-based mandates charge social workers to confront social injustice in all forms and advocate for systematic change, which requires one to hold political opinions and wield power (Abrams & Moio, 2009; Ortiz & Jani 2010; Reisch & Jani, 2012; Weinberg, 2010).

Although a number of studies have examined the political involvement of social workers in a particular country or region (for an overview of the current state of research see Kindler, in press), very little comparative international research has been conducted on the subject (Gray et

al., 2002; Gal & Weiss-Gal, 2014; Gal & Weiss-Gal, 2017). For that matter, the authors could not find evidence of the political activity of social workers in Switzerland or the United States being compared to that of other countries. The US and Swiss contexts present a unique comparative opportunity given the difference in the development of social work in the respective countries. The US has a longer and considerably more developed professional history of both branches of social work--Charity Organization Societies (COS) and Settlement House Movement--than Switzerland. In Switzerland, social work developed primarily from the fight against poverty mainly organized by women in the 19th century, which is parallel to the COS. In 1896, there were 5695 women's associations in Switzerland with about 100,000 members who were committed to promoting financial help on an individual level. Following the example of the international settlement movement, the pioneers of social work in Switzerland increasingly complemented the support of individuals with social reforms and advocated for a professionalization of the training of social workers. Settlements did not develop in Switzerland until after the First World War, and few have existed since (Matter, 2011; Epple & Schär, 2015). Using data from two voluntary self-administered, self-report surveys, this article aims to fill this gap by comparing the political activity, political efficacy, and political ideology of licensed social workers in the United States to social workers in Switzerland.

Literature Review

Political Participation Framework: Civic Voluntarism Model

Social work practice is intrinsically connected to social and political contexts. In the academic literature, socio-political and economic practice contexts are frequently highlighted. To better understand political participation in general in the United States, Verba, Scholzman, and Brady created the Civic Voluntarism Model, (CVM). The most frequently used political science

model in United States research (Lane & Humphreys, 2011), the CVM was used in the political science literature to better understand the political participation of a range of populations and contexts, including gender and racial political differences in the South (Fullerton & Stern, 2010; Fullerton & Stern, 2013), Latino immigrants in the Midwest (Sandoval & Jennings, 2012), and the rising economic inequality and political participation in New York City (Levin-Waldman, 2013).

Verba et al. (1995) define political participation as “directly...affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies” (p. 38). The CVM posits that political engagement requires three critical elements for people to be (1) motivated, (2) able to participate, and (3) they are most likely to do so if they are a part of groups that request such participation. These three integral components are conceptualized in the CVM as: *resources*, *engagement*, and *recruitment*. *Resources* are considered essential to possess the capacity to engage in political activities, including time, money, and civic experience. *Engagement* is necessary to political participation because it creates an essential connection to communities and their individual members through political interests, partisanship, political ideology, and etc. *Recruitment* encourages people to engage in political activity, whether or not directly asked, and is fundamental to the model (Verba et al., 1995). Also integral to this model is the attainment and exercise of civic skills, which Verba et al. describe as “communications and organizational abilities that allow citizens to use time and money effectively in political life” (p. 304). These skills, which are developed early in one’s life and utilized in non-political environments such as work, volunteer and religious organizations, impact individuals’ motivation and capacity (resources) for political activity. As noted by Verba et al, these early factors that contribute to political participation are cumulative over the life

course, and those with privilege experience increased advantage over those without. The CVM asserts that exercising civic skills in these arenas can facilitate political participation through the development of relevant skills, such as decision-making, planning or chairing meetings, and public-speaking (p. 273). In addition, the institutional context in which such opportunities are presented, and personal characteristics must also be taken into consideration, as some individuals will engage at greater levels than others.

Rubenson (2000) compares the CVM to social capital theory, which involves “networks of association, trust and norms of reciprocity” (p. 10) and is another model which holds participation in non-political arenas as key in influencing both the caliber of political institutions and explaining political participation. He concludes that while both models make valid contributions, they fail to adequately explain differences in political participation. Based on an assessment of literature that directly addresses social work’s person-in-environment perspective, it is our position that individual factors related to personal power and privilege may be instrumental in influencing motivation through perceptions of efficacy. Holbrook, Sterret, Johnson & Krysan (2015) found that issue-specific factors accounted for significant differences in political participation by race. Enloe (2004) and Friedman found that the political arena is perceived differently by men and women based primarily on their societal beliefs concerning the heteronormative gender roles and expectations of men and women. Fox and Lawless (2003; 2012) specifically found that such gender norms impact women’s self-perception of being qualified to engage in politics (Enloe, 2004; Freedman, 2002). While literature exists on the role of gender and political participation (Ostrander, Bryan, & Lane, 2019a), there is a paucity of literature specific to race, and even less is known about how race

and gender, and their intersection (Hardy-Fanta, 1993; Jaramillo, 2010; Moore, 2005), affect political participation (Simien, 2007).

In social work, a handful of studies on political participation have used the CVM and included practitioners who have been identified using social work licensure or other non-NASW membership lists. Among these studies is Ritter (2008), who used a more diverse and richer sampling pool to compare the political participation of licensed social workers from eleven states across the country to participation among the general public. Her study found that: licensed social workers engaged in politics regardless of their access to resources; partisanship/political ideology did not predict the political participation of licensed social workers; and very few licensed social workers had been recruited into political activity—although the vast majority of licensed social workers belonged to religious organizations or civic and voluntary organizations. In 2011, Lane (2011) used snowball sampling to identify social workers who had run for political office at the state and local levels. She identified 467 social workers and found that 84% believed they had an ethical obligation to change policy and less than half (48%) had learned about the political process during their social work education. Further, the participant's access to resources (e.g., money, time, energy) was found to be instrumental in deciding to run for office or not. Ostrander and Kelly's (2019) qualitative study of clinical social workers described women who voiced a lack of resources—including time and civic skills—and consequently lacked political efficacy as evidenced by their low levels of political participation. Finally, Hoefler (2013) builds upon Verba, et al's model for the social work profession, describing the CVM as a useful model for understanding social workers' engagement in policy practice. (for a more robust list of studies that utilized the CVM, please see McClendon, Lane, Ostrander, and Smith, 2020)

In comparison to the United States, study of political participation in Switzerland is nascent. Only one study has been conducted to date: Kindler (2019a) used the CVM to focus on factors influencing the political participation of social workers in all states in Switzerland. This research identified membership in professional organizations, political interest, internal political efficacy, agreement with political social work and the strength of left-right-ideology as main influencing factors. Regionally, however, Kulke and Schmidt (2019) used the CVM in Germany and found that social workers who are more interested in politics, who remember political content as part of their education, or who belong to a professional association, tend to work more toward the political mandate of social work. Thus, 76% of the members of the German Association of Social Workers (DBSH) state that they work with a political understanding of social work as compared to 59% of all the study participants. While the CVM has been used internationally, Ghana (Bob-Milliar, 2012), Romania (Tatar, 2015), Spain (Serrat, Villar & Celdran, 2015), Sweden (Lidstrom, 2013), no cross-cultural comparisons have been made to date.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to utilize the CVM and its components to identify the differences between US and Swiss social workers concerning their political participation. Each of the following research questions addresses a component of the model:

Research question 1 (Resources): How does political activity differ between US and Swiss social workers?

Research question 2 (Engagement): How does political efficacy (internal and external) differ between US and Swiss social workers?

Research question 3 (Engagement): How do US and Swiss social workers identify in terms of political ideology?

Research question 4 (Recruitment): How do recruitment networks increase political activity for US and Swiss social workers?

Methods

The data described here were collected from US and Swiss social work participants through two separate voluntary self-administered, self-report surveys that included scales and items that could be used for comparison. The first author developed his questionnaire in 2017 based on findings from his dissertation work, a review of the literature, and feedback from political social work experts. The questionnaire consisted of 85 closed- and open-ended items organized into eight sections and was sent to 44,552 US social workers. The second author developed his questionnaire in 2017 and 2018 based on a broad review of the literature and after several consultations with the first author. The questionnaire consisted of 77 closed- and open-ended items organized into five sections and was sent to 40,000 Swiss social workers. The following sections give insight into the operationalization and measurement of CVM constructs and the study's sampling strategies.

Measurement

Political Activity. In addition to the definition of political activity above, the construct consists of complex dimensions of activity, which Verba et al. (1995) classify broadly as high and low investment activities. High investment activities entail substantial, consistent effort and commitment of time and material resources over an extended period, whereas low investment behaviors do not require sustained effort and can be easily completed with nominal time and other resource expenditure (Serrat, Warburton, Petriwskyj, & Villar, 2018). These concepts

correspond with Rome and Hoechstetter's (2010) instrument measuring political engagement, the Political Activity Scale (PAS). The 20-item scale was adapted and further developed by Ostrander, Lane, McClendon, Hayes, and Smith, (2017) and Kindler (2019a; 2019b). The PAS' "high category" scale was adapted as an *Active Subscale* of behaviors that accord with Verba and colleague's description of high investment activities, such as contacting an elected official, working for pay or as a volunteer for a political campaign, participating in political rallies, marches or protests. The PAS' "low category" scale was adapted to a *Passive Subscale*, that includes behaviors such as voting on local, state and federal levels, using social media to share political or civic information, donating money, discussing current policy and boycotting products. This accords with Verba et al's description of low investment activities.

Participants were asked how often they have participated in each of these types of activities during the last 12 months, with the following possible responses: never (0), rarely (1), sometimes (2), often (3), very often (4). For the current study, the PAS was modified to include only those items which would be understood by both US and Swiss social workers, for a total of 14 items with a score range of 0-56. The Cronbach's Alpha for the entire scale was $\alpha=.851$. The Active subscale and Passive subscale each had 7 items with a score range of 0-28, and Cronbach's alphas were $\alpha=.788$ and $\alpha=.748$ respectively.

Political Efficacy. The survey also included standard scales for political efficacy developed for the American National Election Survey (n.d) (ANES), later refined by Niemi, Craig, and Mattei (1991) to operationalize internal and external political efficacy using a four-item scale. Political efficacy refers to one's belief that they are capable of intervening in the political system (internal efficacy), that the system is capable of responding to their intervention (external efficacy), and the combination of the two (overall political efficacy). All of the items

measuring this construct have five Likert responses that range from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The *internal* political efficacy scale, ranging from 0 to 8, included two items: “How well do you understand the important political issues facing our country?” and “I feel I could do as good a job in public office as most other people.” The *external* political efficacy scale, ranging from 0 to 8, included two items as well: “How much do public officials care what people like you think?” and “How much can people like you affect what the government does?” The ANES scale of internal and external efficacy has been tested for validity and reliability, reporting a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha=.80$ (Niemi, Craig, & Mattei, 1991).

Political ideology. Freedman (2001) refers to political ideology as “a set of ideas, beliefs, values, and opinions... that competes deliberately as well as unintentionally over providing plans of action for public policy making....” (p. 7174). Domhoff (2013) contends that political ideologies can be placed on a *left* and *right* spectrum or referred to as *liberal* and *conservative* in US politics. Those falling to the left, or liberal side of the spectrum, tend to dislike hierarchy, be more oriented toward human needs, focus more on group well-being and social networks, and are more egalitarian than those on the right side of the ideological spectrum. Those on the right, or conservative, side of the spectrum find themselves to be individually oriented, believe success is an individual achievement through individual effort, respect the rule of law and hierarchy, and are supportive of the social and political power structures. In order to measure the respondents’ political ideology, a 6-point scale was applied. Participants were asked to place themselves on the scale with 1 indicating a left-wing orientation and 6 indicating a right-wing orientation.

Recruitment Networks. Involvement in political activity is influenced by civic organization membership, or recruitment networks per the CVM. These include work, voluntary and religious organizations. Participants’ recruitment networks were assessed through two items

that asked if they were a member of a union and if they were a member of a professional social work organization, with a yes/no response set.

Sample

In 2017 and 2018, the professional boards of all 50 United States and the District of Columbia were contacted and a data file including email addresses of social work licensees was requested. In the end and after multiple inquiries, the following 24 states (approximately 221,327 licensed social workers in total) provided data files: Arkansas, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The sample of states are located in all four regions of the United States (United States Department of Commerce: Economic and Statistics Administration, United States Census Bureau, n.d.). After cleaning the list of erroneous email addresses, 133,656 were identified as eligible to participate in the study. Using a random number generator in Microsoft Excel, one-third of these licensed social workers, or 44,552, were selected for the sample. These email addresses were organized into panels of 5,000 and every member of the sample was emailed on four separate occasions between June and October 2018. Most respondents completed the questionnaire in 15 minutes. Of the 3,033 random selected individuals who started the survey, 2,350 participants (77%) finished the questionnaire. The response rate of 7% was calculated after considering the total sample size and the number of completed responses. When considering only the invitations that were opened, the study's response rate rises to an estimated 15%.

In Switzerland, social workers don't have the opportunity to get a license. In addition, there is no reliable data about the actual number of social workers working in the country

(AvenirSocial, 2017), but the number is estimated at about 90,000 (Kindler, 2019a). As a result of having no list of social workers in Switzerland to work from, random sampling could not be used as a data collection process. Instead, the questionnaire was distributed through employers, professional associations, Universities, alumni organizations, Facebook groups and personal contacts. An estimated 40,000 social workers have received the invitation to participate (Kindler, 2019a). Of the 2245 individuals who started the survey, 1824 participants (81%) finished the questionnaire between May and July 2018. For the purposes of this article, all students and other participants who did not hold at least a bachelor's degree in social work have been excluded; 1242 social workers remain in the sample, for an overall response rate of 3%.

In order to compare the political activity and the political attitudes between US ($N=3033$) and Swiss social workers ($N=1242$), both datasets have been merged in the Statistical Package SPSS, Version 24. For the 4275 participants, the mean age was 46 ($M=45.7$, $SD=14.1$) and the sample was predominantly female (76%). Ninety-eight percent of US social workers are registered to vote and in Switzerland, where citizenship is the only requirement to vote, 96% in the Swiss sample are Swiss citizens.

Results

In order to analyze the data collected and to answer the research questions, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of US social workers with the mean scores of Swiss social workers.

Research Question 1 (Resources): Does political activity differ between US and Swiss social workers?

Political Activity Scale. There was a statistically significant difference in overall political participation measured on the Political Activity Scale (Range 0-56, $M=23.0$, $SD=8.8$). US social

workers ($M=24.2$, $SD=8.5$, $n=2372$) have been found to be more politically active than Swiss social workers ($M=20.8$, $SD=8.9$, $n=1242$), $t(3612)=11.308$, $p<.001$. Fourteen percent of the US sample can be called often or very often politically active while in the Swiss sample, only 9% of the respondents can be assigned to this category.

Political Activity on the Active Subscale. There was also a statistically significant difference in political participation measured on the Active Subscale (Range 0-28, $M=6.0$, $SD=4.8$). US social workers ($M=6.8$, $SD=4.6$, $n=2446$) have been found to be more politically engaged in active behaviors than Swiss social workers ($M=4.4$, $SD=4.6$, $n=1242$), $t(3686)=15.005$, $p<.001$. As shown in Table 1, US social workers are more involved than the Swiss social workers in all seven activities, with the biggest difference being in contacting politicians. Concerning active political behavior, only 3% of US and only 2% of Swiss social workers engage often or very often in those kinds of activities.

[Insert Table 1 approximately here]

Political Activity on the Passive Subscale. There was also a statistically significant difference in political participation measured on the Passive Subscale (Range 0-28, $M=17.1$, $SD=5.0$). US social workers ($M=17.4$, $SD=4.7$, $n=2415$) have been found to be more politically engaged in passive behaviors than Swiss social workers ($M=16.4$, $SD=5.3$, $n=1242$), $t(2246.547)=5.606$, $p<.001$. Concerning passive political behavior, Table 2 shows that US social workers are more involved than the Swiss social workers in all seven activities, with one exception: Swiss social workers discuss current policy more often than US social workers. Sixty-three percent of US and 53% of Swiss social workers engage often or very often in those kinds of activities.

[Insert Table 2 approximately here]

Research question 2 (Engagement): Does political efficacy (internal and external) differ between US and Swiss social workers?

Both internal ($\alpha=.604$) as well as external political efficacy ($\alpha=.559$) were measured with two items, both ranging from 0 (no efficacy) to 4 (very high efficacy). In the analysis, the two items were added together so that the new scale ranged from 0 to 8. Overall political efficacy ($\alpha=.541$) therefore consisted of these four items with a scale range of 0-16.

Political efficacy. There was a statistically significant difference in overall political efficacy (Range 0-16, $M=8.0$, $SD=2.6$). US social workers ($M=8.2$, $SD=2.3$, $n=2762$) have been found to have a higher overall political efficacy than the Swiss group ($M=7.6$, $SD=3.2$, $n=1242$), $t(1851.014)=6.085$, $p<.001$, although 29% of Swiss social workers rate having a strong or very strong political efficacy compared to 27% of US social workers.

Internal political efficacy. There was a statistically significant difference in internal political efficacy (Range 0-8, $M=4.6$, $SD=1.8$). US social workers ($M=4.7$, $SD=1.6$, $n=2779$) have been found to have higher confidence in their ability to intervene in the political system than the Swiss group ($M=4.1$, $SD=2.3$, $n=1242$), $t(1805.979)=8.501$, $p<.001$. 56% of the US sample reported a strong or very strong internal political efficacy, while in the Swiss group, only 46% of the respondents can be assigned to this category.

External political efficacy. Concerning external political efficacy (Range 0-8, $M=3.4$, $SD=1.5$), an independent sample t-Test has revealed no significant differences between US ($M=3.4$, $SD=1.5$, $n=2776$) and Swiss social workers ($M=3.4$, $SD=1.7$, $n=1242$), $t(2077.079)=0.105$, $p=.916$, although 29% of Swiss social workers rate having a strong or very strong external political efficacy compared to only 21% of US social workers.

Research question 3 (Engagement): How do US and Swiss social workers identify in terms of political ideology?

In order to measure the respondents' political ideology, a 6-point scale was applied. Participants were asked to place themselves on the scale with 1 indicating completely left-wing orientation and 6 indicating completely right-wing orientation. There was a statistically significant difference in political ideology of US ($M=2.5$, $SD=1.1$, $N=2604$) and Swiss social workers ($M=2.0$, $SD=0.9$, $N=1242$), $t(3032.326)=13.465$, $p<.001$. Thirteen percent of the US respondents placed themselves on the right side, while only 6% of Swiss participants placed themselves on the right side.

Research question 4 (Recruitment): How do recruitment networks increase political activity for US and Swiss social workers?

Participants' memberships in recruitment networks were assessed through two items that asked if they were a member of a union and if they were a member of a professional social work organization, with a yes/no response set. Seventeen percent of respondents were a member of a trade union and 37% indicated being a member in a professional social work organization. Swiss participants were significantly more involved in both networks, $\chi^2(1)=14.663$, $p<.001$, $n=3610$, $CC=.064$, $p<.001$.

Both recruitment network types increased the political engagement of social workers significantly, meaning that social workers belonging to a trade union ($M=25.4$, $SD=9.3$, $n=578$) were more politically active than social workers without membership in a trade union ($M=22.6$, $SD=8.6$, $n=2904$), $t(783.206)=-6.595$, $p<.001$. Also, social workers belonging to a professional social work association ($M=25.0$, $SD=8.7$, $n=1521$) were more politically active than social

workers without professional association membership ($M=21.6$, $SD=8.6$, $n=2093$), $t(3612)=-11.585$, $p<.001$.

Regarding recruitment networks it has been shown that 37% of the total sample are members of a professional social work association and 17% are members of a trade union. Swiss social workers are significantly more often a member in both network types. There is an influence of membership on political participation: Membership in a professional work association increases the political participation of both the US and Swiss subsample. Membership in a trade union increases only the political activity of Swiss social workers, while there is no such significant difference in the US subsample. The connection between professional social work association membership and political activity is the same for US social workers ($M_1=23.1$, $SD_1=8.4$, $n_1=1459$, $M_2=26.0$, $SD_2=8.4$, $n_2=913$, $t(2370)=-8.057$, $p<.001$) and Swiss social workers ($M_1=18.2$, $SD_1=8.2$, $n_1=634$, $M_2=23.5$, $SD_2=8.8$, $n_2=608$, $t(1221.597)=-11.061$, $p<.001$). However, the connection between trade union membership and political participation differs for the US social worker ($M_1=24.2$, $SD_1=8.3$, $n_1=1908$, $M_2=24.8$, $SD_2=9.3$, $n_2=332$, $t(428.565)=-0.990$, $p=.323$) with no significant differences between members and non-members; and for Swiss social workers ($M_1=19.5$, $SD_1=8.3$, $n_1=996$, $M_2=26.2$, $SD_2=9.4$, $n_2=246$, $t(344.055)=-10.263$, $p<.001$) where a significant difference exists. This implies that membership in a union influences the political activity of Swiss social workers to a greater extent than their US counterparts.

Limitations

The limitations of this study include the sampling process and size. While the sampling process in the US study has been randomized, the Swiss group consists of a non-probabilistic sample. In addition, the US sample ($N=3033$) is twice the size of the Swiss sample ($N=1242$).

While not all US participants answered every question, the Swiss participants were required to answer all questions in the survey. The second major limitation of this study is the use of a self-report measure and a moment in time. Also, there may be reliability challenges that could potentially be attributable to the particular political environment of the 2018 midterm election when the US survey was administered as well as the concurrent anti-immigrant movement in Switzerland. Finally, there is a potential limitation in comparing and interpreting the US to Swiss participants' political participation because of different electoral systems, culture, and political structures (Norman and Hintze, 2005). Likewise, variation exists in requirements for social workers to be licensed and in the normative understanding of social work practice. For example, Switzerland does not require college educated social workers to be licensed or registered with a governmental entity, and the US has different laws in each state that dictates who must be licensed.

Discussion

The results of this study show that across both countries, half of the participating social workers are rarely or never politically active, while just over a third can be described as sometimes politically active and a mere 12% of participants are often or very often politically active. Although these results show that the political engagement of social workers can certainly be increased, comparisons with the overall population suggest that social workers are more politically active than average citizens (Kindler, 2019a). While there was no significant difference between Swiss and US social workers' external efficacy, Swiss social workers reported higher rates of external efficacy, and US social workers reported significantly higher rates of internal efficacy. Understanding the two countries' outcomes may be related to several intersecting factors: internal and external efficacy and ideological perspective. For Swiss social

workers, who have higher external efficacy and a more left-leaning ideological view, it would seem to naturally follow that their internal efficacy would be lower, given that they report being more expectant of the government to be responsive to the needs of the people, and in a progressive way. US social workers however, who report a greater internal efficacy, but lower external efficacy combined with more moderate to conservative political ideology, may see themselves as needing to be more competent and active in engaging the political system, as they do not see it as being readily responsive to the needs of the people or themselves in a way that de-emphasizes marginalization. While these differences exist, it is interesting that social workers in both countries report higher levels of internal efficacy than external. Civic skills and the strength of the influence of recruitment networks may be a factor affecting political participation and efficacy. While social workers reported being a part of a trade union, it was membership in a professional association that significantly increased political participation of social workers in both countries. Swiss social workers were significantly more often a member in both network types, and such membership significantly affected their political participation. This potentially speaks to a collectivist versus individualist orientation between the two network types in the United States. Whereas the majority of US social workers are clinical or micro level practitioners, the support from professional social work organizations reinforces/supports this orientation in terms of resources and networking opportunities. Trade unions however, defined primarily by their function of collective bargaining and related advocacy would explain a connection to political activity and its macro influences/effects (Reisch & Jani, 2012).

A comparison between active (range 0-28, $M=6.0$) and passive political activities (range 0-28, $M=17.1$) shows a clear preference for passive political activities by social workers in both countries. These findings confirm the results of Ezell (1993), Domanski (1998), Ostrander

(2017), Kindler (2019a), and others that social workers engage most frequently in political activities requiring few resources, such as time, money, civic knowledge or public exposure. This preference may be attributable to individual level factors such as gender. Over three-quarters of respondents overall were women. As noted in the literature, women tend to view themselves as being less qualified than men to engage in politics, which tends to be equated with “high-investment” or “active” political activities. Additionally, because of traditional gender norms and role expectations, women disproportionately engage in unpaid labor in the home, leaving them with little time to engage in political activity (Ostrander, Bryan, & Lane, 2019). This therefore makes “low investment” or “passive” activities more accessible to them. The ramifications of passive participation are such that while making some political contribution, as a group, women are still structurally marginalized in terms of policy issues such as the gender wage gap, a lack of parity with other developed countries in terms of paid family leave, etc.

Implications

Although both the US and Swiss professional codes of ethics explicitly call on social workers to become politically active, only 12% of the social workers in this study are often or very often politically active. One implication for the professional associations could be to further clarify to the members of the profession why political activity should also be part of professional social work practice. Furthermore, the proportion of respondents who feel little or no competence to participate in politics is astonishingly high. To address this problem, employers, professional associations and universities might work intentionally to strengthen the political efficacy of social workers and social work students. In doing so, social workers can become involved in more active political behaviors. With their advocacy skills and systems-perspective approach, they can also contribute to the political system becoming more responsive, thereby

potentially increasing practitioners' external political efficacy. This ripple effect can also be extended to recruitment networks. With increased active behaviors, and higher levels of internal and external efficacy, social workers involved in professional associations can influence these organizations and their membership to increase their involvement in macro-level issues and movements. In addition, given the significant association between professional association membership and political participation, encouraging social workers to join a trade union, and collaborative relationships between professional social work organizations and trade unions may increase political participation by enhancing civic skills and political efficacy for practitioners.

This article analyzed differences between US and Swiss social workers regarding the application of the Civic Voluntarism Model and its three components--*resources*, *engagement*, and *recruitment*. While the model has shown its utility in this and previous studies, as previously noted, there are some challenges to its ability to adequately explain political participation. Verba et al.'s conceptualization of high-investment and low-investment activities is problematized by its limited attention to socio-political power dynamics. Specifically, the model does not take into account the "cost" of participating in political activity based on one's positionality or social location or the "cost" of engaging in different forms of political activity. For example, in the United States, with its long history of disenfranchisement based on race, gender and socioeconomic status, the "low-investment" or "passive" act of voting can require extensive resources for people of color, women and low-income individuals (Wang, 2012). With decreases in the number of polling stations in numerous locales, disproportionate investments of time may be spent waiting to vote (Salame, 2020), which can also be a financial conundrum for those in low-income employment, who may have little in the way of paid time off or lack transportation to engage in political activities (Brady & McNulty, 2011)). Additionally, there may be financial

disenfranchisement resulting from involvement in the penal system, where voting rights are suspended until legal fees and fines are paid (Sawyer, 2019). For women, whose uncompensated labor in the home is at two and a half times the rate of men's there is even more of a shortage of time and money to engage in political activities (UN Women, 2017).

Perhaps as Rubenson (2004) argues, the overall scale of participation in the Civic Voluntarism Model is problematic. In order to adequately answer the question of why an individual participates, there needs to be an analysis of the different goals' individuals have when they engage in political acts and an examination of the choices they make, both choices between various modes of participation, and choices between who they support. Even if people possess the resources of time, money, and civic skills they still may be non-participants. These resources may not be sufficient for participation to take place. In the specific context of an article comparing US and Swiss social workers, the significant difference suggests perhaps a need for additional measures to capture the reality of political engagement across populations. Our research suggests that being often or very often politically active may be attributed to differences in practitioner social identities and related issue-specific concerns, or identity-specific inhibiting factors, which may not adequately be captured in the CVM. For example, the majority of the sample was predominantly white and female in both countries. While respondents from both countries are likely to live in metropolitan cities with diverse demographics, the recent socio-political environments have seen white supremacy and xenophobia take center stage in the political arena prior to the administration of the research studies. In addition, despite overall diversity in US cities, many residential areas are highly segregated, and Switzerland, which reports demographics in terms of ethnicity/national origin and considers people of color to be foreign. According to Rubenson (2004), diversity is a catalyst for political participation, and

operates based on a zero-sum perspective of gains and resource distribution for various identity groups. In order to strengthen social work practice, additional research in this field--both domestically and internationally--is needed to better understand and promote political participation.

Conflict of Interest and Funding

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest nor did they receive any funding to conduct this study.

References

- Abrams, L. & Moio, J. (2009). Critical race theory and the cultural competence dilemma in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 45*(2), 245-261.
- American National Election Studies. (2017). Home Page. Retrieved from <http://www.electionstudies.org/>
- AvenirSocial (2010). *Swiss Social Work Professional Code of Ethics*. Berne: AvenirSocial.
- Bob-Milliar, G. M. (2012). Political party activism in Ghana: factors influencing the decision of the politically active to join a political party. *Democratization, 19*(4), 668-689.
- Brady, H. E., & McNulty, J. E. (2011). Turning out to vote: The costs of finding and getting to the polling place. *American Political Science Review, 115*-134.
- Council on Social Work Education. (2015). Educational policy and accreditation standards. Retrieved from https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Accreditation-Process/2015-EPAS/2015EPAS_Web_FINAL.pdf.aspx
- Domanski, M. (1998). Prototypes of Social Work Political Participation: An Empirical Model. *Social Work, 43*(2), pp. 156–167.
- Domhoff, W. G. (2013). The left and the right in thinking, personality, and politics. Retrieved from https://whorulesamerica.ucsc.edu/change/left_and_right.html
- Epple, R., & Schär, E. (2015). *Spuren einer anderen Sozialen Arbeit. Kritische und politische Sozialarbeit in der Schweiz 1900-2000*. Zürich: Seismo.
- Ezell, M. (1993). The political activity of social workers: A post Reagan update. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 20*(4), pp. 81–97.
- Freeden, M. (2001). Ideology: Political aspects. In (N.J. Smelser & P.B. Baltes, eds.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, Elsevier Ltd.

- Fullerton, A. S., & Stern, M. J. (2010). Explaining the persistence and eventual decline of the gender gap in voter registration and turnout in the American south, 1956–1980. *Social Science History*, 34(2), 129-169.
- Fullerton, A. S., & Stern, M. J. (2013). Racial differences in the gender gap in political participation in the American South, 1952–2004. *Social Science History*, 37(2), 145-176.
- Gal, J. & Weiss-Gal, I. (Eds.) (2014). *Social workers affecting social policy: An international perspective*. Policy Press.
- Gal, J. & Weiss-Gal, I. (Eds.) (2017). *Where Academia and Policy Meet. A cross-national perspective on the involvement of social work academics in social policy*. Policy Press.
- Gray, M., Collett van Rooyen, C., et al. (2002). The political participation of social workers: A comparative study. *International Journal of Social Welfare* 11, 99-110.
- Hoefler, R. (2013). Social workers affecting social policy in the US. In J. Gal & I. Weiss-Gal (Eds.), *Social workers affecting social policy: An international perspective*. (pp. 161-184). Policy Press.
- International Federation of Social Workers. (2018). Global social work statement of ethical principles. Retrieved from <https://www.ifsw.org/global-social-work-statement-of-ethical-principles/>
- Kindler, T. (2019a). *Sozialarbeitspolitik. eine empirische untersuchung der politischen aktivität von fachpersonen der sozialen arbeit in der Schweiz* (Masterthesis). St.Gallen: FHS St.Gallen, University of Applied Sciences.
- Kindler, T. (2019b). Strengthening political social work: Empirical based suggestions. Retrieved from http://www.sozialarbeitspolitik.ch/Kindler_2019_Strengthening-Political-Social-Work.pdf

- Kulke, D. & Schmidt, J. (2019). Der politische auftrag sozialer arbeit in der praxis: Empirische ergebnisse. In: Köttig, Michaela & Röh, Dieter (Ed.): *Soziale Arbeit in der Demokratie – Demokratieförderung in der Sozialen Arbeit*. Opladen, Berlin & Toronto: Barbara Budrich, pp. 301-313.
- Lane, S. R. (2011). Political content in social work education as reported by elected social workers. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 47(1), 53-72.
doi:10.5175/JSWE.2011.200900050
- Lane, S. R., & Humphrey, N. (2011). Social workers in politics: A national survey of social work candidates for elected office. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 10, 225-244.
- Levin-Waldman, O. M. (2013). Income inequality and disparities in civic participation in the New York City Metro Area. *Regional Labor Review*, 15(2), 22-29.
- Lidström, A. (2013). Citizens in the city-regions: Political orientations across municipal borders. *Urban Affairs Review*, 49(2), 282-306.
- Matter, S. (2011). *Der Armut auf den Leib rücken. Die Professionalisierung der Sozialen Arbeit in der Schweiz (1900-1960)*. Zürich: Chronos.
- McClendon, J., Lane, S., Ostrander, J., & Smith, T. (2020). Training social workers for political engagement: Exploring regional differences in the United States. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 40(2), 147-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2020.1724240>
- National Association of Social Workers. (2017). NASW code of ethics. Retrieved from <https://www.socialworkers.org/About/Ethics/Code-of-Ethics/Code-of-Ethics-English>
- Niemi, R. G., Craig, S. C., & Mattei, F. (1991). Measuring internal political efficacy in the 1988 National Election Study. *The American Political Science Review*, 85(4), 1407-1413.

Ortiz, L. & Jani, J. (2010). Critical race theory: A transformational model for teaching diversity.

Journal of Social Work Education, (46)2, 175-193.

Ostrander, J. (2017). *To participate or not to participate, that is the question: A critical phenomenological study of clinical social workers and their political participation.*

(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

<http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/1296>

Ostrander, J. & Kelly, K. (2020). Fulfilling the ethical obligation to political participation:

Clinical social workers, professional socialization, and professional identity. *Journal of Social Work Education, 56(4)*. DOI: 10.1080/10437797.2020.1817824

Ostrander, J., Bryan, J., & Lane, S. (2019). Clinical social workers, gender, and perceptions of political participation. Special issue on “Promoting social change: Policy advocacy, research, and innovation in social work.” *Advances in Social Work, 19(1)*, 256-275.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18060/22609>

Ostrander, J., Lane, S., McClendon, J., Hayes, C., & Smith, T. (2017). Collective power to create political change: Increasing the political efficacy and engagement of social workers.

Journal of Policy Practice, 16(3), 261-275. <https://doi->

[org.ezproxy.lib.uconn.edu/10.1080/15588742.2016.1266296](https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uconn.edu/10.1080/15588742.2016.1266296)

Pritzker, S. a. L., Shannon R. (2016). Political social work: History, forms, and opportunities for innovation. *Social Work, 62(1)*, 80-82.

Reisch, M. & Jani, J. (2010). The new politics of social work practice: Understanding context to promote change. *British Journal of Social Work Education, (42)6*, 1132-1150.

- Ritter, J. A. (2008). A national study predicting licensed social workers' levels of political participation: The role of resources, psychological engagement, and recruitment networks. *Social Work, 53*(4), 347-357. doi:10.1093/sw/53.4.347
- Rome, S. H., & Hoechstetter, S. (2010). Social work and civic engagement: The political participation of professional social workers. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 37*(3), 107-129.
- Rubenson D (2000, April 14-19) *Participation and politics: Social capital, civic voluntarism, and institutional context* [Conference Workshop]. European Consortium for Political Research Joint Session, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Rubenson D (2004, June 3-5) *Community heterogeneity and political participation in American cities* [Conference presentation]. Canadian Political Science Association, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.
- Salame, R. (2020) Texas closes hundreds of polling sites, making it harder for minorities to vote *The Guardian*. March 2, 2020. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/mar/02/texas-polling-sites-closures-voting>
- Sandoval, J. S. O., & Jennings, J. (2012). Latino civic participation: Evaluating indicators of immigrant engagement in a Midwestern city. *Latino Studies, 10*(4), 523-545.
- Sawyer, N. (2019). Too Poor to Vote: Felony Disenfranchisement in Florida Violates Bearden. *Tex. J. on CL & CR, 25*, 205.
- Serrat, R., Villar, F., & Celdrán, M. (2015). Factors associated with Spanish older people's membership in political organizations: the role of active aging activities. *European Journal of Ageing, 12*(3), 239-247.

- Serrat, R. Warburton, J., Petriwskyj, A. , & Villar, F. (2018). Political participation and social exclusion in later life: What politically active seniors can teach us about barriers to inclusion and retention. *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life : IJAL*, 12(2), 53–88. <https://doi.org/10.3384/ijal.1652-8670.18395>
- Stern, M. & Axinn, J. (2017). *Social welfare: A history of the American response to need*(9th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Tătar, M. I. (2015). Selective or generic activism? Types of participants, political action repertoires and mobilisation capacity in a post-communist society. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 67(8), 1251-1281.
- UN Women (2017). Women In the Changing World of Work - Facts You Should Know. Retrieved from: <https://interactive.unwomen.org/multimedia/infographic/changingworldofwork/en/index.html>
- United States Department of Commerce: Economic and Statistics Administration, United States Census Bureau (n.d.) Census Regions and Divisions of the United States. Retrieved from https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/maps-data/maps/reference/us_regdiv.pdf
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, T. A. (2012). *The politics of voter suppression: Defending and expanding Americans' right to vote*. Cornell University Press.
- Weinberg, M. (2010). The social construction of social work ethics: Politicizing and broadening the lens, *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 21(1), 32-44.

Tables

Table 1 <i>Political Activities on the Active Subscale (Range 0=never to 4=very often)</i>			
Active Political Activity	US sample Mean (SD)	Swiss sample Mean (SD)	Total Mean (SD)
Contacted elected official***	1.6 (1.1)	1.0 (1.2)	1.4 (1.1)
Volunteer with interest group***	1.4 (1.1)	1.0 (1.4)	1.2 (1.2)
Participate in political rallies, protests***	1.3 (1.1)	1.0 (1.2)	1.2 (1.1)
Voice opinion to media markets***	1.0 (1.1)	0.5 (1.0)	0.8 (1.1)
Volunteer for a political campaign**	0.8 (1.0)	0.7 (1.1)	0.8 (1.0)
Civil disobedience***	0.6 (0.9)	0.2 (0.7)	0.5 (0.9)
Work for pay for a political campaign***	0.1 (0.5)	0.0 (0.3)	0.1 (0.5)
*** Significant difference at p<.001, ** Significant difference at p=.002			

Table 2 <i>Political Activities on the Passive Subscale (Range 0=never to 4=very often)</i>			
Passive Political Activity	US sample Mean (SD)	Swiss sample Mean (SD)	Total Mean (SD)
Vote federal***	3.8 (0.7)	3.3 (1.2)	3.6 (0.9)
Vote state***	3.5 (1.0)	3.3 (1.1)	3.4 (1.0)
Vote local	3.2 (1.1)	3.2 (1.2)	3.2 (1.2)
Discuss current policy***	2.5 (1.0)	3.2 (0.9)	2.7 (1.0)
Boycott products***	2.3 (1.1)	1.5 (1.4)	2.0 (1.2)
Donate money***	1.2 (1.2)	0.9 (1.1)	1.1 (1.2)
Use social media to engage in politics	1.1 (1.2)	1.0 (1.3)	1.1 (1.3)
*** Significant difference at p<.001			