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ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL WORK SCHOOLS AND FIELD PLACEMENT AGENCIES IN THEIR JOINT TASK OF EDUCATING SOCIAL WORKERS

Sandra Kahn

This is a study of the process of collaboration between schools of social work and their field placement agencies as they go about the business of educating tomorrow's social workers. In order to develop a complete picture of the nature of the inter-organizational interactions actors in both settings were studied. The student, the field instructor and the university's director of field work were chosen because of their active involvement in the process under investigation.

The sample was drawn from the six graduate schools of social work in the New York City area (i.e., Adelphi, Columbia, Fordham, Hunter, New York University and Wurzweiler). The study was conducted during the 1975-76 academic year. Perceptions of students and field teachers regarding the school-agency relationship was obtained through the mail administration of two separate questionnaires. A total of 285 second year students and 180 field instructors responded. Each of the six field work directors were viewed as "key informants" and seen in individual face-to-face interviews.

The history of social work education is marked by the consistent association between academia and practice. This study attempted to explain the reasons for this engagement. Areas examined involved the motivation of each institution in initiating this educational partnership
and each setting's stake in maintaining it. Efforts were also made to understand the historically recurrent tensions between school and agency through eliciting respondents' opinions regarding their existence and degree of friction. The strains investigated included conflict in organizational structure and goals, the generic-specific controversy, discrepancies in content taught in class and field and the integration of the two.

Special attention was also given to respondents' views of the intimacy of the school-agency relationship, the linkage mechanisms joining them, the reciprocal influences on each other's systems, the importance of the field experience and its connection to the university.

In addition the investigator sought out differential perceptions of various debatable issues in social work education. Among these was the subject of generic training. Opinions were solicited regarding the applicability of the same practice skills in work with individuals, groups and communities and on the need for a "fields of practice" approach. Responses indicated a dubiousness about generic education and an inclination towards method teaching and away from fields of practice concentrations (e.g., aging...). Other educational issues dealt with the prevalence and need for uniform standards for student performance in the field, as well as for choice of field work placements and field instructors.

An attempt was made to explain the views of respondents by school affiliation, by certain demographic factors and by ratings of the field placement as an educational experience. In order to determine whether role effected opinions the analysis of the results also included
comparisons of student, field instructor and field work director perceptions.

The findings of the study reaffirmed the centrality of field work in social work education. It was viewed as being more influential than class work in shaping a student's professional training. Not surprising was the view that the field instructor exerted the greatest influence on learners. Serious question was raised as to who controlled field instruction since the field teacher was seen as a relatively isolated and unsupported agent in his role of helping students to integrate the skills of professional practice. Teaching the field instructor to teach emerged as an issue for further exploration.

Although there was some variation attributable to differences in a school's pattern of field advisement, the relationship between the academic and practice settings was usually not seen as a close one. This raised a question of the role of the faculty advisor as a connecting link. There tended to be general agreement on the need for uniform standards in field work performance and the establishment of criteria for acceptable field work placements and field teachers.

Respondents saw the school as the senior partner in the relationship having ultimate responsibility for student education both in the class and in the field. This study's findings emphasized the need for a great deal more work from both partners in providing quality field education for the aspiring professional.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Historically social work was born "in the field." As the friendly visitor became the paid worker in Charity Organization Societies the need for training became increasingly more obvious. Transmission of knowledge and techniques from one person to another became a method of providing a more efficient service where workers did not have to "start from scratch" with each new case but could draw on the past experience of other agency employees. The apprenticeship model of learning was adopted.

In 1898 a summer course was offered by the New York Charity Organization Society. Shortly thereafter, with the realization that the learning of techniques through apprenticeship was insufficient, a one year educational program was established at the New York School of Philanthropy (predecessor of the Columbia University School of Social Work). The field began to recognize that education was more than the creation of "carbon copy" workers of those who had come before them. "How to" manuals of working with people were too rigid to allow for the creativity of individual workers and the uniqueness of individual clients.

The desire to transmit personal experience and technique from one person to another gave way to a desire to pass along accumulated, time tested knowledge and specific skills from one generation of social workers to another. The movement towards becoming a profession was
actively on its way. Technical expertise, a necessary goal in professionalization, proved more readily attainable in the "knowing" rather than the "doing" areas. The notion of social work as both an art and a science gained greater acceptance.

Although curriculum development was, and is, directed primarily towards course work, social work education continued to stress the advantage of testing out the more standardized theories against the uniqueness of people in life situations. Work in the field, however, provided much more than a "testing ground" for theory. Any review of the literature, related to the education of social workers, documents the conviction of faculty members and agency practitioners that social work education prepares students to deliver a service thereby tying practice and theory inextricably to each other. It seemed self evident throughout history that the skill of service delivery needed to be learned through participation in real life experiences.

The continuing formalization of social work education within the structure of universities did not alter the schools' need for agencies in order to provide for the acquisition of practice skills. The training of social workers continued to exist within the framework of two institutional settings. It seems safe to predict that the collaboration of agencies and schools in social work education will be maintained throughout the foreseeable future.

The history of the relationship between academia and practice agencies was marked by numerous points of strain and tension. These have continued throughout the years in various degrees of intensity. Social work education literature is replete with discussions of conflicts
between these two settings and their respective personnel. Despite this, the association continues to survive. A legitimate assumption might be made that school and agency remain together because each of them derives certain benefits from the other.

The present study is based on the premise that a major thrust of social work education is on preparation for direct practice with clients. It is further assumed that this "doing" part of social work is learned in agencies. These two, rather obvious, assumptions point up the need to maximize the use of the field in educating social work professionals. The writer suggests that a crucial step in accomplishing this is to become more specific in our understanding of the interplay between school and agency. The present investigation is devoted to an analysis of this interaction.

This study was initially stimulated by the author's professional experience as a practitioner, field instructor and social work educator. Each of these roles tended to result in somewhat different perceptions of the interaction and competence of school and agency in the education of social work students. The writer's own struggles and ponderings are reflected in the questions and issues addressed in this study. The final document, however, is more than a personal exposition. The data collected represents the opinions of field instructors, faculty members related to field work and the learners in the educational process - the social work students.

Since this study attempts to analyze a phenomenon as dynamic as a relationship, no static outcomes were sought after or expected. Rather, it was hoped that this investigation would reveal an interaction
in process as seen through the eyes of students, field and school people.

Beginning at the beginning, one line of inquiry in this study was concerned with how and why schools and agencies decided to engage with each other in the education of social workers. It seems generally safe to assume that a relationship that has endured for a period of about 80 years reflects an association where each partner needs the other in order to guarantee certain rewards and benefits. In this regard Schwartz states that:

...need for each other constitutes the basic rationale for...being together. If people do not need to use each other, there is no reason for them to be together - which may seem like a truism until we recall all the experiences in which the mutual need was not apparent and the members struggled to understand what brought them together and why someone thought they had to interact with each other.¹

Implied in Schwartz's statement is a cautionary note which might be applied to the school-agency relationship. It raises the question of whether the 80 year association has continued more out of habit than out of real need. This study makes an effort to distinguish between the two through an examination of the interdependence of school and agency. The major areas of investigation will be:

1. Motivation of each institution in initiating this educational partnership.

2. Each setting's stake in maintaining the relationship.

3. Notions of commitment and mutuality (quid pro quo).

4. Awareness, by students, faculty and field people, of the interdependent quality in the school - agency association.

5. Frequency, type, and direction of exchanges between the two institutions.

A second line of inquiry is related to analyzing the recurrence over time of the tension provoking issues in the interaction between school and agency. The most common causes of strain in the relationship are investigated in this study. They include:

I. Generic-Specific Argument

In 1917, Mary Richmond's "Social Diagnosis" addressed and stimulated further discussion centered on the problem of defining a common core of casework skills and principles which would be applicable to diverse "specific" settings.

The Milford Conference (1923-1929) in its final report (1929) summarized the unanimous perception of Executives and Board member participants that caseworkers differed in the settings in which they worked but shared a common purpose and methodology observable in all settings.

Today, sixty or so years after the publication of "Social Diagnosis" and fifty after the Milford Conference, the "generic-specific" conflict still continues. The language of the argument has changed but the issue remains the same. Reference to "information or knowledge explosion" is used frequently by proponents of the "specific" side to support their argument for more intensive training in particular areas such as aging, retardation, health services, income maintenance and so on. "Education for responsible entry into the field" is a well used phrase for those advocating more generic teaching of social work methods, values and attitudes. This second group assumes that practice agencies provide the more idiosyncratic training according to field of practice or social problem.
The generic-specific conflict remains a point of tension in relationships between practice agencies and schools of social work. Despite the fact that some educators have recently joined with practitioners in proposing more field of practice or social problem centered curricula, the schools operationally continue to emphasize general knowledge and method as opposed to specific knowledge related to specific fields or problems.

II. Craft versus Profession

Although schools and agencies argue that social work is a profession, it was the knowledge base that historically received most of the attention in the professionalization process. To many practitioners and educators field work was seen as more elusive to the professional prerequisites of specificity, curriculum building and identifiable skills easily transmitted from one professional to another. The field was often perceived as the more idiosyncratic piece of the profession of social work. Practice was seen by some as a skilled craft based on repetition rather than a theoretical framework. The field instructor was viewed as the "master workman" with less skilled apprentices at his side. This author's experience supports the fact that these perceptions are very much alive today despite the increase in the amount of energy expended in identifying practice skills and learning expectations with greater specificity.
III. Status Conflicts

Although social work was "born in the field" and continued to rely heavily on this setting in social work education, it was those involved more directly in knowledge building who were awarded higher professional status. Despite the fact that all of social work education is directed towards providing services to people, the academics rather than those who put the knowledge to use, were placed on a higher level of professional competence. This writer suggests that this phenomenon has resulted in competition between educators and practitioners for "first place" in their contribution to the field of social work and to the training of its professionals. Many of the views they hold of each other reflect this jockeying for position.

Some of the more prevalent opinions expressed include:

1. The view of agencies that educators are removed from practice and therefore have less expertise in teaching practice skills than the agency practitioner.

2. The desire of agencies to have an impact on the school's curriculum was given a great deal of attention in the literature. Little has been written or advocated regarding the influence of faculty consultation on service delivery in agencies. From this we might infer that field staff feel they have a contribution to make to the educational process and institution. The corollary, that academia has something to teach about practice does not seem to be readily accepted.

3. The feeling of schools that practitioners are not sufficiently knowledgeable of the theoretical underpinnings of
practice, that they have no time to conceptualize, that they are doers rather than thinkers.

4. Field lags behind current knowledge while schools lag behind current practice — "The academy is the last to know."

IV. **Difference in Organizational Goals**

There is no quarrel with the fact that schools and agencies are "in business" for different things. The school's primary goal is the education of the student. The agency's primary goal is the provision of service to its clientele. It might be noted that different agencies have varying conceptions of the "person" with whom the worker interacts i.e., client, consumer, member, citizen, community organization and so on. Resisting a discussion on ideological differences, suffice it to say that regardless of setting or conception of client group the practice agency is primarily concerned with delivering the "product" to the "buyers" with whom they have contracted.

In discussions of the tension between school and agency the cause is often attributed to the difference in organizational goals. Implied in this view is that the goals of education and service are, at best, mutually exclusive and, at worst, antagonistic.

Attitudes toward this issue are not monolithic. The opposing camp argues that student education cannot be separated from service delivery, that practice ability is tied to competency in providing a service, that the best kind of education is anchored in service.
V. Differences in Organizational Structure

Understanding of formal organizations has been influenced in great measure by the writings of Max Weber. He described what is referred to as the "ideal rationalistic bureaucracy" with certain definable characteristics (i.e., expert tasks, specialization in division of labor, hierarchical authority structure, impersonal interpersonal relations, delimited a-priori rules guiding performance, personnel assignment on basis of merit, separation of policy and administrative decision making). Few institutions represent "pure" types. They each exhibit different degrees of intensity of organizational characteristics. Discussions of the organizational strains due to structural differences seem to place the school and agency in two rigid discrete categories rather than on a continuum of institutional forms.

One aspect of this study is to examine the perceived distinctions between the structure of school and agency. An assumption is made that even if the institutional structures are perceived as similar, tensions would still prevail. Empirical experiences as well as sociological data indicate that inter-organizational relationships, even among institutions of similar structural types are complex and difficult to nourish and maintain.

VI. Role Conflict

It is hypothesized, by many educators and practitioners, that as a result of differences in organizational goals and structure between school and agency that the field instructor experiences role conflict.

---

The nature of the conflict lies in the diverse role expectations for an agency supervisor and an educator of students. Supervision is perceived as an arm of administration whose purpose is "to get the job done." Field instruction, in comparison, is viewed as being primarily related to student growth.

In the opposition, those who argue that student education cannot be separated from service delivery, that practice skills must be tied to competency in providing a service, also view the separation between agency supervisor and student field instructor as a false dichotomy. Although the adherents of this position appear to be in the minority in the literature, they tend to be clear, eloquent writers who are well respected members of the profession.

The phenomenon of role conflict is certainly more complicated than is reflected in the social work literature. In keeping with the popular definition, Sarbin tells us that, "Role conflicts occur when a person occupies two or more positions simultaneously and when the role expectations of one are incompatible with the role expectations of the other."\(^1\) This definition is based on the assumption that the conflict occurs when there are two clearly delineated set of role expectations. The writer suggests that such is not the case in the assumed conflict between "supervisor" and "educator." The agency's expectations of the school's field instructor are as vague as the school's expectations of the agency paid field instructor. It seems probable that this lack of specificity is due to the reluctance of each institution to place demands on employees of another organization.

The notion suggested is not that there is an absence of conflict but that the conflict does not necessarily emanate from a "pull" between school and agency. Sarbin provides another causal alternative. "The degree of adjustment to roles...varies directly with the clarity with which such roles are defined...That such a state of affairs may lead to ineffectual role enactments is a safe guess. A person must move cautiously and uncertainly when role expectations of others are partly known or entirely unknown. Role-role and self-role conflicts are likely to follow from ambiguous role expectations." The author's view is that this alternative provides a more logical explanation to the role conflict of field instructors assuming that one does exist.

VII. Integration of Class and Field Teaching

The dichotomy between the classroom and field work portions of the curriculum is well documented in the social work literature. It is pointed out that historically field work grows out of an apprenticeship model of learning while classroom teaching is akin to the field of higher education; the implication being that field work is in some way training for a "skilled trade" rather than education for a profession.

In the writing on the integration of class and field teaching it is not always clear what is meant by "integration." Surely, it cannot mean making the two situations the same. By definition that would be impossible. Field teaching is oriented to the individual student with an emphasis on the development of his or her practice.

---

1Ibid., p. 227.
skills. Classroom teaching focuses on the more general theories, concepts and approaches to practice. Even in social work method classes, principles and skills are extracted from individual student practice presentations and then generalized.

This writer would define integration as the interplay between theory and practice not a choice of either or an attempt to make one like the other (e.g., the "laboratory" idea of teaching practice in the school setting). In spite of much of the integration talk in the field, the school and the literature, discussions of this issue abound with arguments which demand a choice of one side or the other: theory versus practice, training versus education, technician versus professional person. The author suggests that just as the classroom teacher uses practice examples to bring the theory "to life," so the field instructor must teach within some theoretical framework so that practice learning is not idiosyncratic.

At times discrepancies between class and field teaching reflect ideological differences such as: social action versus "clinical" practice, diagnostic versus functional and so on. Conflicts, however, become overt only when there are clear demands made by the school on the agency for what is to be taught in the field. The literature indicates that these expectations are rarely stated clearly if at all. Therefore, it is assumed that given clearer demands, more conflicts in the content of class and field teaching might be uncovered.

Differences become visible through the most obvious linkages between the two institutions - the student and the faculty field advisor. The student raises questions about the disparities either in class,
supervision or both, thus exposing the conflict in ideology or content.
In the relationship between the field advisor and the field instructor, conflicts lie dormant so long as their contact is minimal. If and when they begin to work more closely with each other, differences in method of working, ideology and mutual expectations, are brought into clearer focus. There are strong, divergent views on how intimate the relation-
ship between school and agency people ought to be.

VIII. Agency versus School Control of Field Instruction

The struggle over who should control field instruction is mani-
fested in a variety of situations in spite of the fact that there is common agreement between faculty and agency people that the school has primary responsibility for, and ultimate authority over, the education of students. The issue of control emerges distinctly in discussions related to the preferred patterns of field instruction. At face value the school sponsored Student Unit solves the "control" problem by putting it squarely in the school's hands. However, this can result in an obstacle to integration of an "outside" system into the life of the agency. Many times agency staff feel closed out and respond by making "life difficult" for the students and their school supervisor. This may take the form of not cooperating in the develop-
ment of assignments or in the sharing of necessary information.

To complicate matters further, agencies often refuse to take control of the content of field instruction by leaving the accountability of the supervisor almost entirely to the school (not only in the school sponsored Unit, but with their own employees as well). Here, the
supervision of the field instructor is the key issue. If the school is then unable or unwilling to provide this supervision, the most influential person in the field work experience is left on his own and becomes the sole determinator of the content of learning in the field.

Also related to the control of the field experience is the issue of what a student is expected to learn and on what level he is expected to perform in each of the four semesters of training. The questions of whether uniform standards for performance are possible and who should set them are other areas for exploration.

The third and final line of inquiry in this study is devoted to an investigation of those mechanisms which connect the school and the agency in their joint task of educating students for the practice of social work. Although others have been suggested, the three major linkages remain the student, the field instructor and the faculty advisor. Questions related to intimacy and frequency of relationship between field instructor - faculty advisor, student - faculty advisor and, student - field instructor will be discussed.

Since the major emphasis of this study is on an analysis of school-agency relationships, the vehicles which connect the two are vital to any understanding of the partnership. The frequency and intimacy of linkage contacts is closely tied in with the issue of control over field instruction. Field advisement patterns tend to reflect a school's philosophy of the degree of autonomy appropriately granted to a field instructor and of how much control the university
should have over the field work experience. Critiques of the role of the faculty advisor are rare in the literature on social work education. Most substantive discussions of how frequently these faculty members should meet with agency people or students occurs in meetings within individual schools and tends to vary not only from school to school, but from one year to the next in the same school. It is hoped that this study will provide additional insights into the role of the faculty advisor as a major linkage to the field.

The student is perceived by some educators and practitioners as the only true connecting "piece" between the classroom and the field since he alone has a "foot" in both settings. Many times the major source of information regarding school curriculum, or field work assignment, is the student. The author questions whether the responsibility for integrating class and field experiences ought to be left primarily to the novice, the learner who might not yet know the important issues to raise or demands to make. In this study, an attempt is made to identify with whom field and school people have the most contact and which connections bring school and agency closest together.

It has been historically proven that the faculty field advisor is considered the school's liaison person. Based on the assumptions that relationships are affected by expectations and perceptions people have of each other, the writer was interested in exploring views students and field instructors had concerning the advisor. Of particular concern was the assessment of relative status positions between field instructor and advisor as well as assessment of ability as educators,
practitioners and scholars. Also of interest were perceptions of influence on the students education in both the field and the classroom.

**SUMMARY**

Social work, a service oriented profession, educates its practitioners through the university and the practice arena. The use of two separate settings necessitates an understanding of the relationship existing between them. This study is a beginning exploration of this association. Beginning with a historical perspective of the development of the relationship between school and agency this investigation will look at the notion of mutual need, strains and tensions and various linkage mechanisms. Also examined is the intimacy of the relationship as well as the impact each setting has on the other and on social work education generally. Throughout the study a special emphasis is placed on uncovering the perceptions the personnel in academia and the field of practice have of each other. It is felt that in order to provide quality education to future social work professionals more must be known about how the university and the social service agency relate to and use each other in this educational partnership.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This study does not involve the testing of a particular hypothesis or set of hypotheses. Rather it is an attempt to describe the relationship between schools of social work and their field placement agencies. The method utilized was survey analysis. The units of attention were three of the "actors" in the social work education enterprise: the students, the field instructors and the directors of field work in the schools studied. The relationship between school and agency was examined through an investigation of the perceptions of these three "actors."

Data collection was carried out during the 1975-76 school year through the administration of two questionnaires (one to students and one to field instructors); face-to-face interviews were conducted with field work directors. Many questions were designed to be similar so as to permit comparisons among informants. Data analysis was first executed through a separate investigation of each type of informant (i.e., student questionnaire, field instructor questionnaire and field work director interviews). This was followed by an effort to compare views across informants.

The sample was drawn from the six graduate schools of social work in the Metropolitan New York City area and their field work
placements. The schools studied were: Adelphi, Columbia, Fordham, Hunter, New York University and Wurzweiler (of Yeshiva University).

Student Survey

Social work literature is replete with discussions by agency and school people regarding the relationship between academia and practice. It was felt that students, actively effected by both, would have something additional and different to contribute to this dialogue. Consequently, this study made a strong effort to solicit student perceptions regarding the strains and gains of the association between schools of social work and field placement agencies.

It was assumed that students would be in a better position to comment on their class and field experiences if they had already lived through a complete agency placement concurrent with school courses. First year students would not have had enough time to accomplish this, especially if questionnaires were distributed in the fall semester. In addition, unless field and class experience occurred at the same time, it would be difficult to assess and to bring into focus the phenomena of integration or conflict between both areas.

Consequently, the sample was restricted to second year students who were asked to complete a questionnaire based on their first year's experience. One year residency students and B.S.W. graduates were not used because neither category fulfilled the prerequisite of concurrent class and field work for a complete year.

A questionnaire was either mailed (four schools) or distributed in classes (two schools). Students were instructed to return the
questionnaire in a stamped envelope or directly to the instructor in whose class it was distributed. Where mailing was the vehicle of distribution all traditional second year students, except in the case of one school, received a questionnaire. In that school, a sample of 100 was approved and they were chosen at random. In classroom distribution the actual number of students enrolled in the school did not necessarily agree with the number given the questionnaire since only students present on that particular day received the material. There was no follow through on absentees.

The method of distribution was chosen at the discretion of the field work directors. Two factors were usually considered in making the decision: the procedure least disruptive to the school and the one insuring the highest student return.

A total of 806 questionnaires were distributed during the 1975-6 school year; 285 or 35.4 percent were returned. (Table 1 describes the distribution and return by school.) Due to the modest return of questionnaires caution needs to be exerted in generalizing the results of this study to cover large numbers of students. However, it might be noted that these results are in agreement with other surveys of student perceptions of field work.

Data was organized in the form of general frequencies and frequencies organized by school. Although similar in many respects, each of the six schools studied reflected differences in size, age, criteria used for hiring faculty, field advisement patterns, curriculum, private or public auspice, sectarian or non-sectarian, and so on. For this reason, frequencies were compared by school in an attempt to examine the effect of school affiliation on the responses of informants.
TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES BY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variation of responses of key variables was examined through testing the existence of significant differences in means of schools (F-test performed to determine statistical significance).

In addition, an index on a "good" field instructor was developed. Multiple regressions were used to examine whether the Field Instructor Index was affected by such factors as the respondents' school, religion, age and marital status. Regressions were also employed to determine the effects of numerous variables on judgments about the quality of the placement as an educational experience. Finally, all questionnaire responses were analyzed according to the age of the student.
Field Instructor Survey

The names of all field instructors in the 1975-76 school year were obtained from each school. A random sample of 50 people from each institution was chosen. Each person was mailed a questionnaire and asked to return it in a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed—180 were returned. A 60 percent rate of return was quite high for a "mail questionnaire" indicating active interest on the part of field instructors in this topic. (Table 2 summarizes the distribution and return by school.) Despite this high return, we ought to speculate about the remaining 40 percent of the field instructors who did not complete the questionnaire. Allowing for some negative reactions to filling out questionnaires, or to this questionnaire in particular, this investigator suggests that the major deterrent to participation in the study was either a feeling that it wasn't an important enough issue to warrant giving it priority in a work load, or that it wasn't worth the effort since the relationship would essentially remain the same. If we accept these suggestions, then we might also assume that the field instructors that did respond tended to allot greater importance to this issue than those that did not. Unfortunately, since there was no follow-up, no definite conclusions can be reached. An observation might be made, however, that despite the active dialogue in the field regarding field-school relationships, a substantial minority of the field people contacted in this study seemed not to view this as an important enough professional issue to warrant their response.
TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRES BY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percentage Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis was done of overall frequencies for the entire sample of respondents and, frequencies by school. The effect of the number of years of post master's experience on the field instructors' perceptions was also investigated. In addition an effort was made to determine other influences on respondents' views through examining correlations between certain variables. For example, did those field instructors who saw their relationship with the faculty adviser as close, also disagree that the goal of education and service were contradictory.
Field Work Director Interviews

In each of the schools, a specific faculty person was designated as the person "in charge" of field work. This person was in most cases referred to as the director of field work and the field work department even if the department consisted only of the one designated faculty person.

Individual face-to-face interviews were held with each of the field work directors. They were seen as "key informants" occupying the unique position of having an active working relationship both with school faculty and agency personnel. As a result of being in this position it was hoped that they could provide information and opinions from both the school and the field. They were also, however, viewed as faculty (the school paid their salary) and as such, their perceptions of issues in social work education, relationship between school and agency and so on, were considered reflections of other faculty members' opinions.

An interview guide was used to insure some uniformity in questions and answers. Each person, however, chose different areas on which to elaborate making each contact understandably different in emphasis. All statistical data (number of students, placement agencies, field instructors, etc.) and organizational information on the school (curriculum, decision making process, field work department, etc.) were obtained either from these interviews or through written material from the school.
Comparative Analysis of Attitudes, Opinions and Perceptions

The final focus of the study was on determining the extent to which role (i.e., student, field instructor, faculty member) affected responses. This was done through a comparison of the frequencies of certain key variables elicited from the field instructor and student questionnaires. Field work director opinions were then used as further commentary on the issues under examination.

Student Sample

A number of factors were used in order to analyze the student sample. These included: age, marital status, religion, ethnic origin, previous work experience, field instruction pattern in student's placement and the number of students supervised by his/her field instructor. The compilation of these characteristics resulted in a profile of the "average" student respondent.

Age. Students ranged in age from 21-60. The mean was 30.2 years. Testing revealed that significant differences in the average age of students existed between schools (F-test = 5.974, df = 5, \( p = \text{under .001} \)). Adelphi and Fordham had the oldest average aged student, Columbia the youngest. A summary of the mean age of students according to school is given below.

\( (N = 285) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sex.** Female students outnumbered males more than two to one. Of 284 total responses, 199 (70.1 percent) were female and only 84 (29.6 percent) were male. One person did not reply to the question. NYU had more females than any of the other schools (81.1 percent) with Fordham showing the next highest number (72.4 percent). The other schools had 64-69 percent women.

**Marital status.** Students tended to be either single (48.4 percent) or married (42.4 percent) with only minimal numbers falling into other marital categories (i.e., divorced, etc.).

**Religion.** Some differences in schools existed. As might be expected, Fordham, a Catholic university, had the highest percentage of Catholic students (43.2 percent). Similarly, the respondents from Wurzweiler were 90.6 percent Jewish. In addition to Wurzweiler, the students from two of the other schools were more than 50 percent Jewish. It is interesting to note that (excluding Fordham) the two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
schools showing the lowest number of Jewish students (39.6 percent and 41.9 percent) also reflected the two highest percentages of those indicating "no religion." In other words, those respondents who are "not Jewish" are also not necessarily proponents of another religious group.

**Ethnicity.** The student sample was 85.2 percent white (242 different students). Of the remaining 43 students, half of them (21) were black leaving only insignificant numbers for other ethnic groups. The highest percentage of black students in individual school samples came from Fordham (13.3 percent). All other schools had less than 10 percent of their total who were black. On the other hand, two of the schools had over 90 percent white respondents, three had over 80 percent and one had 74.6 percent.

**Previous work experience.** Full-time employment prior to school entrance, was more common than part-time experience. A majority of the students (58.6 percent) had one or more years full-time experience. The average length of prior work time was a little under 2 years (1.9): 16.1 percent had one year, 17.9 percent had 2 years, the remaining 24.6 percent ranged in experience from 3-20 years.

Substantial differences in the means of schools were found (F-test = 2.826, df = 5, p = .017). (See Table 4.) NYU, Columbia and Wurzweiler students were the least experienced (under a year and a half). Adelphi students showed an average of 3½ years prior full-time experience.

As indicated earlier, less students had worked part-time prior to entering school than full-time. A majority (55.17) had no part-time experience at all. Of the 44.9 percent who had worked, the
TABLE 4

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS FULL-TIME EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO SCHOOL ENTRANCE
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

average length of time differed significantly according to school
(F-test = 2.979, df = 5, p = .013). (See Table 5.)

Field instruction pattern used in placement. More than half the students (167 or 58.6 percent) were placed in agencies where the agency-paid field instructor with 1-2 supervisees was the most common pattern of instruction. Only 11 (3.9 percent) of the students in the sample came from agencies where there were school units. However, 44 (15.4 percent) were placed where agency financed units operated.

Number of students supervised by field instructor. Slightly under 70 percent of the sample (198 or 69.5 percent) were supervised by agency-paid field instructors with 1-2 students. Another 40
TABLE 5
AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS PART-TIME EXPERIENCE
PRIOR TO SCHOOL ENTRANCE
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14 percent) had field instructors with 3-4 students. Student respondents were overwhelmingly exposed to the agency employee, non-unit type of field instructor. Only 35 students (12.3 percent) were in units, 11 (3.9 percent) were placed in educational centers.

Field Instructor Sample

Background Information

Age. Field instructors ranged in age from 25-69. The mean age was 40.5 years old, the median, 38. The largest number (76) fell between 25 and 35. This was slightly less than the majority of the sample (42.2 percent). Approximately two-thirds (68.9 percent) of the
sample were between 25 and 45 years of age. The following table shows exact breakdown:

**TABLE 6**  
AGE BREAKDOWN OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR SAMPLE  
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 35</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - 69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex. The sample was heavily female which might reflect the sex breakdown in the field of social work as a whole.

**TABLE 7**  
SEX BREAKDOWN OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR SAMPLE  
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marital status. The majority (60.6 percent) of the sample were married. Those who were separated, divorced or widowed totaled 16.6 percent, single people equaled 22.8 percent. A majority (55.6 percent) indicated that they had children.

Religion. Exactly half of the entire sample were Jewish, with Protestants (18.9 percent) being the next most frequent religious group. (See Table 8 for complete breakdown.) Some differences existed among the field instructors from different schools. The Wurzweiler sample had the highest percentage (80 percent) of Jewish field instructors, with Hunter (60 percent) the second highest. Fordham (21.9 percent) and Columbia (21.2 percent) had the most Catholics. Columbia (30.3 percent) and NYU (25 percent) had the greatest number of Protestants. Of those respondents indicating "no religion" (13.9 percent of total) only 3.2 percent of the Wurzweiler sample fell into this category as compared with 21.2 percent of the Columbia field instructors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnicity. The sample was predominantly white (80.6 percent). Black field instructors (12.2 percent) were the second highest. Although there were some differences among schools, no institution had less than 69 percent white respondents with four schools having percentages over 80. The Columbia sample reflected the highest percentage of black field instructors (24.2 percent) with Fordham second highest (15.6 percent). There was only one Puerto Rican in the sample. The following table summarizes the ethnicity of the field instructor sample.

**TABLE 9**

FIELD INSTRUCTORS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Educational background.** Almost 100 percent were MSWs (only 1.1 percent indicated no MSW) with 71 percent having additional accreditation. See Table below.

**TABLE 10**

**FIELD INSTRUCTORS' EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**

(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in other field</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Masters courses</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process of doctoral work</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate completed</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MSW concentration.** The majority of the sample were trained in casework (53.9 percent). Group work ran not too close a second with 21 percent. Community organization claimed only 7.8 percent of the total. Eleven point one percent (11.1) indicated a multiple major in graduate school. A total of 2.8 percent were trained in administration, policy, planning or other concentrations.

**Experience.** Field instructors had worked an average of 2.6 years full time prior to receiving their MSW. Full-time post-MSW experience ranged from 0 to 38 years (mean = 10.4, median = 8). The majority of the sample had from 0-10 years full-time experience (65.6 percent).
Workers in the field more than 20 years constituted only 10.6 percent of the sample. The following table identifies the number and percentage of field instructors according to length of full-time post-MSW experience.

**TABLE 11**

FULL-TIME POST MSW EXPERIENCE OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job category and years of experience in present agency. Respondents were employed by their present agency from less than one year until 27 years. The overwhelming majority (85.6 percent) had worked from 0-10 years with most of those (57.8 percent) employed five years or less in their current agency. The mean number of years was 6.2, the median five (5).

The three most common job classifications were direct practitioner, top agency administrator (i.e., Executive or Assistant Executive
Director) and combination of administrative and direct practice responsibilities. Next in frequency were those who identified themselves as "supervisor" (10.1 percent) or "Department Head" (11.2 percent). All other positions were listed by less than five percent of the respondents. (See Table 12 for detailed picture.)

TABLE 12
FIELD INSTRUCTORS' BY JOB CLASSIFICATIONS
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct practice</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administrator*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department head**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination administrator and direct practice</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency unit supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School student supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other***</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Executive Director, Assistant Director, etc.

**E.g., director of social service department, head of particular department such as older adults or teens, etc.

***Includes a few psychologists, researcher and consultants.
Field Instruction Data

School affiliation. The perception of field work directors, influenced by a study done for the schools in 1974, was that only seven percent of the total number of field instructors supervised for more than one school. Contrary to these findings and perceptions, the respondents in this sample tended to supervise for more than one school. A high percentage of 62.8 percent indicated affiliation with two or more schools. In each school, less than 10 percent of the field instructors supervised only for that school.

In responding to the questionnaire field instructors were asked to answer in terms of the school referred to in the introductory letter. Although they seemed to comply with this (comments made on differences if they were to answer for another school) we cannot rule out the fact that their perceptions of a particular school are influenced by their affiliation with other schools. For example a definition of a close relationship between field instructor and field adviser might change in comparison to what is found with another adviser in another school. Exposure to different alternatives makes one more discriminating in evaluation and analysis.

Pattern of field instruction. The agency-paid field instructor was the most common form of field instruction utilized. In a question asking respondents to check all the forms used in their agencies, 73.9 percent listed the traditional agency supervisor (1-3 students); 24.4 percent indicated agency financed units (4-6 students). Even though more than one structure could be chosen it is still clear that in at least 74 percent of the agencies in which respondents worked,
it was the agency that assumed financial responsibility for educating students in the field.

**Number of students supervised.** The sample in the study revealed that the "traditional" field instructor (1-2 students supervised by an agency employee) was still most common . . . 76 percent of the respondents fell into this category. Another 14.4 percent supervised 3-4 students making a total of 90.4 percent who could be classified as traditional (less than unit size) field instructors.

**Agency responsibilities.** Almost 100 percent of the sample (175 or 97.2 percent) had agency responsibilities in addition to field instruction. Ninety percent (162) felt they were major. Better than half the respondents (68.9 percent or 124) felt responsibilities did not interfere with student supervision.

Whether or not a field instructor ought to have major or minor agency responsibilities revealed some ambivalence. About half (52.2 percent) felt that major responsibility should be for agency service. Yet 62.2 percent also felt that a field instructor's major responsibility ought to be for student supervision. Regardless of whether respondents perceived that agency responsibilities interfered with field instruction or whether they felt they should have only limited responsibility for agency service, a high 87.2 percent (157) did not believe that a field instructor ought to supervise students exclusively.
The Schools of Social Work

As indicated, this study utilized the six schools of social work in the Metropolitan New York area: Adelphi, Columbia, Fordham, Hunter, NYU and Wurzweiler. The schools exhibited a varied picture in terms of student enrollment, years of existence, practice concentrations, pattern of field instruction, number of placements and field instructors, and pattern of field advising. Interviews with field work department directors provided the data presented in this section.

Student enrollment. Using enrollment figures as an indicator of school size, Columbia is the largest and Wurzweiler the smallest. Three of the schools admitted graduates of BSW programs and experienced people (one-year residents) to the second year. The others reflected "typical" first and second year student enrollment. The following table gives a detailed breakdown by school. Statistics in the second year are for "traditional" second year students. One year residents and BSW graduates are not shown in the table.

Number of field instructors and placements. Based on calculations for all the schools, there was an average of 1.4 students per field instructor (Student N = 2338, Field Instructors N = 1640 - one-year residency and BSW students included). In spite of the fact that Columbia reported 17 school units and 14 agency units and Adelphi emphasized the educational center, the overall ratio of student to field instructor indicated that the traditional pattern of 1-2 students per supervisor remained intact for this school sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>257*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>350**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>293***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Plus 135 students from BSW programs and experienced people; Total = 392.

**Plus 36 one-year residency students; Total = 386.

***Plus 89 one-year residency students; Total = 382.

There was an overall average of two students per placement (Student N = 2338, Placements N = 1158). This plus the low number of students per field instructor (1.4) indicates that there were many instances in which field instructors and agencies accepted only one student. This was contrary to the clear bias of schools for multiple placements (at least two students per agency).

The higher number of field instructors than placements (1640 to 1158) demonstrates the fact that in some agencies there was more than one supervisor. (See Table 14 for detailed summary of field instructors and placements by school.)
TABLE 14
1975-76 NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS AND FIELD INSTRUCTORS BY SCHOOL:
AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER PLACEMENT AND FIELD INSTRUCTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Placements</th>
<th>Number of Field Instructors</th>
<th>Number of Students Per Placement</th>
<th>Number of Students Per Field Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>124*</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>236*</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some agencies with branches are counted as one agency.

Curriculum major concentrations. It is interesting to note that each of the six schools had its own unique quality in providing practice concentration options to students. Although in reality what is taught in "methods" classes might be similar regardless of school, in structure there seems to be more difference than uniformity.

Two of the schools, Columbia and NYU operated on the two track system separating direct practice (i.e., casework, group work and certain types of community organization) from policy, planning and/or administration. A point of departure was both in the titles each school attached to the tracks and in the area(s) to be studied. NYU
offered a "major" in "psychosocial treatment" or "administration" (the latter was dropped in May 1975 leaving only one area of study). Columbia students could enroll in Concentration I (integrated social work practice) or II (policy, planning and organization primarily with large constituencies). At NYU, two generic social work practice courses were offered in the first year to all students, regardless of track. In the second year, students are required to take a course each in individuals and families and group methods. This was followed with an elective in one practice method. At Columbia, four generic social work practice courses were offered (two each year). However, "generic" was separated by concentration.

In addition, Columbia provided for a small number of more experienced students a third concentration in the second year which combined the material from the other two concentrations. There was little crossover, in either school, from one area to another. Generally this was discouraged.

At Wurzweiler, students majored in casework, group work or community organization for the two years. Four methods classes in a chosen concentration were required with the possibility of electives in other areas. Changing from one major to another was not permitted unless the student started over again with the beginning practice courses in the new method. Social work values were viewed as generic, social work skills were perceived as method related (i.e., casework, etc.).

Adelphi offered neither a two track system nor a tripartite method curriculum. In the first year, all students took two generic practicum courses. In the second year, one course was required in
casework, group work and community organization. Students could also take additional electives in any of these methods.

Fordham also provided two generic practice courses to all first year students. In the second year, a major in one of three areas was required: Micro (individuals, families and groups), Mezzo/Macro (policy, planning and organization) or Research.

Hunter developed the most elaborate structure of the six schools. Students choose to concentrate in one of five "modules" (fields of practice): (1) Education, (2) Family and Children, (3) Social health (medical, psychiatric hospitals), (4) Social Integration (addictive services, correction, etc.), (5) World of Work and Vocational Rehabilitation. Within each module students elect a major method (i.e., casework, group work, community organization or administration).

This outline of the "method" curriculum in the schools revealed fluctuations in the emphasis on the "generic" and "specific" in social work education. Hunter seemed to operate on the premise that substantive knowledge of particular fields of practice is needed and must be supplied by the school as well as the method, helping skills. On the other hand, those schools stressing the generic practice courses seemed to say that these are most important and that they can be adapted to specific fields. Consequently, in our sample, "The Schools" cannot be perceived as monolithic in the traditional "generic-specific" argument with the field.

Student method affiliation. In those schools offering a choice the majority of the students were enrolled in the direct practice area. In cases where more specific methods were given, casework attracted the highest number of students, group work the next highest with
community organization, administration and research sharing the lower positions in that order.

Summary

This study is an attempt to describe the relationship between schools of social work and their field placement agencies through examining the perceptions of students, field instructors and directors of field work in the six graduate schools located in the Metropolitan New York City area. Questionnaires were distributed to all traditional second year students and a random sample of field instructors. Individual interviews were conducted with each of the faculty members responsible for field work in their respective schools.

Various methods of data analysis were employed including: responses organized by frequencies according to student, field instructor and each one's school affiliation, multiple regressions to determine effects of certain variables on student perceptions of the quality of their placements and their view of the field instructor. Student age and field instructor's professional experience were also examined as possible factors influencing the responses of the study's sample.
CHAPTER III

THE SCHOOL AND FIELD PLACEMENT AGENCY: HISTORICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

History of Social Work Education: The Theory-Practice Components

The history of social work education parallels closely the history of social work practice itself. In the period before 1898 when volunteers delivered services in social agencies they were given training in the methods and procedures of working with the needy. With paid workers replacing the volunteers, the New York Charity Organization Society in 1898 developed a summer training program for agency workers based on an apprenticeship model. In 1904 this summer training course grew into the New York School of Philanthropy with an introduction of a one year educational program containing theoretical underginnings to the practice experience. (This school later became the New York School of Social Work and in 1962, the Columbia University School of Social Work.)

By 1919 fifteen Training Schools had been developed causing the formation of the Association of Training Schools, an early predecessor of the Council on Social Work Education (1952). Social agencies played a significant role in this formalization of education for practice.
Many of the established programs were developed and largely supported by private welfare agencies to meet the purpose of preparing personnel for specific agency assignments.¹

In 1927 the Association of Training Schools became the American Association of Schools of Social Work with a primary function of formulating and maintaining educational standards. By 1932 schools had developed a curriculum of at least one academic year encompassing both class and field work.

During the early period of social work education there was consistent movement towards university affiliation. In spite of this, however, about one-third remained independent programs associated with social agencies. This strong "hold out" for practice agencies as the locus for social work education ended in 1935 when the American Association of Schools of Social Work ruled that only programs established within institutions of higher education accredited by the Association of American Universities could be accredited by the Association of Schools of Social Work.

This mandate for university affiliation was perhaps provoked by a study on social work education done in 1931 by James Haggerty (The Training of Social Workers). One of the recommendations of the study was that field work not be considered part of the graduate curriculum but as a non-credit program held during vacation time and supervised by social work teachers.² Haggerty saw the "state of the art" of


social work as a "craft in which expertness is acquired primarily through practice or supplemented by some schooling...." The "university mandate" might be a response to this criticism of the social work field... an attempt to move from "craft" to "professional" status.

By the close of the thirties, social work education was firmly implanted in the university structure and the academic environment. Acceptance of schools in the American Association of Schools of Social Work had as a condition of membership the requirement that there be a two year graduate program leading to a masters degree. In spite of the recommendations of the Haggerty study, field work remained an integral part of social work education.

In 1942, Bertha Reynolds, in her classic work, "Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work," discussed the indispensable quality of field work in the education of neophyte social workers.

Learning an art, which is knowledge applied to doing something in which the whole person participates, cannot be carried on solely as an intellectual process, no matter how clearly and attractively subject matter is presented...As progressive educators have pointed out, unless there is opportunity to practice its use, there is invariably a gap between knowing a thing and being able to do something with it...2

...as we think of learning in dynamic terms, instead of assuming that knowledge is stored and can be drawn upon at any time, we are concerned that practice shall be immediate and related to living use, and that content shall be continuously tested and modified by what is found in experience. We have called social work an art, by virtue of its application of knowledge to practical problems in the field of the inter-relationships between human beings and their life situations and have seen...that practice should not only accompany but be interwoven with theory.3

---

1Ibid., p. 302. (Quote is from Haggerty's original study)


3Ibid., pp. 136-137.
Reynold's statements clearly highlight the basic beliefs which underlie the arguments in favor of continued relationships between social work schools and service providing agencies. Throughout the history of formal social work education these assumptions have been periodically reiterated by both educators and practitioners. The learning and teaching of practice competence was usually seen as taking place in "the field." In 1934-35, a sub-committee on field work of the Committee on Curriculum of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, stated that, "Field work should take place in social agencies where service is the primary function rather than in agencies developed for research or teaching purposes...\(^1\)

In the 1950's, as social work education took on greater formalization, Grace Coyle emphasized the reciprocity of knowledge and practice experience. She asserted:

\begin{quote}
We of all people can accept the fact that learning is not an intellectual process alone. The making of a professional requires, of course, that inspiration and activation process by which 'being' and 'feeling' find in 'doing' their appropriate and effective outlet...\(^2\)
\end{quote}

In the late fifties Tyler discussed theory and practice teaching as the two aims of graduate professional education...


In the education of the graduate student both theory and practice are important. The student needs experience both in the field and in the university. Practice without theory to get beneath the surface is chaotic and haphazard. Theory without the check of practice becomes pure speculation. Practice is needed to identify problems and to specify the conditions under which they must be solved. Theory is needed to give unity and meaning to possible ways of attacking the problems. Theory suggests alternative solutions. Practice provides a check on the validity of these solutions and thus on the adequacy of theory.1

In an elaboration of the necessity of a "theory - practice" focus, Tyler identified the difference of emphasis between professional schools and academic departments of universities. The professional school graduates a practitioner who provides some service to others. His competence is judged by the quality of the service he renders. The competence of the academician "show up in his intellectual products - his writings, his techniques of investigation, his methods of analysis..."2 Hence, the academic department's focus on the "knowing" and the professional school's emphasis on the use of knowledge to perform some service to others.

In the sixties, Ruth Gilpen referred to theory and practice as a "single reality". There are, according to her, two distinct parts of the social work educational structure, the professional school and the practice agency. The work of educators is to bring these two parts together. To the question, "Can the two ever be closely integrated"? Gilpen answers:


2Ibid., p. 5.
...For many educators and social workers for whom the logical answer is indeed no, the empirical answer is yes. They find in experience that the two parts do somehow come together...1

The spontaneity inherent in real life situations requires a worker who feels, who responds intuitively and emotionally. Educators and practitioners continually question whether the knowledge piece of social work education stifles the creativity of worker responses. The sixties witnessed the birth of a strong movement antagonistic to "credentials" and supportive of the "feeling", "doing", "active", advocate worker. Like Gilpen, William Schwartz advanced the notion of knowledge and practice responses as a unified concept embodied in the same worker:

From our experiences we can testify that there are 'knowers' who cannot help anybody and there are 'feelers' who cannot put their feelings to use in the service of people. Ultimately, both cognition and affect must be transmitted into ways of listening and responding, and it is these operations, consistently reproduced, that represent the educational payoff in any profession.2

An unpublished doctoral dissertation of the mid sixties supported Tyler's contention that professional schools are "in business" to produce practitioners whose competence is evaluated by their ability to deliver services to others.


The goal of social work education is to produce knowledgeable, competent social workers. Students cannot become this unless they are able to integrate what they have been taught, unless they understand the relationship between theory and practice, unless they can apply theory to practice and realize that theory can evolve from practice.1

...Why has practice been continued as an essential part of social work education? Simply because the ultimate test of this education is not whether the student can state the concepts and understand theory but rather whether he can adequately carry out the helping, enabling functions of social work. The final test is thus not conceptual but practical.2

In the late sixties Betty Lacy Jones restated the need for social agencies as partners in the social work education enterprise:

...Since most social services are provided under institutional agencies, field instruction requires the participation of social agencies and host institutions. Learning to practice social work can only take place in the field. Locations in which students are gathered to discuss their practice may vary, and learning other than methods of practice takes place in the field. Neither the location of discussions nor the other learning should be confused...with the essential element of field instruction. The practice activity that tests out and acts to integrate the whole of professional education and from which emerges the beginning professional practitioner.3

During the same time period Kindelsperger in discussing schools and practice agencies proclaimed that "...our relationship is so fundamental as to be reasonably described in terms of a condition for survival of social work as a profession."4

---


2Ibid., p. 6.

3Betty Jones (editor), Current Patterns in Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education, 1969, CSWE, New York, p. XI.

In the seventies the recurrent theme of the position of importance of practice and social agencies in the education of social work students is still being verbalized. Werner Boehm in the early part of the decade commented:

Typically in social work education, community agencies participate in the educational process by providing field experiences for students...Without this participation and the not inconsiderable contribution by the agencies of staff time, space and other resources, social work education would, for all practical purposes, be inoperative because testing out and applying knowledge in practice situations is essential for the development of competence and skill.¹

As we approach the end of the seventies the same familiar points continue to be made....

Since the primary purpose of professional education is preparation for practice there is an intrinsic bond between education and practice in social work...and such involvement has long been accepted as a joint professional obligation....²

**Relationship Between School and Agency...**

**Class and Field Work**

Despite the belief that practice is vital to social work education the relationship between schools and service agencies has historically been perceived by both parties as having its ample share of problems. Kay Dea, in analyzing the collaborative process in undergraduate field instruction programs commented upon the discrepancy in Social Work Education, 1967, Mimeo. Council on Social Work Education, p. 6. Emphasis in the original.


between what "should be" and "what is" in the association between practice and education.

Unfortunately, the long history and rich tradition of field experience in social work education has not automatically resulted in close coordination and cooperation between our campuses and field agencies. To a large extent the ideal cooperative relationships between campus and field have been explicated better in theory than in practice...1

Arthur Leader, speaking from the vantage point of practice presented a similar evaluation of the nature of the interaction between school and agency:

There is no doubt that the school-agency relationship with respect to education for practice continues to be a most complicated, controversial, and troublesome area of mutual concern. Over the years the literature, with its repeated references to problems and gaps in communication, makes this clear. There are many exhortations and pleas for better communication with the understandable implication that opportunities for more discussion would somehow improve the state of affairs.2

From Leader's statement one might infer that a closer, more conflict free relationship between school and agency is a primary goal which can be accomplished through more frequent contacts. Other writers accept the strain of conflict as "normal"...as something to be taken into account but not something that could or should be drastically altered.

Bernhard feels that "mutual dependency and accountability have created the usual mixture of cooperation and tension associated with


all close kinship relations."¹ Litwak and Hylton, sociologists, suggest that the

...conflict between organizations is taken as a given in interorganizational analysis, which starts out with the assumption that there is a situation of partial conflict and investigates the forms of social interaction designed for interaction under such conditions...The elimination of conflict is a deviant instance and likely to lead to the disruption of interorganizational relations (i.e., organizational mergers and the like).²

If we accept the premise that conflict is always present in interorganizational relations then we must also view school-agency interactions on a "continuum of conflict." The problem then changes from finding methods of eliminating conflict, to identifying the causes of strain and developing mechanisms of coordination which make optimal use of the energies of each institution in carrying out their joint task of social work education.

Throughout history the relationship between schools and agencies has been heavily influenced by the perceptions regarding connections between theory and practice, field and class instruction and field and class curriculum. Although educators, practitioners and students have traditionally placed a high value on the learning of practice skills through a supervised field experience, there is still no uniform agreement that field work can ever truly become integrated into an academic curriculum.


As social work education became more entrenched in universities of higher education classroom content was subjected to consistent examination and change. This emphasis on theory grew out of social work's desire to maintain and advance its recently acquired status as a profession. Even today it is regarded by some as a "semi-profession".

A profession, according to Tyler...

...bases its techniques of operation upon principles rather than...simple routine skills. For an occupation to be a profession it should involve complex tasks which are performed by artistic application of major principles and concepts rather than by routine operations or skills.¹

Tyler differentiated between a skilled trade and a profession in the following manner:

In the early days, surgery was not really a profession but a skilled trade. Certain skills, such as those used in bone setting, were transmitted from one generation of surgeons to another, and the surgeon learned largely as an apprentice how to carry on his trade. With the development of the basic medical sciences like anatomy and physiology, it became possible to gain a more fundamental understanding of what was involved..., so that a surgeon with adequate scientific background was able to adapt his particular procedures to the specific condition surrounding a given case.²

The comparison to social work education is obvious. Medicine, however, seems more ready to accept the unity of knowing and doing in education. Social work, on the other hand emphasizes the "deep lying nature of the dichotomy",³ the repetitive issue of whether academic standards can be applied to field work.


²Ibid., p. 3.

In 1940 the American Association of Schools of Social Work reported on the neglect suffered by field work in the formalization of social work education. This neglect was attributed to the fear that social agencies would stop providing placements for students if schools attempted to exert any control and, to the non-routinized aspects of most practice situations which defied standardization attempts. The Report reads:

Field work has often escaped the rigorous scrutiny given to other courses due to the dependence of schools on social agencies for the provision of field work units, instructors and supervisors...

...Although accepted as an essential part of the curriculum, field work has, in contrast to other courses, occupied an anomalous position...If we continue to describe the content of field work as 'elusive' we will continue to try to escape from our responsibility as educators for defining the essential minimum content...and we will continue to use a vague and highly individualized standard of integrated knowledge and performance against which to measure the field work progress of students.¹

In spite of the plea enunciated in this Report for greater "control" of field instruction by the educational institution the basic dilemmas continued to exist. Where does the responsibility for content and standard setting in the field lie? Can and should the school be the determining influence? Is the field instructor to be accorded the same academic freedom, regarding what is taught in his "subject", that the classroom teacher enjoys?

In 1945, at an annual meeting of the American Association of Schools of Social Work the quandary of the schools at that time was described as follows:

There has long been some difference of opinion among the schools concerning the desirability of assuming full responsibility for field work instruction in the same way that it is assumed for classroom instruction. Some prefer this, others advocate that it might be acceptable or perhaps even more desirable to place students under the supervision of agency staff members.¹

In the late forties the Hollis and Taylor study on social work education accentuated the differences between field work and classroom work which needed to be taken into consideration in curriculum planning. The study stated that "...historically they evolved from very different educational traditions. Field instruction has its roots in an apprenticeship type of education, while classroom instruction has its roots in the traditions of American higher education...".²

The Hollis and Taylor study identified different educational content in class and field. From their writing we may infer that they would attribute this dissimilarity to the tradition in education from which each came.

...classroom courses usually center on concepts that constitute the body of social work knowledge and they tend to be taught so as to establish principles and other forms of generalization that are useful in giving order and meaning to the particulars of social work experience... The field...centers too largely on specific knowledges and skills related to the practice of social work.³

In spite of the dichotomy noted, the authors rejected setting up special field facilities where educators would have more control and could better resolve the field curriculum. They indicated that

¹American Association of Schools of Social Work...Administrative Problems in Field Work, 1945 (mimeographed), p. 72.
³Ibid., p. 231.
"...such facilities might become atypical of social work practice..."\(^1\) Still, like the 1940 Sub Committee on Field Work, the Hollis and Taylor study advocated that "schools need educational control of the independent field facilities that they use..."\(^2\)

In 1964, a little more than 15 years past the completion of the Hollis-Taylor study, a conference was held on Block field instruction. Once again the question was raised of developing a unitary approach to social work education. Was it the responsibility and capability of the school to bring the field and class experiences together in a truly educational partnership. The school people attending this 1964 Conference identified two types of relationship between educational institution and placement agency:

...a laissez-faire attitude toward field instruction based on trust in the agency's capacities to carry on its educational responsibilities with minimal direction from the school as to the content and conduct of field practice...

and

...a continuing responsibility to chart the direction of field instruction, both in the definition of appropriate learning experiences and the evaluation of the field instructor's performance...\(^3\)

It might be noted here that the literature abounds with material on the issues of strain between school and agency. Much less attention is devoted to an investigation of the partnership itself...what does it look like...who is it with...is there a junior and senior partner in

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 233.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 233.

\(^3\)Excerpt from: Conference on Block Field Instruction, January 1964, Sponsored by CSWE - Representative from all schools with Block field instruction, p. 7.
decision making...who makes decisions about what. Any discussion of field work is apt to touch on the "partnership" questions such as control, reciprocal demands and expectations, accountability, closeness to each other, distance apart and so on.

In the early 1970's Kay Dea elaborated on the field instruction patterns which have emerged traditionally. Although the focus of his work is on undergraduate social work programs, the similarities to the problems of graduate education are obvious. Dea identified five different patterns of relationship between schools and agencies around student education. They are:

1. **University directed programs** which consider only minimally agency needs and objectives and have the advantage of safeguarding what the school intends. Communication comes from the school to the agency.

2. **Parallel Programs** are characterized by little or no communication between school and agency. The agency agrees to take students and is then left on its own. The student is expected to integrate class and field learning. "Although this pattern is not accepted by educators as a sound way to provide field instruction, it often emerges informally as a solution to pressures resulting from the overdemanding time schedules of both the university and agency staff involved."2

3. **Agency directed programs** are those in which agencies take students and are then left to make decisions on their own. In that

---

2 Ibid., p. 55.
sense they are similar to parallel programs. They differ in that adequate contact between school and agency does exist. The direction of the communication is from agency to school.

4. *Mutually directed programs* in their pure form are "characterized by the collaborative involvement of both agency staff members and university faculty members in curriculum development."\(^1\)

It is in this model that joint committees are formed and ongoing contacts are developed. Unfortunately, as Dea laments,

> Although this pattern is superior to the other three, it has traditionally been limited to the defining of formal structures and relationships regarding one another's educational responsibilities which in turn remain distinctly separate.\(^2\)

Consequently, the collaboration develops within a narrow sphere which "separates and compartmentalizes student learning experiences into two worlds—the field and the classroom."\(^3\)

5. *Transactional model* is proposed by Dea as the most effective one. He advocates school and agency people crossing over into each other's world.

> This pattern requires a true partnership...then traditional roles of field instructor and university...instructor will 'blur' with more formal teaching occurring in the field and additional experiential learning...present in the classroom.\(^4\)

This pattern accepts two notions, one that not all teachers are effective practitioners and vice versa and; two that there is little possibility that either one would achieve an effective level of

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 56.  
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 56 (Emphasis mine)  
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 56.  
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 57.
functioning in the other's area. Based on these assumptions each
would cross over into the other's role thus providing opportunities
for using each in the area of their greatest expertise. A division
of tasks according to competency would then take place. A serious
shortcoming to this pattern is that areas of competence could change
with each field and class person resulting in an absence of consistent
expectations for performance and responsibilities. Dea himself
identified the fiscal, academic, philosophical, role, political and
community restraints mitigating against the success of this model.
It remains therefore only a theoretical abstraction.

It is not clear where the Unit and Educational Center structures
would fit in Dea's classification. If Units were placed in the
"university directed" program they would be viewed relatively
negatively by Dea. Yet, advocates of unit teaching present this
structure as one which could insure high level teaching, greater
accountability to the school, higher and clearer standards for the
field instructor and so on.

Since the purpose of this study is not to evaluate the different
types of relationships cited above, suffice it to observe that a
variety of associations have been adopted. The choices have many
times been made on the basis of factors other than what is considered
most effective (i.e., finances, availability of placements, job load
of faculty and agency personnel etc.).

In the 1970s Rothman and Jones provided another framework for
looking at school-agency relationships. They examined the degree of
integration between class and field content and identified four
possible arrangements:

"1. Class and field integrate. The student has an opportunity to try out theory in practice in a direct and systematic way.

2. Class and field supplement each other...The classroom, for its domain, provides general theory, and the field, in its sphere, offers specific skills and develops professional self-discipline...The two are different but they reinforce each other in providing what the student needs to engage in the practice of the profession...

3. Class and field are unrelated. The two give different things to the student...

4. Class and field are in conflict...not only does the student learn different things...but these are at odds with one another."1

Field Instructor as Educator - Teaching the Practitioner to Teach

Regardless of the type of relationship between school and agency, it is usually the field instructor who is the primary point of contact for the student and the school. It is the field instructor who helps the student to use the field experience in order to learn. In this respect our similarity to the medical profession is pointed out by Sidney Berengarten, an expert in the area of field work.

Colleagues in the medical school say that the mentor who exercises the most profound influence on the medical students' emerging professional identity is the clinical professor...In social work education...the Field Instructor is the closest to the student in action, in feeling, in thinking and in behaving.2


This central position of the field instructor has resulted in a great deal of speculation about his competency as an educator. This issue has been seen as particularly important since the most prevalent pattern of field instruction is still the traditional one where the person is an agency paid practitioner.

Berengarten enunciated the position that field instruction is a different assignment for a worker than practice related tasks.

...The transition from practitioner to field teacher involves a different use of knowledge and reorientation to concept and theory. Thus the field supervisor must be given help to become the educator or teacher who imparts knowledge and skills conceptually. He no longer can demonstrate his own knowledge and skill by doing. He must instead explain and educate others to know and do...1

Aleanor Merrifield, a field instructor from the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago shared her view that:

The shift from practitioner to educator is a complex one... Selection must be related to established criteria for assessing the individual's interest in and potential for the educational role... The field instructor must have a thorough understanding of... educational concepts regarding learning patterns and teaching methods...; he must have some supervisory help... in order to make educational diagnosis and teaching plans; he must have help in learning to use the specifics of the case and the specifics of the student-instructor relationship to generalize to the underlying principles...2

1Ibid., pp. 85-86.

The attempt to differentiate the skills of practice from the skills of teaching is related to the effort to distinguish between social work education and apprenticeship training. Berengarten cautions that field instruction must be, "...teaching by principle and not by rote, as in apprentice training..."\(^1\)

The establishment of the uniqueness of field instruction was also sought through attempts to distinguish it from staff supervision. This notion was developed in the Boehm Curriculum study:

The agency is used primarily to provide the student with an educational experience, and not as a means of helping the student to render service as a staff member.

This conception...clearly distinguishes between the role of the field instructor and staff supervisor. The staff supervisor helps the worker to implement the agency program on behalf of the client. The field instructor helps the student use the agency program for his own learning...For the worker, the agency...exists to give service; for the student the agency program exists...to help him learn skill. In the process, of course, service is rendered.\(^2\)

McGuire, in her study of the group work field instructor, concluded that it is "...specious to belabor differences. Of more importance...is the evidence of serious, purposeful, efforts to heighten the teaching aspect of field work..."\(^3\)


Reynolds makes two vital points on this subject. She cautions against the tendency of, especially new teachers, to become preoccupied with the need to teach, the "...almost irresistible need to demonstrate his command of subject matter by reciting it."¹ Secondly, she stresses the generic skills of the practitioner and the educator to unleash the creativity of the client or student rather than tell him what is "right". She suggests that:

...a supervisor has opportunity for the same skills that a caseworker uses in drawing out what a person knows but cannot mobilize for action at the moment.²

In addition Reynolds persists with the accent on generic skills and generic process:

The process is not essentially different from that which occurs in casework and supervision. Our interest...is to see how to keep preoccupation with subject matter from blinding the teacher to the active responses of living persons...If the teacher wants most not to display knowledge or to justify his being there but to reach them they will teach him almost at once how to teach them something...When the focus of attention is on the group, a teacher well nourished in the subject to be taught, can find for them the concentration points of subject matter which are relevant to their needs.³

To Reynolds the shift from practice to education is not a change in fields. Rather it is the application of sound practice skills to the educational situation. "The first principle of supervision..." she tells us, "...is akin to the first principle of casework: In everything build up the client becomes, in everything build up the worker. Neither client nor worker will grow by having problems solved

²Ibid., p. 294.
³Ibid., pp. 314-15 (Emphasis in original)
for him... Both can use skilled help which increases their strength rather than their weaknesses."¹

In a project initiated by the Council on Social Work Education to study issues, problems and alternative approaches to faculty development the professionals involved agreed in part with Reynolds when they concluded that:

... certain skills are associated with all professional behavior. The transfer of skills is readily accomplished. That there is a generic base in the social work and educational processes should not be minimized...²

On the other hand, although not necessarily negating the previous statement, the Project staff advanced the opinion that,

... a good practitioner may become a good teacher, but he is not a good teacher merely by virtue of the fact that he has been a good practitioner. The orientation, the skills, the 'know how' are different...³

Throughout the report of this Council on Social Work Education Project on Faculty Development, Soffen, the Chairman, stressed the fact that there was no differentiation in the discussions between classroom and field teachers. The vehicle through which the teaching component is developed or learned is open to different perceptions.

... some feel that component is accounted for by knowing about, and learning to value, educational foundations, the psychology of learning, or the methodologies of... teaching and evaluation. Others believe firmly that preparation for the teaching component cannot be satisfied except through 'learning by doing' under extremely competent and consciously planned supervision.⁴

¹Ibid., pp. 288-89.
³Ibid., p. 67.
⁴Ibid., p. 41.
Almost twenty years prior to the Soffen Project Hollis and Taylor warned that in the selection of faculty it

...would be equally disastrous for extremists in either camp to have their way. At the moment, schools of social work are believed to be suffering from a plethora of faculty members who are practitioners rather than educators and...who are transmitting little more than the 'doing' side of narrow fields of practice. But the remedy is not...in increasing academic respectability through replacing these 'practical' people with academicians who have all the earmarks of scholarship but who lack functional...usefulness in the field of social work.¹

The importance of integrating, rather than choosing between, the knowing and doing, the thinking and feeling aspects of our profession is again emphasized.

A literature review reveals that the "theory versus practice" issue is not restricted to a tension between field instruction and classroom teaching. Rather, it pervades the general educational concerns of the social work graduate school. The issue of teaching social work practitioners to "teach" has been grappled with for both class and field settings. One might anticipate greater tension in the notion of "teaching the field instructor to teach" since he or she is usually not an integral part of the educational institution. Yet, we might suspect an equal amount of anxiety on the part of classroom instructors if we accepted the thesis discussed by Soffen that "...the teaching component cannot be satisfied except...under extremely competent and consciously planned supervision."²

Very few class or field people would quarrel with the need for new instructors to acquire additional substantive content. This

¹Op. cit., Hollis and Taylor
view is explicated clearly in the Soffen project when it is con-
cluded that both the field and school teacher needs more than
practice experience, or at least a greater emphasis on the
theoretical frameworks in which practice operates. The strain
occurs in the "how to" aspect of teaching.

The President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) con-
cluded that,

College teaching is the only major learned profession
for which there does not exist a well-defined program
of preparation directed toward developing the skills
which it is essential for the practitioner to possess.2

Reynolds stated unequivocally that "the teacher needs as much
as any student the guidance of a supervisor of this teaching."3

On the subject of the supervision of teachers, Charlotte Towle,
like Reynolds, is a proponent of this position:

It has been a great misconception that, since teaching is
creative, each instructor must be a law unto himself in a
world of his own making. This is an 'art for arts sake'
concept which has no place in professional education...4

...To become something...other than a practitioner need
not be a chance development through a slow trial-and-error
process, if the new instructor can be given and can take
the experience of his seniors through help focused on his
function as a teacher...5

Towle, in agreement with the Soffen faculty development study,
makes no distinction in her discussion of field or class instructors:

1Ibid., p. 59.
2Ibid., p. 29.
4Charlotte Towle, The Learner in Education for the Profession
5Ibid., p. 336.
Field work supervisors, like classroom instructors, are generally experienced practitioners... they likewise must become teachers, and today this need not be a chance development if the new supervisor can be given and take help... ¹

The question then arises as to who provides this supervision of teaching to the field instructor, especially the one employed by and accountable to the agency.

Berengarten states that it is the school's responsibility...

...to actively assist the field instructor and the training agency to develop... skill in teaching methodology. The media best designed for such development are seminars for beginning and experienced field instructors, orientation meetings, workshops, and the faculty-field advising role. ²

Towle describes the differing perceptions of the schools regarding this "responsibility". Her description is as widely accepted today as it was in 1954:

There is variation in practice among schools in the amount of help given the individual supervising students... and in the faculty's conception of the process. In some schools it is envisaged as consultative help which the supervisor seeks as she needs it. It thus becomes focused on problems as they arise. In other schools it is set up as regular individual supervisory sessions, in which the supervisees procedures and practices are reviewed and evaluated systematically with a view to giving help throughout the prevention of problems. ³

This writer's own experience as an agency field instructor with three New York City schools of social work revealed that although similar linkages were used in relating to agencies, they were operationalized differently. Meetings for field instructors were

¹Ibid., p. 347.
held by all schools but their frequency and content varied considerably. All acted out a responsibility, especially with new field instructors, for teaching the skills of student supervision by providing seminars. The method of teaching varied from use of weekly supervisory process records to discussions of how students learn and the more common incidents that might be anticipated in work with students.

This personal experience, supported by fellow colleague practitioners also disclosed that all schools assigned a faculty liaison person but the frequency and content of discussion was quite varied. The impact of the school on the agency seemed to be most influenced by the skill of the faculty liaison person rather than on the school from which he came. Thus, the ongoing relationships between field and school people tended to be highly individualized rather than reflecting any formal institutional arrangements. The role of the faculty liaison person has been perceived by some educators as quasi-supervisory in relation to the field instructor. Others put greater emphasis on the assessment of students' skills and problems, meeting periodically with the supervisor to assess progress and offer suggestions. In the former the focus is on teaching the supervisor how to teach; in the latter it is on helping the supervisor understand the student better. Each without the other is of course only half the job, yet schools do choose an emphasis.

Agencies, like schools, present a varied picture of their perception of "who teaches the supervisor to teach?" Four points of view have generally been enunciated: (1) The experienced practitioner
needs no supervision because it creates dependency; (2) Supervision is a creative process which when done well unleashes the creativity of the supervisee thus making him more secure and independent; (3) It is the agency's responsibility to supervise its worker around teaching as it is around all other aspects of his work; (4) It is the school's responsibility.

The question of supervision of practitioners has often been bitterly debated among social workers. The issue of who supervises or teaches the practitioner to become an educator is a cause of strain in the agency-school relationship. When the school does take the responsibility for field instruction standards or demands on the field instructor this is many times interpreted by the agency as an infringement on its territory.

Dana and Houk caution that,

Tension may occur between schools and agencies when the demands implicit in standards are applied to field instruction and thus impose some judgement and control by the school, of agency practice. Indeed, probably no one change in educational stance has served more to accentuate the inherent differences between education and practice than...efforts to bring field teaching...more firmly within an educational framework.¹

Boehm contends that without demands on the agency, and in particular the field instructor, the students' learning would be substantially diminished. He states that the

...absence, in school, of explicit standards of field work performance...presents difficulty on the part of agency-based field instructors to adhere to them because their primary

¹Bess Dana and Mary Houk, "A Summary of Common Concerns and Current Tensions" in Potentials and Problems in the Changing School-Agency Relationships, p. 3.
service orientation makes it difficult, at the same time, to maintain an orientation to education.1

A historical review reveals the constant concern of the school for the quality of field instruction. Berengarten discussed the need for field instructors to integrate new theoretical concepts as well as teaching methodology.2 He further alluded to the resistance of some field instructors who viewed differently the material they needed to teach.

The literature reflects the strain between school and agency when demands are made on field personnel from an institution other than their own. However, we also see differences of opinion among educators as to how stringent demands ought to be. Similarly, practitioners disagree on the need for supervision of experienced workers even if the supervisor is from their own agency. We might therefore conclude that these issues result in strain not only between school and agency people but also among educators and practitioners within their respective settings.

Definition of Agency

Since the usual contact of schools and agencies occurs around field instruction, social workers have commonly equated the field instructor as synonymous with "the agency". This relatively narrow perception has caused some educators and practitioners to suggest a

broadening of the definition of agency. Illustrative of this view are the following opinions of an educator and an agency executive:

Representatives of local agencies indicated that, on the operational level, communication between school and agency tended to be limited to contacts between field instructor and faculty advisor around educational planning for particular students. There was general agreement that the true partnership imposed the necessity for a system of communication that facilitates the involvement of the total agency...in the educational program of the agency...

And in a similar vein...

One of the greatest problems that we have felt is the strain in relationship...and the inadequate communication between schools and agencies. We are not speaking of the individual field work supervisor, but rather of the executive staff of the agency with school personnel and of the Board and school personnel.

Also supportive of the view to broaden the network of agency relationships. Pins and Ginsberg commented that, "The total agency will need to become involved in providing meaningful field learning experiences rather than leaving all responsibility to a staff member who has been designated as the field instructor."

Dana, in a summary of a 1966 conference involving agency staffs and educators, reported on the prevailing attitude of enlarging the agency-school network to include, "...agency executive, board...and...

---


staff...field instructors, deans, classroom faculty, field adviser...

Strains in Agency-School Relationship

Thus far we have looked at the broader areas of tension between school and agency (i.e., mutual demands, lines of communication, control of field instruction, etc.). Now is perhaps the opportune moment to examine some specific issues causing strain in agency-school relationships. The viability of these tension provoking issues becomes clearer when viewed within the historical perspective of the development of social work education. As such they can be seen as embodied in traditional concerns rather than as isolated "complaints".

Rothman and Jones in their recent book on Field Instruction in Community Organization and Social Planning reviewed the stresses between the school and the field...

Field instructors report that they have insufficient information about academic subject matter, and classroom teachers are often skeptical of certain practices and learning experiences in the agencies...Differences in intellectual backgrounds and outlook of academic faculty and field instructors account in part for different emphasis and lack of integration, but structural factors, such as physical distance between school and field, inadequate communication procedures between the two, and different functional demands in the two spheres of activity, also contribute to the gaps and confusions. In addition, faculty tend not to have recent experience in the newer programs and practices...

Arthur Leader,3 a family agency executive suggests that the split between school and agency grows out of myths, false assumptions

3Op. cit., Leader, "An Agency's View...
and stereotypes of each other. Two common stereotypes are: the "ivory tower, removed from practice" educator and the "unthoughtful, unscientific, unwordly technician."

Leader disagrees with Rothman and Jones and all those who adhere to the position that the split is due to the different functional demands of the two institutions, namely, the dichotomy between service and education. On this point he states,

...there is no inherent conflict in maximizing education through service. Not only is there no conflict, but the best kind of education flows from the thinking, feeling and action that is anchored in service...whoever has an educational role with a student, whether in field or school, should carry within himself the embodiment of an integrated (practice and theory) person.\(^1\)

The Boehm 1959 Curriculum Study, on the other hand, finds that supervisors receive their mandate from agency goals which place the primary emphasis on service rather than education...

Field teaching is still largely done by agency supervisors who have only a nominal connection with a school of social work and whose primary function is to provide services to clients rather than to educate another generation of social workers. Most schools are moving in the direction of using more regular members of the faculty for field teaching...\(^2\)

Earlier, the Hollis and Taylor curriculum study suggested that "...the most feasible way to strengthen and extend field teaching facilities is for university and agency boards to control to make budget arrangements which will enable schools of social work to employ field work teachers."\(^3\)

\(^{1}\)Ibid., pp. 29-30.


Julius Samuels is representative of educators who feel that student units provide the vehicle for focusing on educational issues while keeping the student in a real agency setting:

...what is probably of the greatest importance is that units provide the field instructor with an opportunity to keep the educational focus clear. He can focus on educational goals with relatively little encroachment and distraction from administrative, supervisory, programmatic or miscellaneous demands.¹

Levin is illustrative of those practitioners who believe that good student supervision requires a field instructor who is part of the service of the agency:

...the problem of having effective unit supervision needs to take into account that...from the point of view of agency accountability for service and...so that the student may get a better learning experience, the field work unit supervisor needs to have administrative accountability for those aspects of program in which his students are functioning.²

Manis, looking at social work education...internationally contends that the "...contribution to the organization is secondary to the professional growth of the student."³

Dana and Houk recognize a difference in goals but see this as a positive factor:

...the educational branch of the enterprise derives its structure and functional responsibilities from the mandate to teach, while practice is governed by the mandate to serve. Acknowledgement and acceptance of the differences inherent in the respective charges to practice and to education may well pave the way to the dynamic use of difference in serving the common cause.⁴


Kay Dea proposed that, "the coordination of a training program related to two administrative structures and two sets of organizational objectives has frequently resulted in a breakdown of communication and in a confusion of roles."¹

The view that there is no inherent conflict in organizational goals of service and education has also been eloquently expressed in the literature. Jones, for example, commented...

In the field students learn how 'to do' through carrying responsibility for delivery of a social service... Extra-class experience can serve many educational purposes... but experiences such as serving as clinic escort for underprivileged children or as friendly visitor or observer of a mental hospital, while offering valuable learning experiences in work with people do not constitute the practice of social work or the delivery of social services.²

Ruth Smalley too, sees no antagonism between the goals of education and service...

Social work education still accepts, and must always accept... a primary obligation to prepare for practice... It is the field placement which must always constitute not the locus for the student to apply his knowledge, but the opportunity to develop skill in giving a service. The difference is crucial. In the first instance, the clients, the agency, the community are means to the student's end of becoming a professional social worker. In the second instance they remain ends in themselves and it is in learning to serve them with helpfulness, skill and accountability that the student becomes a social worker.

...It is the requirement to give service which motivates the student to acquire the knowledge and... skill necessary to do it rather than to rely solely on the motivation of his own professional development for his learning...³


Bertha Reynolds argues that the agency supervisor provides the best type of student education because the experience is real and not emanating from an artificial structure such as a unit with only an educational goal. Consequently, she too, believes that the best kind of education is through learning to deliver service in a real agency. She comments:

...the social agencies in which field practice is carried on are real agencies serving the community and not able to make training their major function. Suppose they could be endowed as training centers...we see at once how false such an education would be. Students...if they are to have an experience that is real in any sense the situation must be actual situations and...not shaped exactly to training needs...

...Educationally, if the training unit is a foreign body in the agency, there is lost the fine sense of good administrative relationships which students need to acquire. To belong and to have responsibilities to the agency...are essential to a maturing professional growth. Moreover, if there is an idea that supervision alone can make a good training experience it does not stand up in fact...¹

Reynolds further suggests that rather than put money into units, a school ought to "put what funds it has for supervision into building up whole agencies that have promise for training rather than to delay this development by setting up separate and unasimilable centers of instruction."² Thus she introduces the notion of school responsibility for raising the level of agency practice. As we have seen from the review of history this idea has been translated primarily into education for the field instructor.


²Ibid., p. 142.
Little about increasing the quality of agency practice has found its way into the literature. One might assume that if put into effect this notion would most likely result in a great deal of tension in the school-agency relationship since there is an element of "judging" involved. What is important to take from the Reynold's position is that learning is effected by more than the field instructor; that a school's relationship with an agency should be more than contact with a field instructor and; that service and education are and should be tied to each other.

Generic-Specific Debate

As we proceed in taking inventory of issues causing strain in school-field relationships we arrive at the one which has been verbalized the most, namely, the generic-specific debate. Boehm provides a clear statement of this problem:

Perhaps the key area of contention does result from differences in mutual expectations and ideology. Agencies may expect schools to train for specific jobs and to prepare students with skill to engage in specific tasks upon graduation, whereas schools need to focus on generalized problem solving approaches such that a graduate of the school will be in a position to work in a variety of fields of practice and agency programs rather than in just one.¹

Alex Rosen's reply to criticism by Jewish agencies that social work schools were not responsive to their needs also highlighted the generic specific dialogue.

¹Op. cit., Boehm, p. 269. (Curriculum Study)
It seems clear that schools of social work have neither the talent nor the responsibility to teach the student the relevant cultural and psychological aspects of the Jewish community. This is the in-service training responsibility of the Jewish Center itself or of any other practice agency with identified cultural problems in its client population. The challenge to the schools is to provide a broad generic base...in which this additional knowledge can be harmoniously integrated.  

Gold and Pins, too, lamented the lack of specificity in social work education. They report that:

...recent group work graduates...do not have the needed knowledge, attitudes and skills when they begin their employment in group service agencies. ...Executives and supervisors frequently complain that the new graduates are not adequately prepared for the tasks they must assume...Similarly new workers frequently express frustration at being asked to assume functions for which they were not trained, and at not being given the opportunities to practice what they were taught...  

Ralph Garber of Rutgers provided a humorous, yet accurate, picture of the generic-specific struggle as it may relate to the field instructor...

It must sound like a familiar refrain to all of us to re-engage in the discussion of 'generic-specific' and it can almost be sung that 'education is generic and practice is specific'. We have required, if we are to operationalize the dichotomy, that a field instructor with acrobatic agility has one generic foot in the school of social work and the other specific foot in an agency setting. The distance between the two is to be bridged over his (hopefully) live body...


Social work literature is replete with references dealing with the agency's pressure for increased "field of practice" teaching and; the school's commitment to generic education.  

In recent years the generic-specific argument has moved into the universities themselves in addition to existing between school and agency. Some educators are looking more favorably at education for specific social problems. Using as a framework the 1971 Curriculum Policy statement of the Council on Social Work Education, Boehm reports, 

It seems clear that schools will increasingly address themselves to the question of how masters level practitioners can be helped to become knowledgeable both about appropriate strategies of intervention and about the nature of those social problems that actually or potentially fall within the purview of social work. Included among these new concerns are the incidence and prevalence of such social problems as racial discrimination or poverty and the identification of appropriate strategies of intervention that may vary not only from problem to problem but also within problems.

Since the new policy gives schools a great deal of freedom to examine and design their own program...a greater variety of programs than is currently available is likely to emerge, and different schools may choose to focus on different sets of problems...2

---


Advocates of this "social problem" approach perceive the areas as being broader than the traditional "fields of practice". Yet, one could ask similar questions...Is there a core of social work that is generic and upon which substantive knowledge can be built...If one "majors" in "income maintenance" is he sufficiently educated to enter another "field" upon graduation and so on.

The question of whether this "new" direction will satisfy the demands of the practice community remains unanswered. If the fields of practice are too narrow then the degree would be in "income maintenance" or "geriatrics" and would limit workers' marketability and use in different agencies. If too broad, there would be little difference, except for rubric, between the social problem approach and the method emphasis.

Further complicating the issue of the "generic-specific" argument is the involvement of different definitions of "practice". The 1974 Task Force on Social Work Practice and Education, sponsored by the Council on Social Work Education, discussed the different definitions of clinical social work practice. Prior to the 1960s clinical work was primarily casework. The Task Force found that the "demands on a social worker in a clinical setting today include...services to individuals, families, groups, young and old, consultation to other professionals or workers, supervision, parent education, etc."

practice or "...defining the parameters of social work practice...".1

The report of this Task Force found that,

...There have been two forces operating in social work practice and education within the past decade--toward more emphasis upon 'generic' education and/or preparation of a 'generalist' worker and; toward more specialization...2

These two forces operate, according to Dolgoff's report on practice and education, despite the fact that...

...the obvious assumption is that graduates are never 'finished products' and that social workers must be prepared for lifelong learning and agencies be prepared for their contributions to this continued learning...3

The Dolgoff Report defines the generic-specific issue as found by the Task Force on Practice and Education:

...the agencies suggest that schools are often insufficiently related to practice needs and...from the point of view of the educational institutions, the agencies are asking educational programs to meet the needs of the agency so closely that it appears to some that in-service training and staff development would not be needed...4

It does indeed seem that the generic-specific argument is one that is hard to put to rest. For some practitioners the graduating student will never be skilled enough for his setting. This raises question with an agency's view of the purpose of staff supervision... their attitude toward continued professional growth.

2Ibid., p. 28. Emphasis mine
4Ibid., p. 22.
In spite of the vehemence with which the generic-specific issues are argued, the relationship between schools and agencies continues. Bernhard makes the following observation regarding this continuing association:

...Agencies raise serious questions regarding the appropriateness and effectiveness of social work education, while educators raise equally serious questions about agency programs and practices. Despite such disagreements and frustrations, however, overriding commitment to students and the profession has produced continuous dialogue and accommodation.¹

Although schools and agencies remain committed to field training, some writers question whether a true partnership is a reality. Dana's comments reflect this doubt:

Considerable time, thought and emotion were invested in discussing the reality of the partnership wish. Stimulated by the challenge inherent in one educator's remark that it was the school's responsibility to determine the objective, content, and methods of social work education, which include field instruction, participants sought clarification of the nature of the authoritative relationship between school and agency, addressing themselves to such questions as (1) Who sets the standards for field instruction; (2) Who selects and evaluates the field instructor; (3) Who makes the final determination of the student's achievement?²

Organizational Theory

The question of partnership moves our discussion into an exploration of inter-organizational relations. Differences in the institutional structure of school and agency have only recently, and still infrequently, been examined in the social work education

²Op. cit., Dana, "Role of National Agencies..."
literature. Despite the comparative "newness" of this area, organizational theory does provide a framework within which to better understand the problems of school-agency interactions.

Middleman argues that:

The communication gap between school and agency is inevitable. I believe this stems from the basic dissimilarity between the organizational structure of the two systems. The university and its subsidiary school of social work operates, at least, theoretically, as a collegial structure. The social agency as a bureaucratic structure. The means for decision making, the norms, the organizational behavior, and so forth of each system are different...

Middleman views the difference in organizational type as a positive phenomenon. She contends that,

...greater communication (collaboration) between school and agency has as much potential for further alienation as for compatibility...I say, 'viva le gap'! I believe it is a necessary condition to stimulate ferment and continuous change for both systems...I see the hectic relationship between school and agency as a dialectic process of tension and struggle between two different entities rather than two polar extremes on one continuum termed learning professional practice. Out of the very incongruence the learner creates his own synthesis which becomes his professional behavior.

Middleman's categorization of the school as collegial and the agency as bureaucratic is more complicated than her presentation indicates. Lowy, Bloksberg and Walberg elaborated the changing character of the university,

...testimony can be cited for bureaucratic encroachment on the traditional collegial organization of the university. Logan Wilson asserted: 'As complexity of the organization has increased, equalitairianism has been undermined, and the

---


2Ibid., p. 200.
modern university has tended more and more toward a semi-bureaucratic pattern...

...the university has acquired undesirable aspects of bureaucracy: hierarchic power structures, passing the buck, resistance to social change, insensitivity to student needs... priority of procedures over principles, impersonal standards and credits, fragmentation of knowledge, and holding it all together, a flurry of mimeographed paper containing records, rules and resolutions...1

Unfortunately, much of the current social work literature stresses the dysfunctions of bureaucracy. In connection with this Merton contends that, "Any action can be considered in terms of what it attains or what it fails to attain. A way of seeing is also a way of not seeing."2 From this we may infer the simple insight that bureaucracy is "a little good and a little bad."

It is generally agreed that organizations carrying out one or more "expert tasks"3 manifest bureaucratic characteristics. These organizations are placed on a continuum ranging from those close to primary groups, to those more nearly approximating Weber's ideal rationalistic bureaucracy. Professional discussions and social work literature generally indicate acknowledgement that the agency is bureaucratic while the school is collegial. Implied in this is that the agency is less conducive to professionals who set their own goals and to the development of professionals.

It is not the intent of this study to evaluate the phenomenon of bureaucracy. An attempt will be made to identify where on the


3A term used in much of Litwak's writing on complex organizations.
organizational continuum, described above, the school and the agency fall and how this effects their relationships to each other and their ability to educate social work professionals.

Levine and White proposed a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships\(^1\) which appears applicable to the two institutions under question in this study. They attempted to "...explain relationships among community health and welfare agencies by viewing them as being involved in an exchange system."\(^2\) Their definition of organizational exchange is:

...any voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their respective goals or objectives. This definition... refers to activity in general and not exclusively to reciprocal activity. The definition widens the concept of exchange beyond the transfer of material goods and beyond gratifications in the immediate present...\(^3\)

Aiken and Hage in their study on organizational interdependence followed the exchange conceptual framework. A major focus of their study was on the problems of interorganizational exchanges. They found that:

Most studies of organizational interdependence essentially conceive of the organization as an entity that needs inputs and provides outputs, linking together a number of organizations via the mechanisms of exchanges or transactions.\(^4\)

Both pairs of sociologists, (Levine and White, and Aiken and Hage), agree that the preferred state of most institutions is independence.

---


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 583.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 588-589.

and autonomy and that: interorganizational relationships are based on a "scarcity" principle. They suggest that an abundance of resources would eliminate the need organizations have for each other and consequently their inter-relationships. In this regard it is interesting to note that social work education rests on the assumption that in some manner relationships between agencies and schools are essential for learning.

Reid's analysis of interorganizational coordination in social welfare relied heavily on the theories of Levine and White and Litwak and Hylton.¹ On the notion of exchange he comments:

In coordinating their activities, organizations are essentially engaged in the exchange of resources to achieve their goals. An exchange need not require an actual transfer of resources. It is sufficient if one organization utilizes resources in special ways to satisfy the goals of the other.²

Reid described two types of resources: the tangible ones such as funds and personnel and the intangible ones such as prestige, status and so on. It is perhaps for the latter reason that more agencies, than we assume, agree to accept students. Reid, too, agrees with the preceding authors, that "agencies do not cooperate unless they have to."³

Reid elaborated on the three modes of organizational co-existence defined by Litwak and Hylton: independence, interdependence and conflict.


³Ibid., p. 1/8 (Quoting Ralph Kramer).
In relation to interdependence and similar organizational goals he suggests that "this formulation does not require goals of participating organizations to be identical or even similar. The crucial requirement is the need organizations have for each other's resources to achieve their goals."¹ If we accept this thesis then the issue of difference in organizational goals between school and agency, although causing some irritation, is not crucial to the life of the relationship.

Litwak and Hylton identified two categories of interdependence, "competitive interdependence (where one organization can maximize its goals only at the expense of another) ... and ... facilitative interdependence (where two or more institutions can simultaneously maximize their goals)."² We can assume that the relationship between school and agency is of the facilitative type. In contrast to the thesis of Levine and White and Aiken and Hage, that inter-relationships would cease if resources were adequate, Litwak and Hylton proposed that two organizations can and do exist for mutual aid.

The problem of coordination between independent organizations is discussed at length by Litwak and Hylton:

One strategic problem in interorganizational analysis concerns ... a somewhat specialized coordination, since there is both conflict and cooperation and formal authority structure is lacking. If the conflict were complete, the issue could be settled by complete lack

¹Ibid., p. 179.
of interaction or by some analogue to war. Where the conflict overlaps with areas of support...the question arises: what procedures ensure the individual organizations their autonomy in areas of conflict while at the same time permitting their united effort in areas of agreement?\(^1\)

These authors describe the coordinated agencies in a manner applicable to school-agency relationships: "...the organizations being coordinated are independent, because they have conflicting values or because the demands of efficiency suggest organizational specialization, yet share some common goal which demands cooperation."\(^2\)

Litwak and Hylton specified three necessary conditions for coordination: partial interdependence, organizational awareness of their need for each other and, some standardized units to be coordinated. Although these authors suggested a formal coordination agency, Litwak, in collaboration with others, developed a variety of linkage mechanisms related to organizational type, number of organizations, high or low awareness of interdependence and the degree of standardization in the element to be exchanged.

In their studies of inter-organizational relationships Litwak and his associates\(^3\) have developed various linkage mechanisms which seem applicable to school-agency associations. Litwak and Meyer note that "...the bureaucratic organization is unable to deal with

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 369.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 399.

non-uniform or relatively unique events...\(^1\) Field work is more idiosyncratic than class work, therefore, more elusive to a structured curriculum. Using the Litwak-Meyer observations the school, in social work education, can be defined as the bureaucratic organization looking to the agency as a "primary group" in order to carry out its goals.

If this view of school and agency is accepted then two points made by Litwak and Meyer seem especially relevant. The first, referred to as the "Balance Theory of Coordination", deals with the distance between a bureaucracy (school) and a community primary group (agency). The authors advise that,

If the bureaucratic organization and external primary group are too isolated from each other they are likely to work at cross purposes and thus lose benefits of one or the other. However, if the two organizational forms are brought too close together their anti-thetical atmospheres are likely to disrupt one or both organizations, again leading to a loss of benefits.\(^2\)

This theoretical point might result in the conclusion that schools and agencies should not be as close to each other as practitioners, especially, have previously suggested. It does support the view that as two institutions, each ought to guard its own unique function. What is not clear is the balance point of closeness in a shared function such as field instruction.

The second theoretical notion, developed by Litwak and Meyer which seems relevant, is their thinking about linkage mechanisms between bureaucracies and primary groups. Mechanisms serve to increase

---


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 249.
or decrease the social distance between the bureaucracy and the primary or community group. The authors identify those mechanisms where the bureaucracy assumes a great deal of initiative in an intensive manner, with focused expertise as linkages which encourage closeness.\footnote{Ibid., p. 251.} An example is the detached expert, who might be the field advisor. Accepting the conclusions of Litwak and Meyer we might assume that a school wanting to develop close relationships with agencies would choose a mechanism where they would not only take a great deal of initiative in moving out to the community group but would also provide a person with a great deal of expertise who would encourage intensive relationships.

Generally, it is this writer's feeling that organizational theory not only helps to deepen our understanding of school-agency relationships but that the converse is also true. Observation of the interactions in the social work education enterprise provides empirical data which reinforces or questions theoretical notions.

**Role Theory**

Role theory, like organizational theory, provides a conceptual framework within which the relationship between school and agency may be analyzed. Research of roles is still comparatively recent. Strean comments on this point in his discussion of the "state of the art" of the theoretical material related to roles:
Role theory while still a relatively new field of study and far from the ideal scientific theory, already possesses an identifiable domain of study, perspective and language. Role analysts have chosen as their domain of study real-life behavior as it is displayed in ongoing social situations. Role theorists and role analysts have examined such problems as the processes of socialization, interdependencies among individuals, the organization and characteristics of social positions, processes of conformity and sanctioning, specialization of performance and the division of labor.¹

Despite difficulty in arriving at a unified definition of the term role² the literature does reflect agreement on the relationship, interactionist qualities characteristic of the role concept. This is a social theory whereby a person's actions and performances are effected by the norms of his reference group, behavior expectation and sanctions, and his own perception of prescribed behavior. We might therefore expect that students, field instructors, faculty, field work directors and so on would exhibit a high degree of consensus in perceptions, opinions and values.

The concept of role-set as developed by Merton³ is useful in understanding better the interactions between the chief actors in the social work education business. Merton and Ralph Linton describe each person as occupying a variety of positions in social systems. Each position is referred to as a "status". For example, mother, father, 


teacher, student and so on. A "role" is the "behavioral enacting of
the patterned expectations attributed to that position."¹ Role-set
is "that complement of role relationships which persons have by
virtue of occupying a particular social status."² For example, the
field instructor (status occupant) has a number of role partners
each of whom may perceive his role differently and expect different
things from him. His partners include: students, agency executive,
field work director, faculty and other. Similarly, the faculty field
advisor, as status occupant, has as role partners the University, the
faculty, agency people, students, etc. Howard Irving³ utilized role-
set in examining the relationship between field instructor, field
consultant and casework director.

Role-set should not be confused with the notion of "multiple
roles" where the same person plays different roles in different
situations, (e.g., mother, wife, daughter, boss...). It is an
interactionist concept where the status occupant remains the same
but relates to a number of others whose roles are relevant to his
performance in that position. He needs them in order to carry out
his function.

¹Ibid., p. 368. (In referring to writing of Ralph Linton)
²Ibid., p. 369.
³Howard Irving, "A Social Science Approach to a Problem in
Field Instruction: The Analysis of a Three Part Role-Set."
One of the major sources of instability in role-sets is the differential expectations held by the role partners for the functioning of the status occupant. An example occurs when school people and agency people expect different things of social work students. Merton views this as a consistent phenomenon:

...anyone occupying a particular status has role-partners who are differently located in the social structure. As a result, these others have...values and moral expectations differing from those held by the occupant of the status in question.1

Merton's acceptance of conflict between role-partners as a given is similar to Litwak and Hylton's proposal that the "...conflict between organizations is taken as a given in interorganizational analysis..."2 Although using different language, both theories accept conflict as a given and then identify how the presence of linkage mechanisms may either alleviate or intensify the conflict. Litwak and Hylton search for the appropriate forms of interaction for such conditions. Merton identifies the "social mechanisms through which some reasonable degree of articulation among roles in role sets is secured...".3

Merton describes six such mechanisms which the writer will discuss with illustrations from social work education relationships.

---

1. Different intensity of role-involvement among those in the role set:

Merton posits that if all role partners (e.g., field instructor, faculty advisor, agency supervisor) had equal investments in the role of the status occupant (e.g., Field Instructor) then the plight of the person in this focal position would be intolerable. However, ...

...if the expectations of the one group...are central to their concerns and interests, and the expectations of the other group, only peripheral, this eases the problem of the (field instructor) seeking to come to terms with these disparate expectations.¹

We may infer from this that the fact that role partners do not have an equal investment in the performance of the status occupant results in a more stable role-set and one with less role conflict. Thus, if the field instructor is the status occupant and school and agency do not have an equal stake in his performance it makes it easier for him to function without role strain. Acceptance of this premise would mean that arguments for equal partnership and investment of education and practice in field instruction would have to be abandoned. Unless, of course, we assume that the "pull" between school and agency is healthy and that making it "easier" for the field instructor to function does not necessarily guarantee higher level performance.

2. A second mechanism serving to maintain the stability of role-sets is found in the "...differences in the power of those involved..."² Power as defined by Merton is "...the observed and

¹Ibid., pp. 371-372.
²Ibid., p. 372.
predictable capacity for imposing one's own will in a social action, even against the resistance of others taking part in that action."¹

In this case conflict is between the role partners rather than between the status occupant and his partners. Again, using an illustration from social work education, faculty and field instructor exert influence over student education. Merton sees this "structure of competing powers..."² in role sets as a helpful phenomenon since it allows the status occupant (e.g., student) more autonomy. If we were to concur with this view, attempts at reducing conflict between school and agency would be greatly diminished.

3. Another mechanism which serves to maintain role-sets with a minimum amount of disorder is the insulation of "...role activities from observability by members of the role-set..." Merton tells us that...

...effective social control presupposes an appreciable degree of observability of role behavior. To the extent that the role structure insulates the status occupant from direct observation by some of his role set, he is not uniformly subject to competing pressures...³

Consequently, striving for more intimate relationships between field instructor (status occupant) and a faculty advisor would result in unstable, disordered relationships. Merton uses the notion of academic freedom of university professors as an example of the functioning of this mechanism. His example is also familiar to those

¹Ibid., p. 372.
²Ibid., p. 374.
³Ibid., p. 374.
in social work education both for faculty members and field work instructors. He states:

The norm which holds that what is said in the classrooms of universities is privileged, in the sense of being restricted to the professor and his students, has the function of maintaining a degree of autonomy for the teacher. For if this were uniformly made available to all those comprising the role-set of the teacher, he might be driven to teach not what he knows or what the evidence leads him to believe, but what will placate the numerous and diverse expectations of all those concerned with the 'education of youth'. This would soon serve to lower the level of instruction to the lowest common denominator. It would be to transform teaching and place it on the plane of the television show, concerned to do whatever is needed to improve its popularity rating.¹

However, despite his strong argument for privacy, Merton, like social work educators and practitioners, looks for the balance between autonomy and accountability.

...some measure of observability of role performance by members of the role set is required if the indespensable social requirement of accountability is to be met.²

4. The fourth mechanism insuring the stability of the role-set involves making visible to role partners their conflicting demands upon the occupant of a social status. When these conflicts are not observable it is the person in the status position (field instructor or student for example) who must "solve" the problem. This results in a feeling of role conflict. Merton contends, however, that, "...when it is made plain that the demands of some members of the role-set are in full contradiction with the demands of other members, it becomes the task of the role-set, rather than

¹Ibid., p. 374.
²Ibid., p. 376.
the task of the status occupant, to resolve these contradictions....

The student, as status occupant, might highlight the differing expectations of his performance by practice and school people leaving them to resolve the contradictions.

5. A mutual support mechanism also operates to diminish disorder in role sets. The banding together with "...others in similar social statuses with similar difficulties of coping with an unintegrated role set..." ailds in the creation of a "survival" situation. (E.g., field instructors hold meetings, students form councils, etc.)

6. The final mechanism involves the breaking off of certain relationships leaving consensus of role expectations among those that remain. This would be highly improbable on a general basis in social work education. There have, however, been individual incidents where agencies have "fired" students and schools have dropped agencies whose expectations for students were incompatible with theirs.

A discussion of role sets requires some examination of the factors which influence the behavior of status occupants and their role partners. In social work education repetitive patterns in history seem to have established prescribed norms for the roles of field instructors, faculty advisors and so on.

This phenomenon of continuity of roles based on history and habit demands that we consider the possibility that a "pseudo-mutuality"

---

1Ibid., p. 376.
2Ibid., p. 377.
3Ibid., p. 379.
situation between school and agency exists. Pseudo-mutuality, as
developed by Wynne, Ryckoff, Day and Hirsch\(^1\) occurs when the
following conditions are in effect:

1. Each person brings to the relationship a primary
   investment maintaining a sense of relation.

2. A predominant absorption in fitting together exists.

3. Divergence is perceived as leading to disruption of
   relationships and must therefore be avoided.

4. Emotional investment is directed more towards
   maintaining the sense of reciprocal fulfillment
   of expectations rather than accurately perceiving
   them.

Looking at history alone without analyzing the present inter-
actions between school and agency could result in relationships of
pseudo-mutuality rather than real need.

In addition to historical influences, the group to which a
person belongs also influences behavior. Bott's study\(^2\) of London
families identified the effect on roles of a close (connected)
family network as compared with loose knit networks. This can be
tied in with reference group behavior and easily related to the
chief actors in the social work education enterprise. It perhaps
explains why school people tend to articulate their views with more
conviction and greater frequency than field instructors. There are
certainly more vehicles through which faculty get together and
influence each other (yearly Program Meetings, School Seminars and
faculty meetings...). One might anticipate that the field instructors,

\(^1\) Wynne, Rykoff, Day and Hirsch, "Pseudo-Mutuality in the Family
   Relations of Schizophrenics." *Psychosocial Interior of the Family*,
   (Reprint from a 1958 article by same author.)

\(^2\) Elizabeth Bott, "Conjugal Roles and Social Networks." *The
   Families*, Bell & Vogel (eds.) (New York: Free Press, 1968), pp. 272-
   281.
as a group are loosely connected and therefore not as influenced in standard setting or rigid norms of behavior.

Since this is a study of the relationship between schools of social work and field placement agencies from the perspective of students, field instructors and some faculty, the concepts of role-set and reference groups seem particularly relevant. This investigator will restrict discussion to these two areas and resist a more comprehensive review of role theory.

Summary

This chapter has traced historically the connections between the theory and practice components of social work and their influence on the education of professionals. A review of the social work literature has revealed the complexity of the relationship between class and field, school and agency. The pattern of the association reflects both inextricable ties with concommitant tensions. Since "what is past is also prologue" this historical overview has been presented as one method of deepening our understanding of school-agency contacts and predicting future ties and conflicts.

Some theory on roles and organizations has been summarized in order to provide different perspectives of analyzing the relationship between social work school and field placement agency.
CHAPTER IV

STUDENT SURVEY
GENERAL FREQUENCIES AND FREQUENCIES BY SCHOOLS

One of the aims of this study is to examine the relationship between school and field placement agency from the perspective of the three key actors in the social work education enterprise. Much of the literature concentrates on the views of educators and practitioners. This chapter will report on student perceptions of the interaction between the two institutions.

Areas of exploration will include student observations of: class and field conflict in goals and teaching content, uniformity of content taught, comparative influence of school and agency people on education, field work as an integral part of the social work school's curriculum, degree of intimacy between the two institutions and student contact with faculty and agency personnel. In addition, data will be supplied on student respondent viewpoints regarding repetitive and current issues in social work education as well as their attitudes towards popular conceptions of school and agency people (e.g., faculty steeped in theory and out of touch with practice).

The Notion of Closeness

The material presented in this section will generally refer to student views of the contact between school and agency, for example, how
frequently they "touch each other." Examination will focus on how students perceive the degree of influence school and agency exert on each other's tasks and institutions, what efforts are made to integrate class and field content, and frequency of contacts between school and agency in the form of meetings, phone calls and memos.

Historically the designated liaison people between the two institutions are the faculty field adviser from the school and the field instructor from the agency. This arrangement continues to be the most common one despite the fact that some schools assign a greater liaison role to the Field Work Department than others.

Students were asked to comment on the degree of intimacy between their field instructor and faculty-field adviser by indicating whether the association was "distant" or "close." A "distant relationship" was defined as involving infrequent contacts or contacts related to crisis situations rather than one that involved ongoing communication. "Close-ness" was defined as phone calls and meetings at regular intervals rather than only at crisis points.

Student responses left no doubt that they perceived the relationship between the agency and school liaison people as basically superficial. A majority (56.5 percent) of the respondents viewed the relationship as "distant" while only 20.4 percent perceived a "close" relationship. Although 43.5 percent of the respondents did not indicate a distant relationship between Field Instructor and Faculty Field Adviser, a large proportion (80 percent) of the students did not feel the association was close (see Table 1).

An attempt was made to discover if perceptions varied by school affiliation. Results indicated that the view of "Distance" showed no
TABLE 1

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE DISTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS
BETWEEN THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISER AND THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students were asked to indicate which of "the following..." best described the relationship of their field instructor to their faculty field adviser by checking all that applied.

Substantial differences between schools ($F = 1.964$, df = 5, $p = .085$).* In the perception of "closeness," however, significant differences in the means of schools were found ($F = 2.983$, df = 5, $p = .013$) (see Table 2).

In comparison to the perceptions of other student respondents, the students from Columbia and Fordham viewed their field instructors and faculty field advisers as being further apart. Although there was only a one percent difference between Columbia and Fordham, there was a 12.6 percent difference between them and the next school on the continuum. It is important to note that in no school did the majority of students see the relationship as close.

During the time of this study, Columbia and Fordham were the only two schools relying primarily upon student group advising. The

*NOTE: In this and all succeeding instances, F-tests were used where categories were ordered since variables were presented as nominal scales.
TABLE 2

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE EXISTENCE OF
A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIELD ADVISER AND FIELD INSTRUCTOR
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "Closeness" defined as phone calls and meetings at regular intervals rather than only at crisis points.

others used the one-to-one method. We might speculate that the students receiving the more individualized attention might have assumed that contacts between school and agency were more frequent and intimate. For example, 74 percent of the Wurzweiler students and 77 percent of the Adelphi students indicated that they met with their advisers exclusively on an individual basis. These students also perceived less distance between adviser and field instructor than students of other schools. On the other hand, the Columbia (67.4 percent) and Fordham (65.3 percent) respondents showed the highest percentage of students perceiving a distant relationship.

In this speculation we ought to note that NYU second year students are seen only on an "as needed" basis. (They are seen regularly and individually in their first year.) However, even if their viewpoints were influenced more strongly by their present experience, their
tendency to perceive greater closeness than students from Columbia and Fordham may reflect the fact that their "as needed" advising is still carried out on an individual basis.

Cutting across school lines various student comments referred to the fact that many times school and agency "... work as separate entities ..." Most stressed the need for "closeness and cooperation." It is clear that most students tended to see the agency and the school as operating in separate domains.

Coordination of classroom content and field experience was seen as one way of judging the closeness of school and agency. Consequently, students were asked to indicate the extent to which faculty members and field instructors attempted to integrate class and field learning (see Table 3). Some felt that "Neither school nor agency helped the student to integrate theoretical concepts with the practice experience. It is generally assumed that this integration happens automatically but most students ... agree this is an area of difficulty for them."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Some Effort</th>
<th>Hardly Any Effort</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Adviser</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Teachers</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Efforts of the Key Actors in Social Work Education to Integrate Classroom Content with Field Experience as Rated by Students (n = 205)
Only the methods teacher was seen as making a reasonably strong effort at integration. Almost half (48.1 percent) the respondents shared this view. The field instructor, although second to the methods teacher (27.4 percent) did not make a strong showing in integration efforts. Very few faculty other than the methods instructor were seen as making special attempts to relate class and field teaching and learning.

When the "strong" and "some" effort response categories were combined the students' perceptions reflected the following distribution of attempts at integration:

| Faculty Field Adviser | 53.3% |
| Field Instructor      | 62.8% |
| Other Teachers        | 78.6% |
| Method Teachers       | 89.2% |

This shows a clear indication that students felt that methods teachers in particular, but also other classroom faculty, made more efforts to integrate class and field than the other two categories. Almost half of the respondents (46.7 percent) viewed the Faculty Field Adviser as making hardly any or no effort at all as compared to only 10.9 percent who viewed the methods teacher in this manner.

These results raise doubts about the historically prescribed role of the faculty field adviser as a liaison person. If, as some writers indicate (see for example, Ruth Gilpin, "Theory and Practice as a Single Reality"), the faculty adviser ought to be the embodiment in one person of theory and practice, then these results certainly do not support this hope. One might have anticipated that the person connected to both school and agency would be viewed as making the greatest efforts at integration rather than the least.
Student attitudes regarding integration efforts remained essentially consistent regardless of school affiliation. Testing did not show any significant differences in means of schools. In the instance of the method teacher, however, the results were very close to showing significant variations between students from different schools ($F = 2.188, df = 5, p = .056$). A high percentage of students in all six schools felt that the methods teacher made some or strong efforts at integration (range: 81.1 percent - 96.7 percent). Wurzweiler and Fordham fell on the lower end of the range (81 - 82 percent). In addition, more students from Wurzweiler (17 percent) and Fordham (14.7 percent) felt that method teachers made hardly any or no effort at integration. Only 3.2 percent - 4.7 percent of the respondents in the other schools gave such poor ratings to the methods teacher.

In spite of these school differences, it was still clear that the method teacher was given the highest "score" in efforts at integration of class and field content. This held true for all schools represented in the study. A primary reason for this might be the fact that the curriculum in method classes grows out of the students' practice experiences in their field placement agencies. Almost by definition the specific focus of these classes is the teaching of the interplay between theory and practice skills.

In other classes too, practice material is often introduced in order to make the theory become "more alive," more understandable. It is therefore "integrated" into the curriculum, albeit less frequently than in practice classes. The possibilities for perceiving integration of practice and theory are relatively good in the classroom since students are exposed to their course instructors on a consistent weekly basis.
In comparison, most students reported infrequent contacts with their faculty advisers "... none when everything is okay ..." It seemed that the purpose of student-faculty adviser contact as perceived by respondents was restricted to providing solutions to crisis situations effecting the student in placement.

In the field placement, unlike the classroom situation where students are able to provide practice examples to a teacher who might have minimal contact with practice, there are very few students who can provide a theory component to a field instructor who might be less conversant with theoretical literature than the school faculty person.

In examining the closeness of the two partners in the social work education enterprise another criteria-looked at was student perceptions of their reciprocity ... how they effect and influence each other. Students' views of the influence "school people" have on service delivery, the primary business of agencies, were identified. The three faculty categories chosen for examination were those who would most likely be expected to be closest to the field work placement (the faculty adviser, method teacher and field work department). Results indicated that the majority of students perceived no influence at all of these school people on agency service. Approximately three-quarters of the sample saw no effect on program by either the method teacher or the field work department. Almost 60 percent of the sample viewed the person "closest" to the field, the adviser, as having no influence (see Table 4).

Similarly, agency people (field instructor, executives and other social workers) were generally perceived as having hardly any or no influence at all on the school's general curriculum or content of method
TABLE 4
THE INFLUENCE OF PRACTICE FACULTY ON AGENCY SERVICE
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Adviser</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Teacher</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

classes. There was some modest effect on the choice of field agencies. Both executive staff (39.6 percent) and field instructors (37.8 percent) were seen as having some input regarding choice of field agencies (see Tables 5 and 6 for student perception of influence of agency people on certain educational areas).

In all three educational areas (general curriculum, content of methods classes and criteria for student performance), NYU and Wurzweiler students in particular saw agency staff as having very little influence, while Adelphi respondents saw them as exerting more influence than students from other schools. For example, 20 percent of the Adelphi respondents felt Executive staff exerted a great deal of influence on the general curriculum as compared to a range for other schools of 3.2 percent to 9.4 percent. Similarly, 13.3 percent of Adelphi students saw the field instructor as making a large impact on the content of method classes as compared to a range of 5.3 percent to 9.3 percent. Examining the field instructor's impact on method classes
from another perspective, 67.9 percent of Wurzweiler students and 71.7 percent of NYU students attributed no influence to him (her) as compared to a range of 43.3 percent to 58.1 percent for students from other schools who felt similarly. Even in a category as vague as "other social workers" the pattern was maintained. Adelphi respondents saw the greatest influence (10 percent in a range for other schools of 0 to 5.3 percent) and Wurzweiler and NYU students (62.3 percent and 58.5 percent in a range otherwise of 33.3 percent to 48.8 percent) perceived the least influence.

Predictably, 86 percent of the students felt the field instructor exerted a great deal of influence in establishing the criteria for student performance. Both executive staff and other social workers were assigned some minor importance in this area.

In general, students perceived as minimal the effect and influence school people had on agency service and agency people had on specifically "educational" spheres (i.e., curriculum). Where field work was involved (choice of agencies or student performance) agency people were seen as having some modest effect. However, even in the case of the field instructor, the agency person most closely related to the school, the input into educational spheres was perceived as minimal in all but the criteria for student performance (see Table 7).

Conflict in Goals and Teaching Content

Much of the literature emphasizes conflicting organizational goals as a primary cause of tension between school and field placement agency. An attempt was made to solicit student perceptions regarding
TABLE 5
STUDENT VIEW THAT SELECTED AGENCY STAFF
HAVE HARDLY ANY OR NO INFLUENCE ON FOUR EDUCATIONAL AREAS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Staff</th>
<th>General Curriculum</th>
<th>Content of Method Class</th>
<th>Choice of Field Agency</th>
<th>Criteria for Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Workers</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages reflect combined ratings of "Hardly Any" and "Not at All" categories in a question soliciting student perceptions of influence of agency people on educational areas such as general curriculum, content of method classes, choice of field agencies and criteria for student performance.

TABLE 6
STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF SELECTED AGENCY STAFF ON FOUR EDUCATIONAL AREAS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Staff</th>
<th>General Curriculum</th>
<th>Content of Method Class</th>
<th>Choice of Field Agency</th>
<th>Criteria for Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Workers</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages shown are combined ratings of "Great Deal" and "Somewhat" categories in a question soliciting student perceptions of the influence of agency people (field instructor, executives, other social worker) on four educational areas.
TABLE 7

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S INFLUENCE ON GENERAL CURRICULUM, METHOD CLASSES, CHOICE OF FIELD AGENCIES AND CRITERIA FOR STUDENT PERFORMANCE (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Area</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Curriculum</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content of Method Class</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Field Agencies</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Student Performance</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this phenomenon. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statement: "The School's goal of education and the Agency's goal of service are contradictory."

Although better than a majority (59 percent) of the students did not perceive a conflict between educational and service goals, there was still a substantial minority (39 percent) who did see such a contradiction. Very strong feelings of agreement or disagreement were not expressed. Of those students who did view the goals as contradictory only 9.5 percent felt strongly about it. Those who disagreed showed stronger feelings. Of the 59 percent who perceived no conflict, about half (30.9 percent) felt this strongly. In other words when strong opinions were expressed three times as many students did not see
a contradiction, between the school's goal of education and the agency's
goal of service, as those that did.

Further exploration revealed that the school a student attended
appeared related to the notion of conflicting goals. It was dis-
covered that there were significant differences in mean perceptions of
subjects from different schools ($F = 2.677$, $df = 5$, $p = .023$). These
results are summarized in Table 8.

Students in individual schools tended not to express strong agree-
ment with the opinion that service and educational goals were conflict-
ing. When these were strong views students tended to disagree rather
than agree. These responses were consistent in the overall school
findings.

**TABLE 8**

**STUDENT AGREEMENT BY SCHOOLS ATTENDED**
**THAT SERVICE AND EDUCATIONAL GOALS ARE CONTRADICTORY**
**(N = 285)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we collapse the four categories into two (agreement and disagreement) we discover that a contradiction between service and educational goals was felt most keenly by the Fordham (52 percent) and Wurzweiler (41.5 percent) students. Columbia (65.1 percent), Adelphi (66.7 percent) and NYU (69.8 percent) respondents showed the highest rate of disagreement with the view that agency and school goals conflict.

It is difficult to explain school differences with any degree of sureness. One factor might be the pattern of field placements. Adelphi, for example, places heavy emphasis on the concept of Educational Centers where school and agency people are in geographic proximity and hopefully closer in communication and teaching content. This phenomenon might account for the fact that almost half (46.7 percent) of all Adelphi students in the sample disagreed strongly with the idea that educational and service goals were contradictory. When, however, we view overall disagreement we find that Columbia (65.1 percent) and NYU (69.8 percent) students are comparable in their opinion to Adelphi (66.7 percent) respondents. Neither of these two schools emphasizes educational centers although Columbia does encourage multiple placements in the form of units.

Further digging unveiled the fact that students from the two schools who perceived the greatest contradiction in goals were from the two schools offering "method majors." At Wurzweiler, students concentrate in one area for both years of training (i.e., casework, group work or community social work). Although Fordham provides a generic practice sequence in the first year a major in micro, mezzo or macro social work must be chosen in the second year. Columbia, NYU and Adelphi lean more in the direction of a generic practice emphasis.
Although NYU and Columbia have a two track system, the overwhelming majority of students are enrolled in the tracks concentrating in casework, group work and certain areas of community organization.

A generic focus might allow for a broader variety of agency ideology. If a student comes from a school stressing differences in methods or therapy versus social work, and the student is placed in an agency which doesn't "fit," e.g., uses more than one modality, or does not distinguish between therapy and social work, then contradictions in ideology might erroneously be viewed as contradictions in the goals of service and education.

If agency responsibilities of the field instructor were seen as interfering with educational responsibility then we might assume that a contradiction between agency and school goals would also be perceived. No such association was found in this data. Illustrative of this is the fact that Wurzweiler and Fordham students, who felt most keenly the conflict in goals, did not perceive that their field instructors' agency responsibilities interfered in their relationship. In fact, respondents from Wurzweiler indicated the least interference. Only 20.8 percent of their students felt responsibilities interfered as compared to 48.8 percent of the Columbia sample, 30 percent from Adelphi and 26.4 percent from NYU.

Conflict in content taught in class and field was another area of exploration. Students were asked to describe the degree along a five point scale: great deal of conflict in content, some conflict, hardly any, none at all and mutually exclusive. Most respondents perceived some degree of conflict. Only 8.8 percent felt that none existed. More than half the respondents (55.8 percent) believed the
content taught in class and field reflected some significant discrepancies. A few students (7 percent) viewed the content as different enough to be considered mutually exclusive. (Table 9 reports the general frequencies.)

**TABLE 9**

CONFLICT IN CONTENT TAUGHT IN CLASS AND FIELD
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Conflict</th>
<th>Some Conflict</th>
<th>Hardly Any Conflict</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Mutually Exclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of conflict did not vary substantially from school to school (F = 1.548, df = 5, p = .176). However, there were some observations worthy of note. In combining the "great" and "some" conflict categories, it was discovered that more than half the students in all the schools except Adelphi (40 percent) and Hunter (45.2 percent) felt conflict present between class and field. As a total group of students only 35.8 percent felt that hardly any or no conflict existed. Columbia reflected the highest number of students (67.4 percent) who felt great or some conflict existed. On the other end of the continuum, a majority (53.3 percent) of Adelphi students saw only slight or no conflict at all.

When elaborating on the question of conflict many students
attributed this phenomenon to their perception that schools were
generic but agencies were not. The comments indicated not so much
a generic method problem (i.e., group work/casework . . .) but rather
one of ideology where the school took the position that it was edu-
cating social workers to practice in a variety of settings rather than
training "therapists" to work in "clinical" settings. It is apparent
from student responses that many placements were seen as being more
comfortable with the title "therapist." Reasons for this choice range
all the way from presumed higher professional status to the notion of
"common" agency title (i.e., every professional is a therapist . . .
occupational, recreational, physical . . . so why not also for the
social worker).

Student statements reflecting this cause of conflict include:

School is more generically oriented and doesn't see the role
of social worker as therapist. My experience both years has
been in psychoanalytically oriented agencies . . . school has to
some degree shirked its responsibilities in preparing me for
these placements . . . dissonance between what the school teaches
and where it places students.

When school maintains a generic stance but places students in
clinical settings it creates a schizophrenic atmosphere in the
classroom.

School has unrealistic perception of work of social workers in
field work agencies. School's insistence on distinction between
casework and psychotherapy and the content of courses based on
this distinction makes for conflict between school and agency.

. . . My agency is not treatment oriented but my education is . . .

We are not allowed to function as therapists in class and yet
are placed in psychiatric settings and told we are THERAPISTS.
There is an inherent contradiction which must be reconciled if
the learning experience is to be valid and helpful.

There needs to be greater coordination of clinical practice
training and academic forces . . .

. . . this places additional strain on the students . . .
Confusion can be discerned from these comments. The students become caught up in what looks like an ideological conflict but which is primarily a problem in terminology. Group work versus group therapy, social worker versus therapist, casework versus psychotherapy . . . all arguments leading only to obscuring the investigation and learning of professional skills. Energies spent in defining what we are called rather than what we do. The dilemma is whether this student confusion actually grows out of a conflict in content taught in class and field or whether the conflict is one of labels.

This section has concentrated on students' perceptions of two areas of possible conflict between school and agency, i.e., institutional goals and teaching content. Before concluding the discussion it might be helpful to compare the students' responses for each area. Although more than half of the students (55.8 percent) perceived conflict in content, better than a majority (59 percent) believed that education and service goals were not contradictory. We might infer from this that student respondents did not view the conflict in field and class teaching content as affected by contradictory organizational goals.

Uniformity of Content Taught to Students

In this section the issue addressed is whether the students perceived the knowledge and skills imparted to them as idiosyncratic or uniform and consistent. If in fact there is a conflict in what is taught in class and field question arises as to whether it is attributable to the uniqueness of each field instructor and teacher or whether
it reflects a consistent difference in the material covered by school and agency.

Students were asked to indicate their own opinion as well as their perception of the points of view promulgated in class and field about the uniformity of social work theory and practice skills. We will begin with an exploration of the matter of the existence of a common core of social work theory which is easily identified (see Table 10).

**TABLE 10**

SOCIAL WORK HAS A COMMON CORE OF THEORY WHICH IS READILY IDENTIFIABLE
STUDENT VIEWS AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS
OF SCHOOL AND FIELD VIEWS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Common Theory</th>
<th>Readily Identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Own View</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Field View</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of School View</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students were asked to indicate their opinion and then specify the view they thought was promulgated in class and field.

Responses show that although a majority (67.7 percent) of the students felt that social work had a common core of theory, only 35.9 percent of them expressed security in being able to readily identify this
theory.

Reactions to both questions reveal that the respondents saw the school as expressing more strongly than the field the view that there is a common core of social work theory and that this theory can be readily identified and described. We might infer that students perceive that they are being taught a generic social work theory base in class which they felt was not being transmitted as consistently in the field.

An effort was made to see whether student perceptions of how field, school and students view the theory question were effected by school affiliation. School means were analyzed. Results indicated no significant differences by school. (F-tests showed probability scores not achieving the .05 level.) Nevertheless, some dissimilarities seem worthy of reporting. Adelphi students, for example, tended more than others to perceive opinions through a "generic bias." As many as 93.3 percent of Adelphi subjects shared the belief that a common core of social work theory existed as compared to percentages in the 60s for respondents of other schools. In addition, 80 percent of the Adelphi students viewed the field as agreeing with the opinion that there was a common social work theory base. This is about 10 percent higher than the overall perception of students regarding agency people (general frequency was 70.5 percent). All the Adelphi students (an uncommon 100 percent) felt that the school perceived a common core of social work theory. Columbia respondents also felt strongly that their classroom instructors represented the opinion that a common theory existed (view shared by 90.7 percent of the student respondents).

Students' attitudes towards the ability of field and school
people to specify social work theory showed some variation. As was the case in the belief that there was a core of social work theory, Columbia and Adelphi students also gave the highest scores of all the schools in attributing to classroom teachers a capacity to identify the theory. (In a range of "yes" responses of 60.4 percent - 83.3 percent, 83.3 percent of the Adelphi students and 72.1 percent of the Columbia students felt school people could specifically distinguish the theory.)

Less Columbia students (34.9 percent) than from other schools felt that field people could identify the core of social work theory (range was from 34.9 percent to 63.3 percent). More Adelphi students (63.3 percent) believed that agency staff has the competence to do this.

In an attempt to explain these school differences it was surmised that a student's view of the scholarliness of faculty members and field instructors might affect his perception of their capacity to see and to identify social work theory. Results of this examination only somewhat supported the supposition. It was true that less Columbia students (29.7 percent) saw their field instructors as scholarly than from other schools (range of others was 32.5 percent to 45.9 percent). This correlates with the Columbia students' view of the field's ability to identify social work theory. Similarly, more Columbia respondents (72.1 percent) felt their method teachers were scholarly than those from other schools. This was in keeping with the high scores given by Columbia students to classroom teachers' ability to understand and to specify social work theory.

Adelphi responses, however, did not support the assumption that views of scholarliness are positively correlated with ability to see and identify a common core of social work theory. In fact more Adelphi
students, than from other schools, did not rate their methods or other classroom teachers as scholarly. In fact in both cases they fell on the lower end of the continuum.

Another assumption we might make is that a school with students who viewed the greatest divergence of opinion between class and field would also reflect the highest percentage of students who felt that there was a great deal of conflict between the two. Columbia students showed the most discrepancy between class and field on the two questions regarding theory. (Difference of 23.3 percent in belief that common core of social work theory exists; 37.2 percent that it is readily identifiable.) They also had the highest score on responses indicating conflict between class and field.

The next area of attention was the students' own viewpoints and their perceptions of the opinions promoted by class and field regarding the existence of a common core of practice skills which are readily perceptible to identification. (Table 11 summarizes the results.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Common Skills</th>
<th>Readily Identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Own View</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Field View</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of School View</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students were asked to identify their own opinions as well as their perception of the view promulgated in field and school.
Results are similar to those emerging in the "theory" area. All three categories, in the view of the students, agree in the majority of cases that there is a common core of practice skills. Also similar is that a smaller number in each category believed that the skills were easily recognized. Interesting to note is that from the students' perspective each of the three parties perceived skills as more readily identifiable than theory (see Table 12). This perhaps points to the fact that methods or practice classes concentrate on skills specific to social work practice whereas the other courses might be presented as more general in their application.

TABLE 12
STUDENT PERCEPTION OF STUDENT, FIELD AND SCHOOL VIEWS THAT SOCIAL WORK HAS A CORE OF THEORY AND PRACTICE SKILLS WHICH ARE READILY IDENTIFIABLE (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View</th>
<th>Theory Identifiable</th>
<th>Skills Identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's Own View</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Field View</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of School View</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the results regarding "theory" students see the school as expressing the strongest belief in the existence of easily recognized
practice skills which are unique to the social work profession. School
and agency are viewed as being closer together in the identification of
practice skills than in specifying a core of social work theory.

Perceptions of field and school as well as the students' own
opinions of the presence of a common core of social work practice skills
which are readily identifiable proved relatively consistent regardless
of school affiliation. No significant differences in the means of
schools were noted. (Results of F-tests indicated a significance level
for all categories, in both cases, not achieving the .05 level.)

We might comment briefly on the fact that, consistent with other
perceptions of faculty and field people, Columbia students gave the
highest percentage ratings to the school in both cases: view that there
were specific social work practice skills (95.3 percent) and that these
were subject to easy identification (79.1 percent). These same stu-
dents gave "student" and "field" categories the lowest rating of all
other respondents in promulgating the view that there was a common core
of practice skills. In spite of the high ratings given the school,
better than a majority (60.5 percent) of the Columbia responses indi-
cated that their students could not easily define and specify practice
skills.

As was the case in the "theory" issue, students who perceived
the greatest difference in views of school and agency also felt the
greatest conflict in content taught.

In an attempt to ascertain the uniformity of theory and practice
skill teaching material, the previous examination has concentrated on
an analysis of the views of the three partners in social work education,
as perceived by student respondents. The next areas of discussion will
examine more specifically the two settings in which the student is educated . . . the school and the agency. In this regard, the focus will be on an exploration of the existence of internal consistencies in each of the settings. An attempt will be made to determine whether students, irrespective of school or field affiliation, feel they are receiving the same "message," i.e., the same content, in each of these places.

The first unit of attention in exploring this uniformity question was focused on the field. Students were asked to indicate whether they felt there were uniform standards for performance in the field and if they believed they ought to exist.

**TABLE 13**

**STUDENT PERCEPTION OF WHETHER THERE ARE AND SHOULD BE UNIFORM STANDARDS FOR FIELD WORK PERFORMANCE**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Perception</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are uniform standards in field work.</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be uniform standards in field work.</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is necessary to call attention to the high percentage (72.6 percent) of students who shared the view that uniform standards did not exist and, equally important to note that 68.1 percent felt the need
for them. One might infer that student respondents felt that expectations for their performance in field work tended to vary from placement to placement and field instructor to field instructor.

Next will be an examination of whether, from the student perspective, the content of material taught in the field approaches some degree of homogeneity. In this vein, students were asked to indicate the degree of difference or similarity of the field content taught to them in comparison to other students in the same method and in different methods (see Table 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very Different</th>
<th>Slightly Different</th>
<th>Slightly Similar</th>
<th>Very Similar</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Method Field Content</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Method Field Content</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student responses revealed that 70.9 percent felt that their field work content was similar to that taught to others in the same method. Only 38.6 percent, however, felt that the content was "very similar." We may therefore conclude that a sizable group saw their learning as
individualized and in some cases quite idiosyncratic.

More than half the students (61.5 percent) viewed what was taught to them in the field as different from those majoring in other methods. Less than 10 percent saw the content as very similar. Only 16.8 percent found content even slightly similar. According to these findings more than a majority of this student sample did not perceive practice content as being taught from a generic base.

At this point we might want to distinguish between practice skills and specific knowledge about clients in different settings. Using this distinction we can expect that content regarding schizophrenics, older adults, children and so on would normally be different even if practice skills remained the same for all methods. We cannot be absolutely sure that student respondents were defining skills as helping movements or knowledge about clients. Based on this writer's professional experience it is her judgment that most of the students were using the more common definition of method, namely, interventive skills. Regardless of this distinction, however, students did not perceive a common base of learning in the field.

In examining school variations it was found that Columbia students reflected the strongest perception of differences in field content for different method education. In Columbia, which has a two track system, only 4.7 percent of the respondents viewed the content as even slightly similar. The overwhelming majority (81.4 percent) saw content as very different. Students in other schools fell into a 20 - 37.7 percent range who viewed the content as very different. Responses from the Columbia sample were not too surprising. In a personal interview with this investigator Columbia's Director of Field Work indicated that
the school had deliberately established clear distinctions between their two concentrations. One covered direct work with clients as individuals, in families, in groups and in neighborhoods. The second emphasized policy and planning with work in larger societal systems. Student perceptions of clear separations in the two tracks therefore seems to reflect the emphasis in the school.

Wurzweiler students, although coming from a school with clear method divisions (i.e., casework, group work and community organization), did not feel as strongly as the Columbia respondents that content was very different (only 35.8 percent as compared to 81.4 percent). It would seem that although the methods are defined as different, worker interventions are still perceived as overlapping . . . principles and values still seen as generic. On the other hand, the two track system, by definition divides the professional tasks into direct service and policy and planning skills. Consequently, one might expect the students to view greater difference between these two areas.

Adelphi which has the heaviest emphasis on the generic notion of practice showed that a majority (55.2 percent) of their students felt that field content for the same method was "very similar." This was the highest percentage of the six schools. Only 20 percent of the Adelphi students felt instruction to students in other methods was "very different" (lower than for the other schools).

Uniformity of field work content may also be examined through a knowledge of the areas discussed with the field instructor. Students were asked to indicate the degree of frequency of discussion of the seven topics assumed to be the most "popular." Following is a list of
those items covered "very frequently" or "quite a bit" as reported by the student respondents:

1. Client problems 81.1%
2. Practice skills 70.5%
3. Process records 60.7%
4. Agency functioning 54.7%
5. Learning problems 53.0%
6. Personal problems 21.4%
7. Problems in supervisory relationship 17.2%

The data indicated that the greatest emphasis in supervision of students is on client problems. One might then assume that "diagnosis" ranks first in what is taught in the field. Interventive skills are second to assessment skills. The process record, traditionally a major tool in supervision is still used frequently although not as much as we might expect (60.7 percent of the cases).

All seven areas of discussion were tested to determine whether any considerable differences existed among schools. Means were examined for this purpose. Problems in the supervisory relationship, personal problems, use of process records and agency functioning showed no important variations. The other three topics did reveal significant differences:

Client Problems  (F-test = 3.456, df = 5, p = .005)
Practice Skills  (F-test = 3.638, df = 5, p = .004)
Learning Problems (F-test = 2.486, df = 5, p = .032)

For the purposes of this study it is important to recognize the existence of variations among schools. It is not essential to identify the specific school comparisons. The mere fact that there are significant
differences in the three most common areas of discussion (client problems, practice skills and process records), provide evidence that field instruction content varies to a considerable degree and most probably by field instructor and student.

In still another attempt to assess uniformity of field work content, as well as integration of class and field, students were asked to indicate the extent to which certain theoretical material was taught in the field. Nine areas of theory were examined. Three areas were perceived by students as receiving comparatively high consideration. These were: casework, psychopathology and family therapy.

TABLE 15
THEORETICAL MATERIAL MOST FREQUENTLY TAUGHT IN THE FIELD AS IDENTIFIED BY STUDENT RESPONDENTS (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory Taught</th>
<th>Great Deal of Theory</th>
<th>Some Theory</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathology</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Therapy</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining six areas were perceived as receiving little theoretical emphasis in field work (see Table 16).

A test was administered for all nine areas to ascertain whether substantial discrepancies existed in student perceptions by schools.
TABLE 16
THEORETICAL MATERIAL TAUGHT LEAST IN THE FIELD
AS IDENTIFIED BY STUDENT RESPONDENTS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Areas</th>
<th>Hardly Any or No Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Theory</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Theory</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change Theory</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Planning</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicated highly significant (better than the .05 level) differences in means of schools in all but the teaching of theory related to community organization and policy and planning. Again, as in the case of what was covered most frequently in field instruction, recognition of the fact that there are significant school variations among students seems more important than a detailed comparison of the differences. The conclusion that field work content, as seen through the eyes of students, lacks uniformity seems an obvious one. It is underscored by respondent comments such as: "... each placement is different ..." "standardization is limited. ..." and so on.

Perceptions of School and Agency People

In addition to examining student views on conflicts in content, goals and structure of school and agency, this study attempted to identify student perceptions of faculty and agency staff people. Answers
were sought to questions such as: "Who has higher status," "Who is better as educator, as practitioner," "Who does what better," "Who knows more about what."

A series of "opinion" questions were posed. Respondents were asked to express the extent of their agreement with common assessments made about educators and practitioners. Testing to determine whether university affiliation affected students' opinions revealed no significant differences in the means of schools. (F-tests performed on all four variables listed in Table 17 showed results higher than the .05 level.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School people know more about educating students than agency field instructors.</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are more sensitive to current practice directions. Agency people are more parochial.</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty have more practice experience than agency people.</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are more concerned with social problems and policy. Agency people with direct practice.</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of these questions revealed certain perceptions that occasioned surprise in the investigator. For example, it seems axiomatic that the educational institution would have more knowledge about the education of students than the practice agency. Yet, 65.6 percent of the students disagreed with this. Only a small percentage (8.8 percent) agreed strongly that school people knew more about student education than agency people. One explanation for this response might be the students' emphasis on field work as the primary source for learning practice which in turn is seen as the most important component of social work education.

Also somewhat unexpected was the student opinion regarding the practice experience of faculty and agency people. Social work schools, unlike many other graduate institutions, have tended to recruit faculty from among seasoned professionals. In spite of this tendency, 75.7 percent of the students disagreed that faculty had more practice experience. In fact, only 4.6 percent agreed strongly that they did. This perhaps uncovers a student belief in a dichotomy between theory and practice settings where regardless of the previous practice experience of the faculty member, the practitioner in the agency is seen as having greater practice background and expertise.

Not unexpected was the perception of a majority of the respondents (60 percent) that agency people were related to direct practice while school faculty were more concerned with social problems and social policy. Again, if students are more concerned with direct practice they would naturally feel closer educationally to the field instructor and the placement agency.

On the question of who was more sensitive to current practice
directions--faculty or agency people--the students were split evenly (almost 50-50).

Although three-quarters of the sample (75.7 percent) did not feel that faculty had more practice experience, a majority (55.5 percent) disagreed that agency people were more skilled practitioners. Clearly, regardless of years of experience, students viewed the faculty as performing on a higher level even in the supposed area of expertise of the agency person, i.e., practice.

Test results closely approached being statistically significant (F = 2.235, df = 5, p = .052). The following table summarizes school comparisons:

### TABLE 18

**STUDENT AGREEMENT THAT AGENCY PEOPLE ARE MORE SKILLED PRACTITIONERS THAN SCHOOL PEOPLE BY SCHOOL AFFILIATION**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally the pattern of students' perceptions of agency and school people remained the same as in other instances. For example, in rating "scholarliness" Wurzweiler and Fordham students gave the highest ratings to the field instructor while Columbia and NYU respondents rated the method faculty highest. Thus, Wurzweiler (49.1 percent) and Fordham (53.3 percent) respondents showed the highest rate of agreement that agency people were more skilled practitioners. Similarly, Columbia (60.5 percent), NYU (64.2 percent) and Adelphi (70 percent) students disagreed most with the opinion that the agency person was the more skilled practitioner indicating the greater weight they placed on the practice ability of faculty.

On the question of faculty being steeped in theory and out of touch with real practice, analysis revealed significant differences in means of schools (F-test = 3.144, df = 5, p = .009). In total percentages students tended to split their opinion close to a 50-50 breakdown (agree, 47.3 percent; disagree, 50.9 percent). Still only 20.8 percent of the NYU respondents saw faculty as heavily theory based as compared with better than a majority (60.5 percent) from Columbia who shared this view. We might query whether there is a correlation between student views of faculty as primarily "theorists" and their view of distance between school and agency. In this regard, 32.1 percent of the students in NYU felt a degree of closeness between field instructor and faculty field adviser as compared with only 9.3 percent from Columbia.

Other data was found which disclosed the presence of a relationship between students' perceptions of faculty as theory people and their view of the degree of closeness between adviser and field instructor. Columbia and Fordham students expressed the highest rate of agreement
that faculty are steeped in theory. They also represented the two
groups of students identifying the least degree of closeness. (See
Table 19 for a detailed picture of respondent opinions on "Faculty
Steeped in Theory . . . ")

TABLE 19
STUDENT AGREEMENT BY SCHOOL THAT FACULTY
ARE STEEPED IN THEORY--OUT OF TOUCH WITH PRACTICE
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the opinion questions, students were asked a num-
ber of rating questions in order to elicit a more complete picture of
their perceptions of school and agency people. Field instructor, field
adviser and method teacher were evaluated on their abilities as educator
and practitioner. The three category "hierarchy" remained consistent.
Method teachers were perceived by more students to be on the highest
level of functioning whether as educator or practitioner. In fact, some respondents felt that "... method instructors should be stronger practitioners in order to provide fuller classroom experience ..."

Next in the rating hierarchy came the field instructor, with the field adviser assigned last place (see Tables 20 and 21).

### TABLE 20
STUDENT RATINGS OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR, FACULTY FIELD ADVISER, METHOD TEACHER AS EDUCATORS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method Teacher</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 21
STUDENT RATINGS OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR, FACULTY FIELD ADVISER, METHOD TEACHER AS PRACTITIONERS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method Teacher</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An investigation was done to determine variation in student ratings by school affiliation. Significant differences were found in the perceptions of the method teacher as an educator \((F = 3.840, \text{ df} = 5, p = .003)\) and the faculty field adviser as a practitioner \((F = 2.958, \text{ df} = 5, p = .050)\). In all other cases (method teacher as practitioner, faculty adviser as educator, and field instructor as educator and practitioner), membership in one school or another was not associated with significant differences in responses.

A high 67 percent of all the respondents rated the methods teacher as an excellent or above average educator. There was a greater number of students than the overall percentage coming from Columbia (76.8 percent) and NYU (86.7 percent) who shared this view. More students from Wurzweiler (14.5 percent), Fordham (20 percent) and Hunter (19.3 percent) saw the methods teacher as a below average or poor educator. (See Table 22 for detailed comparisons.)

### Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In assessing faculty advisers as practitioners, 46.7 percent of all students felt they were excellent or above average. Investigation of individual schools yielded a somewhat different perspective. Many more Wurzweiler respondents (64.2 percent) than from other groups gave excellent or above average ratings to the adviser. This might be influenced by the fact that at this school the faculty adviser was also the method instructor who was generally seen as performing on the highest level of the field and school people under consideration. Clearly the Wurzweiler group felt most positively about the faculty adviser. Students from Adelphi reflected the second highest estimation of the adviser and only 46.7 percent of them shared this view as compared with Wurzweiler's 64.2 percent.

There were fewer students from Columbia (23.3 percent) than from other schools who saw their faculty advisers as above average or excellent practitioners. This group also reflected the largest number (27.9 percent) who viewed the adviser as a poor or below average practitioner. This was in sharp contrast to these students' perception of the method teacher. (Table 23 describes the differences in school means. Students rated the adviser along a five point scale.)

Students were also asked to rate the degree of scholarliness of their field instructors, methods teachers and other faculty. Responses were generally consistent regardless of school affiliation. No substantial differences between schools were found (F-tests were performed on all three categories resulting in significance levels not achieving the .05 level). Table 24 summarizes rating comparisons.

Faculty were seen as more scholarly than field instructors. Methods teachers were rated higher than other teachers. These results
TABLE 23
STUDENT RATINGS OF FACULTY ADVISERS AS PRACTITIONERS
BY SCHOOL MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>5 = Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>4 = Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>3 = Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2 = Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>3.129</td>
<td>1 = Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 24
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SCHOLARLINESS OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR,
METHODS TEACHER AND OTHER TEACHERS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Scholarly</th>
<th>Not Scholarly But Widely Read</th>
<th>Hardly Scholarly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Teacher</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are comparable to ratings given to methods teachers and field instructors as educators and practitioners (see Tables 20 and 21). In all cases the method teacher was perceived as superior to the field instructor. These findings gave credence to the fact that students assigned primacy to the faculty in the knowledge area. In addition the
methods teacher was seen as a better practitioner than the instructor in the field.

Although school differences were not statistically significant we might note that Columbia and NYU gave faculty the highest ratings. Four of the schools had "scholarly" percentages for method faculty ranging in the 40s, while 72.1 percent of the Columbia students and 66 percent of the NYU group shared this view. Similarly these two schools rated "other faculty" higher than respondents from the remaining schools. More students from Fordham saw the field instructor as "scholarly" as compared to Columbia which had the fewest number with this perception. These views were generally consistent with findings on other school comparison questions related to faculty and field people.

**Status of Field and School People**

In addition to seeking out student attitudes towards agency and school people as educators, practitioners and scholars, an attempt was made to identify their perceptions of the status positions occupied by those two partners. Students were therefore asked to indicate whether the relationship between their field instructor and faculty field adviser was hierarchical or on a peer level (see Table 25).

Although there seemed to be no clear majority feeling, more students saw the relationship on an "equal footing" than on a hierarchical basis. Testing uncovered significant differences in means of schools (F-test = 4.060, df = 5, p = .002). (Table 26 describes school comparisons.) More than half (54.7 percent) of the students in Wurzweiler viewed
### TABLE 25

**STUDENT VIEWS OF STATUS RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIELD INSTRUCTOR AND FACULTY FIELD ADVISER**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Superior</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor-Superior</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 26

**STUDENT BELIEF BY SCHOOL THAT FIELD INSTRUCTOR AND FACULTY FIELD ADVISER HAVE A PEER RELATIONSHIP**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Students were asked to check whether they perceived a peer relationship.
the relationship on a peer level as compared to only 14 percent of the Columbia respondents. The students from the other schools reflected greater consistency in their perception of the existence of a peer relationship between field instructors and faculty field advisers (a range of 28 percent to 33.3 percent).

Of those students who felt that the faculty adviser was in a superior position, Fordham reflected the lowest percentage (four percent) and Adelphi the highest (33.3 percent). Those respondents viewing the field instructor in the superior position did not exceed 6.5 percent of the population in any of the six schools.

These results indicate that contrary to what might be expected, student respondents did not perceive the school liaison person as having higher status than the agency field instructor. This particular finding should not be used as a yardstick of the status relationship of school and agency people in general. In most cases, in this study where faculty were compared with field instructors the teaching faculty was viewed more favorably.

Influence of School and Agency People on Student Education

The issue addressed in this section is whether either of the partners in social work education have more influence than the other in helping to shape the student's educational experience.

Respondents were asked to judge the influence of class work and field work along a four point continuum (very influential, somewhat, hardly or not at all). Each variable was tested to determine whether means of schools were significantly different from each other.
Field work did not show any substantial variations indicating that student opinions regarding its importance in education were comparatively uniform and affected minimally by school affiliation. . . (F-test = 1.094, df = 5, p = .364). A high 95.2 percent of all students found field work very or somewhat influential. Some students felt that class work would be more influential if it resembled more the focus of teaching in the field, i.e., skills. " . . . Field of social work demands well trained clinicians with a solid base of skills . . . School only provides an overview and emphasizes a lot of irrelevant stuff . . ."

Views of class influence on social work education were affected by the school in which the student was enrolled (F-test = 3.744, df = 5, p = .003). A total of 87.7 percent of all respondents felt that class work was very or somewhat influential. However, the majority (53.3 percent) of these only saw it as "somewhat" a factor in their education. A minority (34.4 percent) saw class experience as having a great deal of influence. Adelphi and NYU showed the highest percentage and mean scores of students who felt class was "influential." (See Table 27 for a detailed picture of school differences.)

Comparison of student perceptions of field and class influence indicate that the respondents from half of the schools viewed both as almost equal in effect. Students from the remaining three schools attributed 10 - 17 percent greater importance to field work than to class work on their education (see Table 28). It is surprising to note that Columbia students, who consistently rated faculty on a higher level than those from other schools showed one of the largest differentials between the effect of class and field on student education with
TABLE 27

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE INFLUENCE OF CLASSWORK ON THEIR EDUCATION
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Influential*</th>
<th>Hardly Influential**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Influential = Combination of "very" and "somewhat" influential.

**Hardly Influential = Combination of "hardly" and "not at all" influential.

the field given the greater importance. Wurzweiler and Hunter students were the other two groups ascribing greater influence to field work than class work. Of the three, respondents from Wurzweiler gave the greatest emphasis to the field.

An attempt was made to examine how separate a student's field experience was from his school experience. This was explored through identifying which faculty, other than the assigned liaison adviser, had contact with the student around his field work and the degree of influence of these contacts on his field performance. Responses tended to be consistent regardless of school enrollment. No significant
TABLE 28

INFLUENCE OF FIELD AND CLASS ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT RESPONDENTS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N (N=43)</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are given for combined "very" and "somewhat" categories.

differences in school means were seen (F-test = 1.961, df = 5, p = .085).

Reactions to these questions showed that 33.5 percent of the students spoke to no one other than the field adviser about their experience in their placement. Only a small percentage (3.9 percent) had contact with anyone in the field work department. A majority (57.5 percent) indicated that they discussed their field work with classroom teachers, overwhelmingly from practice courses. Since about half (48.1 percent) of the respondents viewed methods teachers as making a strong effort at integration of class and field it was no surprise that this instructor was the most common choice.

A majority (53.3 percent) of the students perceived their faculty contacts as having influence on their field performance as compared to
38.6 percent who saw them as having little or no influence. However, only 16.5 percent attributed a great deal of influence to them. More strong feelings (22.1 percent) were expressed indicating that faculty contacts had no effect on their field performance at all.

In examining the influence of particular people on a student's social work education four categories were chosen as units of attention: field instructor, methods teacher, faculty field adviser, and fellow students. Respondents were asked to identify the degree of influence along a four point continuum: very, somewhat, hardly, not at all.

(Results are summarized in Table 29.)

TABLE 29
STUDENT RATINGS OF FIELD, FACULTY AND STUDENT INFLUENCES ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Teacher</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Students</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look only at the "very" column then the field instructor is by far perceived as the most influential by a majority (51.9 percent) of the students. However, when the two positive columns of "very" and "somewhat" are combined then differences, except with faculty adviser,
tend to dwindle. In using this combination as the definition of "influ-
ential" fellow students take on a more important role in social work
education than many agency or school people might suppose. The faculty
field adviser comes through as the person having the least influence
on student education. In fact, 63.5 percent of the respondents picture
the adviser as having hardly any or no effect at all.

All four categories were analyzed in an attempt to rule out school
influences. Test findings, however, denoted significant differences
in the means of schools for each of the four classifications under con-
sideration. 1

The greatest variation among schools were found in the case of
the influence of the faculty adviser (p = .002). Columbia and Fordham
students attributed less influence to faculty field advisers than those
from other schools. This might be partially explained by the fact that
only these two schools employed the group advising system. Contact
with the adviser was therefore diluted and more concerned with common
issues related to students but not "tailor-made" to each specific
student.

Respondents from Wurzweiler and Columbia identified the greatest
differential in the respective influence on education of the field in-
structor and the methods teacher. Columbia students saw the methods
teacher as much more influential, and Wurzweiler students felt it was

1 Results of F-test to identify differences in school means of
student perceptions of the influences on student education of the field
instructor, methods teacher, faculty field adviser and fellow students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(F-test, df, p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>2.891, 5, .015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Teacher</td>
<td>2.745, 5, .020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Adviser</td>
<td>4.058, 5, .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Students</td>
<td>2.730, 5, .020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the field instructor who was on the top step of importance. All other respondents viewed them as almost equal in their effect on student education. The reasons for these differences remain elusive to interpretation.

TABLE 30

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF KEY ACTORS ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION BY SCHOOL MEANS
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Field Instructor</th>
<th>Methods Teacher</th>
<th>Faculty Field Adviser</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Key Actors = field instructor, methods teacher, faculty field adviser and fellow students.

Ratings for field instructors were lower than influence ratings for field work in general. This was somewhat unexpected to the investigator since it is generally assumed that the field instructor is the primary force in field work and that if he/she is viewed as highly
qualified then the field experience would be perceived equally favorably. Illustrative of the basis for this assumption is found in a sample of the statements by some respondents.

... all the relationships between school and agency are not too important. As long as there are some cases and a good supervisor... the conditions for learning are adequate...

**TABLE 31**

**STUDENT PERCEPTIONS BY SCHOOL ATTENDED OF COMPARISON BETWEEN FIELD WORK AND FIELD INSTRUCTOR INFLUENCES ON STUDENT EDUCATION**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Field Work</th>
<th>Field Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia (N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler (N=53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi (N=30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham (N=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University (N=53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter (N=31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (N=285)</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages in each column reflect combined "very" and "somewhat" influential categories.

This study's findings revealed that the **field instructor** was seen as very influential by a bit more than half the respondents (51.9 percent) with a mean of 3.2 reflecting a perception of slightly higher than somewhat influential. This compared to 72.7 percent of the students
who felt that field work was very influential with a mean of 3.7 or minimally lower than the "very" influential category. It might be re-emphasized that respondents were more consistent in their assessment of the influence of field work. As described earlier, tests on field work revealed no significant differences in means of schools. Student views regarding the influence of the field instructor varied from school to school indicating less consensus regarding its effect on student education.

We might therefore assume that even when the field instructor was not viewed positively the placement in a real life setting still proved important to students. In fact, many commented on situations where "the supervisor was terrible but I could learn from watching his mistakes . . ." or "... I had the experience of learning on my own," or "I learned most from another social worker in the agency who was not my supervisor. . ."

**Student Contact with Faculty Field Adviser**

History supports the fact that schools and agencies perceive the faculty adviser as the liaison between the two and, as such, responsible for continued contact with both the student and the field instructor. This section will explore the content of student-adviser contacts through identifying the most and the least common topics of discussion reported by student respondents. This procedure can provide a clearer picture of what in the student's field experience is of concern to the school person.
Students were asked to designate how frequently specific areas were discussed with their adviser. Those issues discussed very frequently or quite a bit are summarized below:

1. Field Assignment 41.4%
2. Evaluation of Placement 39.0%
3. Assessment of Practice Skills 35.0%
4. Integration - Class and Field 24.5%
5. Problems with Field Instructor 23.5%
6. Problems in Practice Skills 18.9%
7. Class Work 10.2%

Testing indicated that six of the above areas showed significant differences in the means of schools. Only "integration" seemed consistent among students from different schools.

It is helpful to view these same areas from the other end of the frequency continuum, i.e., never or hardly ever discussed:

1. Personal Problems 71.6%
2. Class Work 55.1%
3. Problems with Field Instructor 50.2%
4. Practice Problems 49.1%
5. Integration of Class and Field 24.5%
6. Evaluation of Placement 34.3%
7. Assessment of Practice Skills 32.2%
8. Field Assignment 26.3%

Despite school differences what seems clear is that there were no strong, uniform preferences for what faculty field advisers discussed with the students in this sample. No one item was designated by even 50 percent of the respondents. It is obvious that (even if we omit the one school that assigns separate people for field work and class work), whatever the content of student-adviser meetings the primary emphasis was on the field. It seems safe to assume that the faculty adviser's focus of work with the students in this study included very little classroom material.

One ought to note the small number of students who reported discussing frequently either practice problems (18.9 percent) or practice
skills in general (35.0 percent). If we accept the premise that the heart of field learning is the development of practice skills through the resolution of "normal" developmental practice problems, then the infrequency of discussion with the adviser leads to the supposition that the school may see this as a focus of field instruction but not field advising. Decisions on what is taught specifically are therefore left to the field rather than to the educational institution.

This situation has been discussed frequently by social work educators and practitioners. To some, the field instructor developing a "curriculum" based on broad goals, but primarily, on his expertise is no different than the faculty member creating the specifics of his course content and teaching "style." Others, however, perceive as a crucial difference the fact that the field instructor usually has no administrative responsibility to the school and therefore no formal vehicle through which his performance is monitored and considered.

**Student Contact and Identification with Field Instructor**

Almost 90 percent of all respondents were seen regularly in supervisory conferences denoting consistent contact with the field instructor (60 percent had planned conferences of two or more hours per week; 29.1 percent had conferences of one hour per week). In addition, students found field instructors relatively accessible outside of planned conferences (see Table 32).

Tests revealed that students' perceptions of field instructor availability varied substantially from school to school (F-test = 3.295, df = 5, p = .007).
TABLE 32
STUDENT RATINGS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS OUTSIDE OF FORMAL CONFERENCES
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Available</th>
<th>Fairly Available</th>
<th>Moderate Difficulty</th>
<th>Great Difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 33
STUDENT RATINGS BY SCHOOL OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S AVAILABILITY OUTSIDE OF CONFERENCES
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Available*</th>
<th>Available With Difficulty**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Collapsed "very" and "fairly available" categories.

**Collapsed "moderate" and "available with great difficulty" categories.
Although 76.9 percent of the students found their field instructors available outside of planned conferences only 42.6 percent found them to be very available. One might suspect that the perception of availability affects and is affected by the students' feelings regarding whether their field instructors' other responsibilities interfered with their relationship.

The overwhelming majority (89.8 percent) of students had field instructors with other responsibilities in addition to student supervision. A large number (75.1 percent) carried major agency responsibilities. Only 30.2 percent of the respondents felt that the field instructor's agency assignments interfered with their relationship. In these cases students made the following observations: "Agency needs often precluded meeting student learning needs." "Client responsibility and other agency responsibilities came before supervisory relationship." "... if crisis arose, that was her first concern regardless if we had supervision ..." And so on. Of course, question needs to be raised about the reality of an expectation that says, as in the last example, that a supervisory conference ought to supercede a crisis! Similarly, the issue of whether client responsibility comes before supervisory responsibility needs to be viewed in a less simplistic manner. It is reassuring that the polarization implied in these students' statements (me or the agency) is not a common perception.

Almost 70 percent (69.8 percent) of the students felt that the field instructor's agency responsibilities did not interfere with the supervisory relationship. We might then conclude that the quality of the relationship was, in most cases, not dependent upon how busy the field instructor was.
The impact of school affiliation on student perception of interference indicated that although differences in means did not prove to be significant ($F$-test $= 2.144$, df $= 5$, $p = .061$), they were large enough to warrant reporting (see Table 35). An interesting question to raise is why students from Columbia felt the greatest interference (48.8 percent) from their field instructors' agency duties and Wurzweiler respondents saw the least problem (20.8 percent). In regard to this it might be important to consider that Columbia's philosophy favors as many units as possible while Wurzweiler's position is that the agency supervisor provides the more preferred experience. This emphasis might affect the way in which students perceive "what is better." In a school where units are comparatively numerous, students view the field instructor as being there primarily for them and therefore might feel more keenly the intrusion of agency responsibilities.

As previously reported, field instructors were perceived by respondents as having a great deal of influence on student education despite some feelings about their availability to students. It is therefore somewhat unexpected that a comparatively small percentage of students perceived their field instructors as good role models, i.e., professionals they might want to emulate. Although 79.7 percent of the sample saw field instructors as very or somewhat influential, only 41.5 percent thought they were excellent or above average as role models.

There were no significant differences found in comparing student opinions by school means ($F$-test $= 1.166$, df $= 5$, $p = .327$). Some

---

1 This information on philosophy re units was obtained through personal interviews with the field work directors and supported by the statistical information revealing the number of units in each school.
TABLE 34
STUDENT OPINION BY SCHOOL ATTENDED THAT FIELD INSTRUCTORS' OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES INTERFERED WITH STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

variation by school affiliation still seems important to report. More than half (52.8 percent) of the Wurzweiler sample felt their field instructors were either excellent or above average role models. This was the highest percentage of all the schools. Hunter respondents reflected the smallest number (29 percent) sharing this view. Columbia students showed the highest percentage (39.5 percent) of those respondents who perceived their field instructors as below average or poor role models. (Table 35 summarizes these perceptions.)

More students saw their field instructors as excellent or above average educators (52.3 percent) and practitioners (57.9 percent) than they did as role models (41.5 percent). In fact 31.6 percent of all respondents felt field instructors were below average or poor role
### TABLE 35

**STUDENT RATINGS BY SCHOOL OF THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR AS ROLE MODEL**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 36

**STUDENT RATINGS OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR AS EDUCATOR, PRACTITIONER AND ROLE MODEL**

(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Field Instructor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
models as compared to only 17.3 percent who rated them similarly as educators and 11.6 percent seeing them in this light as practitioners (see Table 36).

It seems that although the majority of the students in this sample perceived their field instructors quite favorably as educators and practitioners almost one-third (31.6 percent) did not feel they were professionals they would see as "good" role models. It would be difficult to offer precise explanations for this phenomenon. We might guess that some students saw their field instructor favorably but did not view their social work positions as ones they would like to occupy. Or, we could assume that students were more positive towards their field instructor in areas related more closely to them and less positive in viewing their role in the agency.

**Student Views on Issues in Social Work Education**

Student opinions regarding some recurrent issues in social work education were solicited. The first area of examination was the value students placed on observation as an educational tool.

Despite a strong commitment by both educators and practitioners that social work practice is learned through doing, through direct work with and in the service of people, an ongoing dialogue continues regarding the proper timing of and emphasis on this doing stage. Observational experiences have been suggested by some schools and agencies as the step before direct practice. This is seen as having more learning
benefits than immediate entry into direct work. Students in this sample were asked to specify their agreement with the view that "observation of a trained social worker in action is as good a learning experience for the student as engaging in his own direct practice with clients, consumers, members or other professionals."

The responses to this question were not what this investigator would have predicted. Better than a majority (58.6 percent) of the students shared agreement with the view that observation was as good a learning experience as direct practice. Almost 70 percent (69.8 percent) of the Columbia sample and 60 or more percent of the Fordham (60 percent) and Hunter (64.6 percent) students put observation on an equal plane with direct practice. The respondents from Wurzweiler (47.1 percent), Adelphi (46.7 percent) and NYU (45.1 percent) showed the highest rate of disagreement. (See Table 37 for detailed picture.)

Wurzweiler students showed the highest rate of disagreement with the idea of observation being equated with direct practice as a learning tool. Similarly more students from this school (52.8 percent) felt that the school would disagree with this view. The range of respondents from other schools who felt their school shared this opinion was 20.9 percent for Columbia to 36.7 percent for Adelphi. Perceptions of agency views were also similar. Wurzweiler (37.7 percent), NYU (37.7 percent) and Adelphi (36 percent) respondents saw agency people as disagreeing most strongly in a range otherwise of 18.6 percent (Columbia) to 29 percent (Hunter). This too was the same order as the opinions of the students themselves.

---

TABLE 37

STUDENT AGREEMENT BY SCHOOL WITH THE OPINION THAT "OBSERVATION OF A TRAINED SOCIAL WORKER IN ACTION IS AS GOOD A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR THE STUDENT AS ENGAGING IN HIS OWN DIRECT PRACTICE WITH CLIENTS, CONSUMERS, MEMBERS OR OTHER PROFESSIONALS" (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=75)</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>(N=53)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=285)</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-test = 1.658, df = 5, p = .146

Another area explored was the students' view of the "generic-specific" dialogue in the social work field and its educational institutions. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with three statements referring to the notion of generic practice and its implications for professional education.

As described in previous chapters the generic-specific argument exists today both between field and school and among educators themselves. The "knowledge explosion" phenomenon has been cited by practitioners and faculty as requiring a curriculum which would educate
students for specific fields of practice rather than in methods (casework, group work) or generic skills. As some schools were moving away from the tri-partite division of method to generic practice, others (and sometimes even the same schools) were developing two track systems which put them on record as accepting the belief that there are different skills in direct practice than in policy, planning and administration.

Opinion in the field is obviously not monolithic. This study attempted to identify students' agreement with some of the most common expressions of the generic-specific issue. The three chosen were:

1. Generic practice produces a student who is "Jack of all trades, master of none."

2. Schools should drop method concentrations (i.e., casework, group work, social work practice) and offer majors in practice fields such as aging, etc.

3. Social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups, communities, etc. It is therefore unnecessary to provide courses in particular methods.

Three-quarters (75.8 percent) of the student sample felt that social work practice skills were not the same in work with individuals, groups and communities and therefore schools still needed to provide courses in particular methods. Slightly more than half (51.6 percent) of the respondents felt strongly about this view. In examining differences by school affiliation some unpredictable and unexplainable findings were observed. Despite the fact that Adelphi placed greater emphasis on the teaching of generic skills than the other schools, 86.7 percent of the Adelphi respondents disagreed that social work practice skills remained the same in work with individuals, groups and communities. In comparison the highest percentage (28.3 percent) of
TABLE 38
STUDENT OPINIONS REGARDING SELECTED ISSUES IN THE "GENERIC-SPECIFIC"
ARGUMENT IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic practice produces student who is Jack of all trades, master of none.</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should drop method concentrations (i.e., casework, group work, social work practice) and offer majors in practice fields such as aging, etc.</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups, communities, etc. It is therefore unnecessary to provide courses in particular methods.</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

agreement with the consistency of skills came from Wurzweiler students, the one school retaining the tri-partite method division.

Although 75.8 percent of the students did not feel social work practice skills remained the same a lesser percentage (50.5 percent) felt that generic practice produced a "Jack of all trades, master of none." However, an almost equal number (47 percent) believed that the student learning generic practice knew a little about a lot of things but was not proficient in any area. We might therefore conclude that student perceptions of the validity of generic practice skills were not strongly
affirmed. The respondents certainly reflected a split endorsement.

In this instance, Adelphi students (56.7 percent) disagreed most with the idea that generic practice produced a "Jack of all trades . . ." Fordham respondents showed the highest rate of agreement (54.6 percent). It is again interesting to note that the Wurzweiler students agreed the least (41.5 percent) despite the school's policy of method divisions. Testing indicated that although school affiliation somewhat affected responses, there were no significant differences in means of schools (F-test = 0.616, df = 5, p = .500).

Although students in this sample did not seem to clearly endorse generic skills and practice, they also did not feel that education needed to be specifically related to different fields of practice. Only 26 percent believed that the schools should drop method concentrations and concentrate on fields. A high 71.5 percent disagreed with eliminating methods and developing curriculum for specific areas such as aging, child welfare and so on. Of those disagreeing, 54 percent disagreed strongly.

Despite the fact that there were no substantial differences in means of schools (F-test = 1.141, df = 5, p = .314), there was variation in some student opinion. For example, in most schools, 70-75 percent of the student respondents disagreed with dropping method concentrations in favor of fields of practice. Yet, Columbia showed only 65.2 percent disagreeing. Conversely, Columbia students reflected the greatest support for dropping methods (36.6 percent compared to a range of 22.6 percent for Hunter respondents and 30 percent of Adelphi students).

Students perceived differences of opinion between school and
agency on these "generic-specific" issues (see Table 39). They tended to view the school as expressing greater confidence in generic education. For example, 63.2 percent of the respondents felt the school would disagree with the conclusion that "generic practice produces a student who is Jack of all trades, master of none." Only 49.1 percent felt the agency shared this view. Similarly 61.1 percent of the students identified the agency as striving towards education in particular practice fields as compared to 80.9 percent who felt the school would favor method concentrations (casework, group work . . .) rather than majors in fields of practice. These perceptions seem consistent with the prevalent views in the field that schools are more interested in general education for social work as compared to agencies which place greater stress on the learning of skills specific to individual settings.

Despite the differences noted, student respondents saw both school and agency as being almost equal in disagreement with the idea that "social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, group and communities."

Historically, some educators and practitioners have drawn a sharp division between practice and theory resulting in a distinction between where each is taught. An attempt was made to solicit student opinions on whether theory was the primary province of the classroom rather than the field. Slightly more than half (51.2 percent) of the sample disagreed with this view. The dissenting opinion, however, was substantial enough (46.3 percent) to warrant some caution in assuming that students clearly disagreed that theory teaching was the primary province of the classroom.
TABLE 39

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY OPINIONS
REGARDING GENERIC PRACTICE AND EDUCATION FOR GENERIC PRACTICE
(N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Agree School</th>
<th>Agree Agency</th>
<th>Disagree School</th>
<th>Disagree Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic practice produces a student who is &quot;Jack of all trades, master of none.&quot;</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should drop method concentration (i.e., casework, group work, social work practice) and offer majors in practice fields such as aging, etc.</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups and communities. It is, therefore, unnecessary to provide course in particular methods.</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "Agree strongly" and "agree slightly" categories have been collapsed into one "agree" category. Similarly, "disagree strongly" and "disagree slightly" are combined into one "disagree" classification.

TABLE 40

STUDENT AGREEMENT THAT CONCEPTUAL AND THEORY TEACHING ARE THE PRIMARY PROVINCE OF THE CLASSROOM RATHER THAN THE FIELD (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Partner</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were almost equally divided in their perception of the schools' agreement (46.4 percent) that conceptual and theory teaching were the primary province of the classroom (46.4 percent agree, 43.9 percent disagree). The majority (57.2 percent) viewed agency people as agreeing that theory teaching was not within their sphere.

**Control of Field Instruction**

Although this study did not ask any specific questions regarding students' perceptions of who does, or should, determine what they are taught in field work, the issues arose in a variety of areas. For example, in specifying topics students and faculty field advisers concentrate on it was clear that, outside of some concern with assignment, practice skills get minimal attention. The heart of field teaching, i.e., practice skills can then be perceived by students as falling into the province of the agency. Another illustration occurred when 72.6 percent of the students saw no uniformity of standards for their performance in field work. This situation could create the impression among students that individual field instructors, rather than schools, define expectations for learning and performance.

Since it is generally accepted that the field instructor is the key person in the practice educational experience one needs to examine the issue of accountability. Is he a "free agent" in his educational role or responsible to someone in school or agency. Student responses shed some light on how they view who is responsible for their field instructor's performance. They were asked to indicate their perception
of how influential various school and agency people were in setting expectations for the field instructor's performance as a student supervisor (see Table 41).

TABLE 41

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE INFLUENCE OF KEY AGENCY AND SCHOOL PEOPLE ON THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S PERFORMANCE AS A STUDENT SUPERVISOR (N = 285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and School People</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Someewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Executive</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor-Supervisor</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Field Instructor</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It ought to be noted that a comparatively high percentage of students did not respond to the question perhaps indicating a lack of knowledge about the role of specific school and agency people who might set expectations on the field instructor. Of those that responded very few (less than 13 percent) perceived any of the people listed as being very influential in setting expectations for their field instructor's
performance as a student supervisor. More than a majority of the students felt that the agency executive (51.9 percent), the Dean (61.9 percent) and other field instructors (59.6 percent) were hardly or not at all influential in setting expectations. Only 25.3 percent of the respondents viewed the faculty field adviser as very or quite a bit influential. Slightly less (23.2 percent) saw the field instructor's supervisor as exerting a great deal of influence; slightly more (26.7 percent) viewed the field work department as very or quite a bit influential.

Some school differences are worthy of mention. In rating the role of the faculty field adviser in setting performance expectations for the field instructor as a student supervisor Adelphi students revealed the highest number (23.3 percent) who felt they were very influential. Otherwise the range was from 2.7 percent (Fordham) to 17 percent (NYU).

More Columbia students (23.3 percent) felt the field work department was very influential than those from other schools. The range in other schools was 5.3 percent (Hunter) to 11.3 percent (Wurzweiler and NYU). In combining the "very influential" and "quite a bit" categories, Adelphi students gave the highest percentage rating (40 percent) with Columbia students second highest (34.9 percent). The range otherwise was 16 percent (Fordham) to 30.2 percent (NYU).

Less than 25 percent of the respondents from any school felt the field instructor's supervisor was very influential in setting expectations for his/her performance as a student supervisor. The highest percentage was shown in the Adelphi sample (20 percent), the lowest from Hunter (6.5 percent).
Despite these school differences, what remains clear is that student respondents perceived their field instructors as being minimally affected by either school or agency people in their performance as educators in the field. We may infer from this that students view their field instructors as being self directed with little outside influence.

Student responses, however, indicated their feeling that it was the school who should "control" the field experience and that in many cases, the educational institution was remiss in carrying out this responsibility. These perceptions were highlighted by reactions to an open-ended question on the questionnaire asking for additional comments about school-agency relationships. The issue of "control" was a recurrent one. More students chose to make comments about this phenomenon than about any other issue. Out of 59 students who responded, 28 made comments on this issue. Sixteen of the more common opinions are given below. In offering these statements, we might assume that only those students who felt strongly, either negatively or positively, would respond to the open-ended question. This leaves out the vast majority of the sample whose opinions might still be inferred from various other questions.

1. School does not investigate or periodically evaluate agencies. . . they are out of touch with placements and therefore when problems arise in agencies, they take on crisis proportions. If ongoing follow-up was there all along, there would be more prevention. . .

2. . . . there should be more care taken in the evaluation and selection of field instructors. Faculty advisers should visit their students and field instructors at least once during the year. . .

3. . . . school had little real interest or concern about the quality of the field instructor as well as the field work experience. . . irresponsibility on the school's part in terms of field . . . school continues to use field instructors and placements in spite of complaints against them. . .
4. School does not visit agency often enough to know what student actually does there.

5. School very careless in choosing field assignments. Field instructors and field agencies seemed to have very little accountability to the school. Complaints and criticisms had to be initiated by the students.

6. School field work department has absolutely no knowledge of agency.

7. With the exception of one or two faculty members, the school's contact with field agencies is totally inadequate. I have been fortunate in having two excellent field instructors but were this not the case, I suspect an unlearning situation could well persist without the school being the wiser and the student perhaps unaware of his loss.

8. School and agency are often disjointed, in my case they were not.

9. School does not screen field instructors adequately, usually taking who they can get.

10. (Following is from a student representative on a faculty-student committee):
    . . . school has minimal input and educational control over the agencies it uses . . . In a significant number of cases the student-agency match and the field work department's involvement resemble a third rate comedy . . . At times, it seems to me, the irresponsibility reaches monumental proportions . . . in many instances a field placement is used simply because it will act as a repository for a body . . . (Interesting to note that this student signed name.)

11. . . . faculty just doesn't bother to find out what we're doing at our agencies and thus don't know what the field demands. . . If professors would step out into the field a little more things would be better.

12. . . . educational experience at social work school is very uneven and too much is left to chance. The school appears to be powerless to make demands on agency even as far as the educational piece is concerned.

13. Supervisor is well known for his inability to supervise . . . the school is aware of the problem but as to date has not done anything to solve the problem.

14. Feeling that the need for control depended on the quality of the field instructor . . . Field instructor was a better practitioner and educator than my faculty adviser . . . she did not attend a lot of school conferences for a variety of
reasons and in her case . . . she did not need to attend . . . In many cases the school should have more control over what is happening in the field placement. I had a good one but many students did not.

15. School should evaluate student placements . . . Since quality of experience is more important than quantity we might consider a first year placement that would utilize school exposure and resources rather than agency participation.

16. . . . school should develop a comprehensive oral and written exam every supervisor must pass before being appointed . . . The schools hardly pay any attention to criticisms students voice about supervisors, even though we are asked for them.

The perceptions of these students showed that although they saw their field experience as part of their total school life, they "belonged," so to speak, to the school rather than to the agency. As a result, they held the school accountable for what they were taught and what they learned in their field placements. For the students there seems to be no conflict over who should be ultimately responsible for field work . . . it is the school.

Summary

This chapter has examined student perceptions of the relationship between schools of social work and field placement agencies. Areas covered included: closeness between the two institutions, uniformity of teaching content in the class and the field, conflicts in organizational goals, common conceptions of school and agency people, faculty and field personnel's influence on student education, issues of strain in social work education and, student relationships with faculty and field people.

Students generally perceived a distant relationship between school
and agency. In no school did the majority of students see the relationship as close. The tendency was to see each institution as operating within its own boundaries with very little influence exerted in each other's domains. Only the methods teacher was perceived of as making a reasonably strong effort to integrate class and field learning. More than half of the student respondents believed that class and field teaching content reflected significant differences between the two. On the whole, however, student respondents saw no conflict between the agency's goal of service and the school's goal of education. An inference might be made that students did not see differences in organizational goals as adversely affecting the lack of intimacy between school and agency.

Students in all schools saw field work as having greater influence on their education than class work. Despite this, almost three-quarters of the sample felt that uniform standards for field work performance did not exist. Better than a majority felt the need for this uniformity.

Although given somewhat lower ratings than field work, students viewed the field instructor as very influential on their education. However, they perceived the field teacher as being minimally affected by either school or agency people in their capacity as educators. In the same way as the students saw a lack of uniform standards for their own performance, so too, they perceived a minimum of consistent expectations for the performance of the field instructor as an educator. The tendency was to see field work as idiosyncratic to field instructor and agency placement and lacking in accountability to some standard setting organization. Students felt it was the schools' responsibility to
"control" the field instruction experience and that they were remiss in carrying this out.

Field work content was perceived of as somewhat similar for students in the same method. A majority of the respondents felt that the content was different for those majoring in other methods. These differences seemed to be viewed as necessary since three-quarters of the student sample felt that social work practice skills were not the same in work with individuals, groups and communities. Students saw the school as expressing greater confidence in generic education than the agencies. The students seemed split in their evaluation of generic education. Yet, almost 75 percent of the respondents disagreed with the notion of developing a curriculum based on fields of practice rather than methods. We might infer from this that students saw specific methods as being transferable from one field of practice to another.

More students perceived the methods teacher as a better educator, better practitioner and more scholarly than the field instructor or the faculty field adviser. With the exception of scholarlyness, where "other teachers" were rated second to methods teachers, the field instructor was viewed on a higher level than the faculty adviser and second to the methods teacher. In general, the faculty adviser was seen as less influential on student education, not as proficient an educator or practitioner and not as scholarly as the other field and school people under investigation.

Despite the high ratings given the methods teachers, better than a majority of the students disagreed that the school knew more about educating students than the practice agency. Conversely, the respondents did not feel that the agency people were more skilled practitioners.
Whether or not faculty were seen as steeped in theory and out of touch with practice depended in large part on the school attended by the student. A slight majority disagreed with this perception of the faculty member. Although students perceived field and school people as operating primarily in their own areas, they reflected no overwhelming opinion that theory was the primary province of the classroom. Only a slight majority felt this to be true.

Clearly the students in this sample have commented on the lack of and need for standardization in field work content and performance expectations for both learners and field instructors. Their responses have indicated that in spite of the importance of field work in their education they see the school as having little control over this experience. In fact, they view the field instructor as basically a "free agent" influenced minimally by either school or agency people. The responsibility for standardization is, however, placed on the school. Students saw the skill and theory components of their education being taught in two separate institutions and asked for both institutions to identify the interplay between the two.
CHAPTER IV - ADDENDUM

FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

An effort was made to determine whether student views of various aspects of social work education were influenced by specific factors.

I. Age

Age was not found to be a major factor in predicting student replies. In only 26 of a possible 201 cross tabulations did it account for statistically significant differences in student opinions. Some of these associations reflected predictable connections between age and other background factors (e.g., the oldest students had the most full time experience, were more apt to be married and to have more children). Others might well have been the result of chance factors.

II. Student View of the Field Placement as an Educational Experience

The variables of age, sex, religion, ethnicity, pre-school work experience, respondents' perception of the influence of students on agency service and on social work education, were selected as factors with the potential of influencing student opinions of their placement. They accounted for only 4 percent of the variance in student views.

Also examined was the impact of predictor variables on each other and on the students' perceptions of their field instructors and placements. The resulting correlations showed very few significant associations of which most could have been easily anticipated (e.g., close
relationship between age and experience).

Given the fact that demographic and other material explained so little (see Table 1), a Field Instructor Index composed of seven variables (i.e., perceptions of the availability of the supervisor outside of regular conferences, interference of job responsibilities with supervision, ability as an educator and practitioner, potential as a role model, influence on social work education and degree of scholarliness), was then used as a predictor for student perceptions of their field placements.

With the inclusion of the Field Instructor Index as a predictor of student views of their placements 39 percent ($R^2 = .389$) of the variance was explained. The field instructor had an impact in 35 percent of the cases on how students rated their field agencies as educational experiences. Although these results documented the importance of the field instructor in the perceived quality of the placements, they also supported earlier findings which showed that students rated field work in general as being more influential on their education than a particular supervisor. We might conclude that within the organizational structure of the agency there were many factors in addition to the field teacher which effected student opinions of their placements.
TABLE 1
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF STUDENT VIEW OF PLACEMENT USING SELECTED INDEPENDENT VARIABLES AS PREDICTORS
(N=285)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Product-Moment Correlations</th>
<th>Beta Coefficients</th>
<th>Percent Unique Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Catholic</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jewish</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. White</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Years part-time pre-school experience</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Years full-time pre-school experience</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number students supervised by field instructor</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Students influence on service</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students influence on education</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .207
Multiple R² = .043

*p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001
CHAPTER V

FIELD INSTRUCTOR SURVEY - PART I
GENERAL FREQUENCIES AND FREQUENCIES BY SCHOOL

In recognition of the central role of the field instructor in the social work education enterprise, this study concentrated on the opinions and perceptions of this individual. Much of the material covered in this Chapter can be divided into two general areas: The first concerns the relative isolation of the field instructor in his capacity as educator, from both agency and school personnel. The second area concerns perceived lack of control, direction and structure of field work content as this relates to the teaching skills required of field instructors.

These areas were studied through examining the respondents' perceptions of the degree of closeness between schools and agencies, mutual influences exerted on each other's systems, and conflicting pulls on the field instructor as a student supervisor and an agency employee. Their views were also assayed relative to the uniformity of field work standards and conflicts in content taught in class and field. Also evaluated was the perceived degree of influence on social work education of selected agency and school people, including the field instructor.
The Process Begins

Motivation for Becoming a Field Instructor

The importance of the field instructor as the agency's connection to the educational institution and the educational process in general is well known and widely accepted. It is of interest to inquire into the motives of a staff member to become a field instructor. Respondents were asked to rate eight motivating factors in their decisions to engage in student supervision. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1
FIELD INSTRUCTORS RATINGS OF MOTIVATING FACTORS
IN BECOMING FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat a Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percentaged across)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional learning Experience</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation with University</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher status and prestige</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional Opportunity</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Salary</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired by Agency</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthering Profession</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy Teaching</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Differences from 100% are "No Response" category choices.)
Enjoyment of teaching was seen by almost three-quarters (72.8%) of the sample as the chief force affecting their desire to become field instructors. More than half the group (57.2 percent) perceived the fact that it was an additional learning experience as a major influence in their decision. A contribution towards furthering the profession was reported by 40 percent of the sample as a major motivation for entering student supervision. Other items were judged as very important by only 28 percent of the respondents. Those factors which had the characteristic of being less "idealistically" perceived such as "increase in salary" (3.3 percent) and "higher status and prestige" (19.4 percent) were minimized as influences on the decision to become a field instructor.

When the "major" and "somewhat" choice categories were combined, each of the items, except for salary increases was endorsed by at least 50 percent of the respondents as being influential in arriving at a decision to get involved in field instruction. The three strongest motivations remained enjoyment of teaching, additional learning experience and furthering the profession.

This sample saw themselves as the major force in initiating the school-agency association. That is, respondents identified their own aspirations to become field instructors as an important factor in motivating agencies to become field work placements. Almost 70 percent of the sample rated this either as a major or somewhat a major influence on agency decisions. (See Table 2) The desire to further the social work profession was seen by many field instructors as a major factor (49.4 percent). This compared quite favorably to the importance of furthering the profession (77.2 percent) and requests by schools (72.8 percent) as factors motivating agencies to become field work placements.
### TABLE 2

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS MOTIVATING AGENCIES TO BECOME FIELD WORK PLACEMENTS (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain additional manpower</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save money on staff</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff wants to be field instructor</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthering profession</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased prestige</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested by School</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their perceptions of both staff people's decisions to become field instructors and agencies' desires to become field work settings for schools, respondents tended to choose the more "altruistic" motives such as furthering the profession, rather than those providing immediate payoffs, such as increased salary or saving money. Similarly, the field instructors saw the schools' motivation for developing relationships with agencies as "altruistic" (related to the profession) rather than "self serving" (providing immediate benefits to the school). For example, 95.6 percent of the respondents felt that the school's belief that field
work was indespensible to social work education was a major factor in
their seeking agency connections, as compared to only 28.9 percent who
specified limited finances preventing schools from setting up their own
Units as a major motivating factor. (See Table 3)

TABLE 3

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE SCHOOLS MOTIVATION
IN DEVELOPING RELATIONSHIPS WITH
INDEPENDENT PRACTICE AGENCIES
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Motive</th>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field work is indespensible to social work education</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited finances prevent schools from having own teaching agencies</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited finances prevent schools from hiring their own unit field instructors</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty does not want to do field teaching</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that practice should be learned from agency practitioners</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise level of practice</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both situations field instructors perceived the agency and the
school in moving out to each other, as more concerned with social work
and social work education than with their own unique institutional
needs or interests.

**Relationship of the Field Instructor to the School**

Historically and currently the field instructor and the faculty field advisor are the designated liaison people from the agency and the school. They constitute the important linkage between the two systems. The frequency and intimacy of contact between them may be seen as "barometers" of the degree of closeness between the practice and academic settings. The field instructors in this study indicated in most instances that schools provided some structure to encourage communication between them and field agencies. In nine out of ten cases this took the form of the assignment of a faculty member as the field advisor and liaison between the two institutions.

Respondents reported that contact with the liaison person was at best twice a year. Generally meetings were scheduled for once each semester. A total of 40.6 percent of the field instructors reported this "once a semester" frequency of contact. Some(22.2 percent) met with their assigned field advisor on an "as needed" basis rather than according to any fixed schedule. A small percentage (11.6 percent) held monthly meetings.

In examining field instructor responses to the question of the frequency of contact with the faculty field advisor it is important to report on the number of respondents choosing the "other" category. Almost a fourth of the supervisors (23.3 percent) designated this response. The following comments are illustrative of responses to the request made in the questionnaire to specify what "other" represented:
"did not meet"..."never met"..."no meetings"..."rare contact"..."seldom met"..."two phone calls"...I was never asked what I did"..."met only as I requested"..."rarely"..."No meetings at all"..."never".

Since schools varied in their advisement patterns an attempt was made to examine whether the frequency of contacts between the field instructor and field advisor varied according to schools. (See Table 4)

**TABLE 4**

FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS BETWEEN FIELD INSTRUCTORS AND FACULTY FIELD ADVISORS COMPARED BY SCHOOL (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Once a Semester</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>As Needed Basis</th>
<th>At Evaluation Time</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Since only 2.2% of the total sample indicated meetings "more than once a month" this category is omitted from this table.

Examination revealed some school differences, most of which might have been anticipated by checking the school policy regarding meetings with field instructors. For example, during the year in which this study
was done, Columbia held monthly group meetings. Consequently, the fact that the field instructors from that school reflected the highest percentage of monthly meetings is not surprising. The observation ought to be made that adherence to school "policy" varied greatly. Again, using Columbia as an example, only 21.2 percent of the field instructors indicated that they attended these monthly meetings. In this particular situation we might point out that, contrary to practitioner complaints of not being involved by the school, it was the field instructor that seemed to make the choice not to avail himself of these meetings. Caution needs to be exerted before reaching any specific conclusions regarding reasons for non-participation since the purpose and content of the meetings were not explored.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they viewed the association with the schools as "distant" or "close". A "distant" relationship was defined as involving infrequent contacts or contacts related to crisis situations rather than one that involved ongoing communication. "Closeness" was defined as phone calls and meetings at regular intervals rather than only at crisis points. (See Table 5)

Although a little more than half of the field instructors (58.3 percent) did not describe a distant relationship with their faculty liaison person, a major proportion (75.5 percent) chose not to indicate a close association. It seems safe to assume that contacts between field instructors and faculty advisors were not intimate.

Based on the patterns of field advisement in each of the schools, some comparison by educational institution seemed warranted. (See Table 6.)
**TABLE 5**

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF THE DISTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AND THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Percentaged across)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Respondents were asked to indicate which of "the following..." best described their relationship to their faculty advisor by checking all that applied. Five choices were offered and a respondent could check more than one.

**TABLE 6**

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION BY SCHOOL OF THE DISTANCE OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AND THE FIELD INSTRUCTOR (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Distant Relationship</th>
<th>Close Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>N=180</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Since respondents could choose from 5 categories to describe relationships with faculty advisors, percentages shown do not equal 100 percent.
Field instructors in those schools in which the faculty advisor was also the methods teacher reflected the highest proportion viewing a close relationship between themselves and the faculty person. Thus, Hunter (40 percent) and Wurzweiler (32.3 percent) respondents showed the highest percentage signifying a close relationship (range otherwise was 15.6 percent-21.4 percent). Field instructors from the schools holding group meetings, as compared to one-to-one contacts between the two liaison people, indicated the smallest number who felt a close relationship existed (i.e., Columbia 18 percent and Fordham - 15.6 percent). We might infer from these results that the field instructor felt a closer contact to the faculty advisor in schools where the field advising pattern was individualized and where the faculty liaison person was more clearly seen as having a practice connection in the classroom. It ought to be emphasized that regardless of school affiliation or field advisement pattern, there was no strong indication of perceived closeness.

Several contradictions become apparent when views of distance were examined. For example, although falling next to the last in describing a close relationship, less Columbia field instructors (30.3 percent) than from other schools felt that their association with field advisors was distant. Adelphi, with an individual advising pattern, had more field instructors (42.3 percent) seeing a distant relationship than Columbia with a group meeting pattern. These bi-modal "contradictions" tended to prevent reliable conclusions from being reached which linked perceptions of closeness with the pattern of field advising. If anything, the "contradictions" lead to the assumption that the intimacy of the association might be more heavily influenced by individual arrangements
between field instructor and faculty advisor than by any formal school structures.

In investigating the degree of intimacy between the partners in the educational enterprise an attempt was also made to identify additional contacts between agency and school people. The field instructor was again used as the agency person most likely to be in touch with the university. Respondents were asked to signify the frequency with which they had contact with school personnel other than the faculty field advisor. (See Table 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Person</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Key school people were designated as classroom teacher, field work department and the Dean.

The findings clearly demonstrated that contact between field instructors and school people was very minimal. In fact 70.6 percent of this sample never had contact with the Dean and an almost equal number
(69.4 percent) had no interaction with classroom teachers. The field work department faculty with whom greater interplay might be expected was also not perceived as close. Slightly less than three-quarters of the field instructor respondents either never saw or had hardly any contact with this department.

Only minor differences in perception existed between field instructors in separate schools. Contact with classroom teachers was generally so rare that the "very" and "quite" frequent categories were under 7 percent in all schools except Hunter which showed a 16.7 percent percentage.

Examination of the field instructors' contact with the school's designated liaison (faculty field advisor) and other faculty members supported a conclusion that the field instructor was relatively isolated from the influences of academia. Another yardstick used for exploring this position of isolation of the field instructor was respondents' perceptions of the attempts at integration of classroom content and practice experiences. Respondents were asked to specify the degree of effort to integrate class and field exerted by themselves, other field supervisors and school faculty. (See Table 8)

Almost the entire sample (90 percent) saw themselves as making integration efforts as compared to a range of 36.1 - 67.3 percent who felt the faculty field advisor, teachers and other field instructors made similar attempts. Nearly half (44.4 percent) of the field instructors viewed themselves as making a strong effort. They did not perceive other field instructors as exerting efforts as strong as their own. In fact, almost an equal number felt that methods teachers made
TABLE 8

EFFORTS OF THE KEY ACTORS IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
TO INTEGRATE CLASSROOM CONTENT WITH FIELD
EXPERIENCE AS RATED BY FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor</th>
<th>Strong Effort</th>
<th>Some Effort</th>
<th>Any Effort</th>
<th>No Effort</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisor</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Teachers</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teachers</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Field Instructors</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attempts at integration which were comparable to those of other field instructors. The faculty advisor (67.3 percent) on the other hand was perceived as making greater efforts at integration of class content and field experience than everyone else except the field instructor respondents themselves.

Attention ought to be drawn to the relatively high percentage of "no response" answers. The prevalence of these "no responses" seemed to vary according to the frequency of contacts respondents had with each of the people listed. worthy of note is that respondents tended to know the least people in their own position (e.g., 30 percent "no responses" for "other field instructors", 25 percent for "other teachers"
and, 19.4 percent for "methods teachers").

It is clear that the field instructors in this sample did not see either school or agency people as making strong efforts to bring classroom content and field work experience together in an integrated teaching format. They perceived themselves as the only group making consistently strong integrative efforts. These views are in line with their reported feelings of a lack of closeness in the interrelationships between school and agency people in general and their own distance from the school in particular.

An assumption might be made that the issue of the nearness of school to agency was closely related to the field instructor's perceived connection to the academic setting. It is therefore not surprising that in response to an open-ended question asking for any additional comments regarding school-agency relationships most respondents not only tended to elaborate on this notion of closeness, but also to answer in terms of their own personal associations.

Approximately 90 of the 180 field instructors chose to respond to this open-ended question. Half of those spoke to the "intimacy-isolation" concern. Responses overwhelmingly reflected a perception of a distant relationship between the two settings in social work education. Rarely were there comments indicating feelings of intimacy and a shared enterprise. The following type of comment was relatively rare: "One of the most important elements for me was the close, frank, honest, direct communication with the liaison faculty advisor.

Some respondents felt that closeness depended upon the faculty field advisor. The following statements are illustrative of this point of view:
1. "...it depends...I felt close and connected to the group work person yet unrelated to casework faculty advisor who visited only once at the end of the semester."

2. "My relationship with the school depends on the faculty liaison. One year I almost never saw the person and had no connection because he was so passive to whatever I presented. Another liaison and I worked closely together and shared our thinking."

Clearly, most field instructors discussing this issue found the relationship between school and agency to be sorely lacking in closeness:

1. "...total lack of communication with school..."
2. "The agency (executive and other staff) often felt unrelated to the school."
3. "...telephone contact only..."
4. "...met once during the year..."
5. "Never met the field advisor..."
6. "Very limited contact..."
7. "Until this past year there was almost no communication between the agency and the school."
8. "The field work instructor and faculty advisor should work more closely together."
9. "I operated in a vacuum as to what course content covered. I only learned as student brought up course discussions..."
10. "The wide separation of the two with student in the middle is a waste."
11. "Field instructors are isolated from the school faculty. Students are...in a situation promoting a split and conflicted loyalties."
12. "Agencies and schools have a hard time coordinating schedules...I don't get into the school very often and faculty advisors seem equally as busy so they do not get to the agency either..."
13. "I think that there has been a sharp decline in coordination between the field and the school due to financial problems and later rationalized by some bull...concepts. The students lose out..."
14. "Large educational institutions and busy involved agencies more often than not, fail to communicate in any but the most scanty fashion."

15. "I find the linkages to be weak."

16. "We have attempted group meetings of school field work faculty with our supervisory staff...These meetings have not been successful. Faculty find it hard to attend. On the other hand, our attendance at meetings called by schools is usually rather poor because we are busy."

17. "I have no idea of what the school's perspective is on different issues...all my information is from students."

Some respondents indicated that connections between schools and agencies occurred only around problem students:

1. "Field instructors and classroom teachers never meet. Faculty field advisors become involved only after the students develop problems."

2. "...Contact is minimal unless there is a problem. The school will respond to problems."

3. "...with students who were extremely talented...I did not need to work closely with the school or attempt to integrate field work and school because the student was able to do that...with problematic students I have had to work closely with the school."

4. "Relationship of field and school is lip service only, and only around problem students."

5. "I've had outstanding students. Faculty advisor seemed less involved with them due to priority problems with less successful students. I feel they deserved more attention because they were so good."

6. "Students often complain about lack of integration between school and placement. We feel faculty rarely contacts us unless there is a problem."

Some responses suggested areas where school and agency might work more closely:

1. "...Lack opportunity for field instructors to play a direct role in the formulation of educational programs and evaluation."
2. "School and agency should work together more closely to develop course content and curriculum as well as field performance standards."

3. "I would like to see more contact between school and agency with coordination of planning...so that field work is more relevant to classroom work and vice versa."

Field instructors sometimes expressed the feeling that the school was the partner responsible for the development of closeness between the two settings in social work education:

1. "More communication is necessary...I feel this is the school's responsibility since most field placements are busy with more than educating students and this is the school's sole purpose."

2. "The schools must take a stronger part in visiting the agencies...agencies are more frequently visiting the schools than vice versa."

3. "Faculty advisor should visit the agency at least once per semester."

4. "More coordination is certainly indicated...but it must take place on agency premises. Agencies cannot afford to finance supervisory staff to go for frequent conferences."

5. "The school must take the initiative in increasing communication and must look to practice settings as a means of improving social work education."

Various suggestions were made by respondents for solutions to the problems of distance:

1. "Field and classroom should be integrated by exchanging teachers and field instructors every two years or so."

2. "There must be better coordination between school and agencies. I feel much more discussion needs to be created around the establishment of classes within the agency in close contact with current problems of clients."

3. "Field instructors are remote from classes; teachers are remote from realities of the field...need consideration of a rotation system."

4. "There should be at least half of the faculty rotating between practice and teaching and be aware of practice changes."
5. "Needs to be more active meaningful reciprocal involvement between school and agency such as:
   (a) agency involvement with curriculum development
   (b) school involvement with direct practice experiences at agencies."

6. "Schools do not give sufficient recognition to contributions field instructors could make to the classroom as resource participants in teaching special fields and skills."

7. "I feel there should be more of a mix, the field instructor doing some classroom teaching, the school faculty to keep a hand in direct practice."

8. "Field instructors should be invited on an exchange basis to do class instruction and so should the class instructors be given direct service experience."

9. "I wish we could have more sharing of teaching and practice."

10. "It would be helpful to have meetings with school to better understand curriculum content."

These narrative comments show the concern of the field instructors in this study about the distance between themselves and the school, and the school and the agency. Little was said about the cause of the lack of intimacy between these two educational partners. "Busyness" was mentioned as the reason for the distance by one or two respondents. However, none of the anticipated factors were specified such as difference in goals and structure. The comments were more descriptive than analytic. It is interesting to note that the solutions offered for increasing the intimacy between school and agency suggested that school and agency people change roles and settings. There were no suggestions offered for methods of closing the distance between the two existing structures each with their own unique functions.
Field Instructor's Relationship to the Agency

Understandably, the written material related to social work education deals primarily with the field instructor's connection to academia. A search of the literature revealed almost no published discussion of the "closeness" of the field instructor to the agency system. The only notable exception to this observation was the case of school sponsored student units where the issue most frequently examined was that of the accountability of the field instructor. It seems to have been generally assumed that the agency paid field instructor would experience very little difficulty in being an integral part of his agency. Since the vast majority of respondents in this sample came from this latter category it was anticipated that the same would hold true for this group.

A substantial majority (82.2 percent) of the field instructors indicated that they were accountable to an agency staff member. An attempt was made to ascertain how much influence this supervisor had on the assignment of the field instructor's work tasks. (See Table 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influential Person</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Hardly Influential</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Supervisor</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF THE EXTENT OF INFLUENCE OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR SUPERVISORS ON ASSIGNMENT OF THEIR WORK TASKS (N=180)
The findings disclosed that when compared to their supervisors' primary in the assignment of work tasks, more field instructors (92.8 percent) perceived themselves as being influential in contrast with their supervisors (53.9 percent). In fact, 71.7 percent of the group saw themselves as very influential as compared to only 31.1 percent who assigned their supervisors the same degree of power. A fairly sizeable portion of the sample (21.1 percent) did not even respond to the question on the effect of the supervisor. It seems safe to conclude that the field instructors in this study viewed themselves as the primary decision makers in the nature of their agency assignment.

Since the focus of this study was on social work education there was no attempt to examine who might set demands on work performance and evaluate functioning relative to other work tasks in the agency. There was an effort to investigate who was influential in setting expectations on the field instructor's performance as a student supervisor. Certain school and agency "key actors" in student education were chosen. Respondents were asked to rate the degree of influence each had on the performance of field instructors in their teaching role. (See Table 10)

The findings indicated that the vast majority of field instructors (87.9 percent) viewed themselves as very influential in setting expectations for their own performance as student supervisors. In fact, if we include those that attributed "quite a bit" of influence to themselves, then 96.8 percent of the sample saw themselves as the primary performance standard setters. No other category could compare even slightly favorably. In contrasting the effects of agency and school
personnel in work tasks and on performance expectations as student supervisors, an even greater proportion of field instructors saw only minimal influences on their functioning as teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actor</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Advisor</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Agency Supervisor</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Field Instructor</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than 20 percent of the field instructors felt any great effect on their student supervisor role exercised by the faculty advisor or their agency supervisor. Almost half of the group viewed the influence of the field work department as hardly, or not at all existent. Slightly more than 50 percent attributed very slight influence to their field instructor peer group.

We may safely conclude, that for this group of respondents, neither school nor agency people were perceived as exerting demands on, or setting
standards for field instructor performance. For the group represented in this study it was clearly the field work supervisor himself who set standards and made internal demands for his own functioning. An assumption might therefore be made that performance expectations were not standardized and that therefore acceptable levels of functioning would tend to fluctuate from person to person.

Role Conflicts of the Field Instructor

The results discussed in the previous section, contrary to popular beliefs, suggest that the field instructor is free from strong influence on his functioning exercised by either partner in social work education. The picture of a student supervisor who experiences the strain of being pulled by two equal forces was not supported. If a role conflict between educator and service deliverer did exist it seemed to emanate, as Sarbin suggests, from an absence of clear demands and expectations from either side. Consequently, pressures on the field instructor seemed to be associated with a lack of clarity of what is expected rather than conflicting expectations.

Advocates of the student unit pattern of field instruction agree that the supervisor in this model is not subjected to the same role conflicts as the agency paid supervisor with one or two students. It is suggested by those who favor the former that these role conflicts


2The student unit pattern discussed has the following characteristics: Four or more students supervised by a field instructor who is employed by the school and whose primary responsibility is student supervision.
emanate from the conflicting goals of schools and agencies which result in the contradictory roles of educator and service deliverer. An attempt was made to obtain the perceptions of field instructors on this issue.

Respondents were first requested to indicate the extent of their agreement with the opinion that the school's goal of education and the agency's goal of service were contradictory. (See Table 11)

TABLE 11
FIELD INSTRUCTORS' AGREEMENT THAT SCHOOL'S GOAL OF EDUCATION AND AGENCY'S GOAL OF SERVICE ARE CONTRADICTORY
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important to note is that more than three-fourths of the sample (77.7 percent) disagreed with the notion that educational and service goals were in contradiction to each other. More than half of the field instructors disagreed strongly. In comparison a very modest 1.7 percent of the respondents agreed strongly that the goals were antagonistic and less than one quarter agreed slightly with this orientation. Findings revealed some differences of opinion among field instructors from different schools.
TABLE 12
COMPARISON BY SCHOOL OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS' AGREEMENT THAT SCHOOL'S GOAL OF EDUCATION AND AGENCY'S GOAL OF SERVICE ARE CONTRADICTORY (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 54.4 percent of the total sample disagreed strongly that service and education goals were contradictory, field instructors from Wurzweiler (71 percent) and Hunter (70 percent) reflected even stronger views. Less than half of the respondents from Adelphi, Fordham and NYU disagreed strongly. Differences diminished when both gradations of disagreement categories were combined. Results then indicated that better than a majority (range = 68.8% - 83.9%) of field instructors in each of the schools did not see the educational and service goals as antagonistic. It is important to note that in three of the schools not one person agreed strongly with the contradictions and in each of the remaining three institutions less than 4 percent felt the same.
The next area of investigation dealt with the field instructors' feelings that a conflict in their roles as educators and service deliverers existed. (See Table 13)

**TABLE 13**
FIELD INSTRUCTORS' VIEWS OF THE DEGREE OF CONFLICT BETWEEN THEIR ROLE AS EDUCATOR AND SERVICE DELIVERER (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Strong Conflict</th>
<th>(2) Moderate Conflict</th>
<th>(3) Minimal Conflict</th>
<th>(4) No Conflict</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field instructors overwhelmingly (81.1 percent) asserted their belief that there was minimal or no conflict in simultaneously being an educator and service provider. This was comparable to their views expressed about the contradictory nature of education and service goals where 77.7 percent of the sample disagreed. It ought to be noted that field instructors in four schools saw no strong conflict in their role and those in the remaining two schools reflected only 3 percent of each population. At the other end of the continuum a majority of the respondents in half of the schools perceived no role conflict at all.

When the "minimal" and "no conflict" classifications were collapsed into one, more than 70 percent of the field instructors in each of the schools expressed this view. In two of the schools almost
90 percent of the respondents saw minimal or no conflict in their education and service provision roles. Following is a breakdown according to school of those field instructors who saw minimal or no role conflict:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field instructors in this sample, contrary to the view expressed by many educators and practitioners, did not see contradictory pulls between education and service goals, nor did they feel a conflict in carrying out their responsibilities in each area simultaneously. Supportive of this conclusion are the responses of 68.9 percent of the field instructors who indicated that their agency responsibilities did not interfere with student supervision.

Of the 27.8 percent of the field instructors who felt that job pressures interfered with their role as student supervisor, several indicated only minor obstacles with such phrases as: "occasionally", "sometimes", "to some degree", "...at times...interfered with ability to give additional service to students". A small number expressed their feeling of interference much more strongly as reflected by their actual statements:

1. "Because of my heavy workload, the amount of time I was able to spend with students was less than I would have liked."

2. "I did not have the appropriate amount of time to establish the educational program I would have desired."

3. "I feel I could not provide proper preparation for student conferences."
4. "Agency responsibility was in itself like two jobs."

5. "I could not comfortably juggle my work responsibilities and responsibilities for student learning."

In looking for reasons which would explain further the amount of pressure on the field instructor to serve "two masters" the issue of reciprocal influences of school and agency on each other's systems was examined. Respondents were asked to judge the effect of school people on service delivery, the primary business of agencies. Three faculty categories were selected: faculty field advisor, classroom teachers and the field work department. Field instructors were also asked for their perception of the degree of influence identified agency staff had on certain educational areas. Aggregation of the data revealed that respondents saw very minimal mutual affects. (See Tables 14 and 15)

### TABLE 14

FIELD INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTION OF THE MINIMAL* INFLUENCE OF SELECTED AGENCY STAFF ON FOUR EDUCATIONAL AREAS (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Staff</th>
<th>General Curriculum</th>
<th>Content of Method Class</th>
<th>Choice of Field Agency</th>
<th>Criteria for Student Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Social Workers</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages shown are combined ratings of "Hardly" and "Not at all" categories in a question soliciting field instructor perceptions of the influence of agency people on four educational areas.
TABLE 15
MINIMAL* INFLUENCE OF KEY FACULTY ON AGENCY SERVICE
AS PERCEIVED BY FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Hardly or Not At all Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Advisor</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Percentages reflect combined ratings of "hardly any" or "Not at all" categories in a question soliciting field instructor views of the influence of school people on agency service.

In comparing the relative influence on each other's institutional functions, we note that this sample attributed greater influence to the field instructor than to the faculty field advisor. Only 12.8 percent saw the faculty advisor as very or quite influential on service as compared with 30.6 percent who saw the field instructor as having a great deal or some influence on curriculum, or 23.3 percent on methods classes. An insignificant number of respondents (5.6 percent) saw the field work department as having an effect.

It ought to be noted that in every area investigated (except in the presumed strength of influence of the field instructor on criteria for student performance), a majority perceived very little affect of
the two systems on each other. Based on previous findings related to infrequency of contact between the field instructor and faculty, these results occasion little surprise. They also might account for the self description of the field instructor as a "hybrid" of both settings, and the expressed regret at getting "lost in the middle"...i.e., the grey area where neither school nor agency touch each other.

Uniformity of Content Taught to Students

This section explores whether field instructors perceived themselves as teaching within a framework of uniform content and standardized student performance expectations in field work. An effort was made to determine whether material taught in the field was consistent in all settings or varied with each field instructor in each placement. Respondents were asked to indicate with what degree of frequency they discussed seven topics assumed to be the most common areas covered with students. Following is a continuum showing those areas handled "very frequently" or "quite a bit" as reported by field instructors:

1. Practice skills 94.4%
2. Client problems 90.6%
3. Learning problems 74.5%
4. Agency functioning 74.4%
5. Process records 66.6%
6. Personal problems 31.7%
7. Problems in supervisory relationship 25.6%

Practice skills and client problems were identified as the topics most often covered in conferences. Almost 95 percent of the field instructors focused on the interventive skills with 90.6 percent concentrating on diagnosis. Personal problems (31.7 percent) and problems in
the supervisory relationship (25.6 percent) were the areas discussed least frequently.

It might be noted that the process record, traditionally seen as a major tool in supervision, was used by only 66.6 percent of the field instructors. Question might be raised about what "tool" was substituted for the study of practice skills.

School affiliation did not seem to affect the frequency with which field instructors discussed the seven topics under consideration. For example, respondents in each of the schools rated personal problems and supervisory relationship problems as the two areas given least attention and; in each school the two most frequently covered topics were practice skills (number one in all 6 schools) and client problems (number two). An inference might be drawn from this that the content of supervisory conferences, as reported by this sample, was quite consistent when using the most frequently and least frequently discussed issues as criteria for uniformity. Despite this, a safe assumption regarding uniformity in field teaching is still not possible since the specifics as to which practice skills were taught in which semester were not explored.

The field instructors' perceptions of conflicts or inconsistencies of what was taught in the classroom and the placement were also explored. Respondents were asked to signify the degree of conflict they felt existed between the two social work educational settings. (See Table 16)
TABLE 16
CONFLICT IN CONTENT TAUGHT IN CLASS AND FIELD
AS PERCEIVED BY FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Conflict</th>
<th>Some Conflict</th>
<th>Hardly Any Conflict</th>
<th>None At All</th>
<th>Mutually Exclusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(percentaged across)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a slight majority (51.6 percent) of the sample perceived a conflict in the content taught in class and field, only 3.3 percent felt it was great conflict. Almost 45 percent of the field instructors saw no conflict or hardly any. A small group (4.4 percent) did not see a contradiction as much as they perceived no contact at all resulting in content that was so different it was considered "mutually exclusive."

The fact that field instructors indicated infrequent contacts and generally distant relationships with school faculty seemed to suggest that their knowledge of teaching content was also sparse. This might account for the relatively small number (3.3 percent) who felt a great deal of conflict existed. In addition, lack of contact while resulting in less intimate relationships also lessens opportunities for conflicts.

Field instructors from different schools showed some variation of opinion regarding conflicts between class and field content (See Table 17). It ought to be re-emphasized that a very small percentage of the respondents saw "great conflict". Field instructors from three of the
six schools did not even choose this category. It was difficult to offer precise explanations for the variety of responses based on school structure or policy since the field instructors reflecting different views came from schools that did not reveal any more similarity to each other than to other schools. Rather it seemed as if variations of opinion were due to individual field instructor experience and perception.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON BY SCHOOL AFFILIATION OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS' VIEW OF CONFLICT IN CONTENT TAUGHT IN CLASS AND FIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Great or Some Conflict*</th>
<th>Hardley or None**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N=180</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Great and Some Conflict categories collapsed into one.
**Hardly and No Conflict categories collapsed into one.
Uniformity of Field Work Performance Standards for Students

The next area investigated was respondents' views of the consistency of field work performance standards for students. Field instructors were asked to indicate the degree of similarity or difference in these standards for students majoring in the same method or in different methods. (See Table 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Method</th>
<th>Very Similar</th>
<th>Similar</th>
<th>Slightly Different</th>
<th>Very Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different Method</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Method</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost seventy percent (68.3 percent) of the respondents felt that field work performance standards for students in the same method were generally similar. Yet only 27.2 percent saw them as "very similar". Standards for students in different methods were felt to be more varied. A majority of the sample (53.3 percent) viewed them as more different than uniform. However, a relatively large minority (43.9 percent) still believed that standards were generally similar even for those in different methods.
In general, school affiliation seemed to have little affect on field instructors' opinions regarding the similarity of field work performance standards for students in the same method. Only in one case was there a strong discernible difference. More Wurzweiler respondents (22.6 percent) in a range otherwise of 6.7% - 12.1%) felt that the performance standards were very different.

Respondents' views, by school, regarding uniformity of field work standards for students in different methods disclosed some unanticipated findings. In Adelphi, where generic education was most emphasized, 61.6 percent of the field instructors saw standards for different methods as being different. Similarly at NYU where only one "major" was offered (psycho-social treatment) 67.8 percent of the respondents viewed performance standards as lacking in uniformity. We might also note that most of the schools stressed generic education for at least one of the two years of training. From this we might infer that despite what the school curriculum professed, field instructors still perceived social work as consisting of a variety of methods and educational institutions as teaching these different methods.

With the exception of Hunter (46.6 percent) and Fordham (40.7 percent) respondents, more than 50 percent of the sample in each school viewed field work performance standards as different for students majoring in different methods. Columbia field instructors indicated the highest percentage (36.4% in a range of 21.4% - 29%) perceiving the standards in different methods as being "very" different.1 This might

1The percentages referred to are for the "very different" category. All other percentages are for combinations of "slightly" and "strongly" different classifications.
be explained by the fact that Columbia tried to make a very clear
distinction between their two tracks* resulting in the perception of
strong differences. (See Table 19 for Field Instructors' views of the
uniformity of field work performance standards by school.)

TABLE 19

COMPARISON BY SCHOOL OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE SIMILARITY OF FIELD WORK PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR STUDENTS IN THE SAME AND IN DIFFERENT METHODS
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Same Method</th>
<th>Different Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia (N=33)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler (N=31)</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi (N=26)</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham (N=32)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU (N=28)</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter (N=30)</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (N=180)</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: "Similar" and "Different" categories were derived through
combining the "slightly" and "strongly" classifications for both.

In regard to uniform field work standards respondents commented
that: "Learning goals are often poorly defined by the school"."Each
school is different"."Experiences differ from year to year and from
school to school".

*Information obtained in interview with the Director of Field Work.
An attempt was made to determine whether field instructors advocated the establishment of uniform field work performance standards regardless of method. Slightly more than three-quarters (78.7 percent) of the sample felt that there ought to be uniform field work performance standards with less than one-fourth (21.3 percent) in disagreement. Clearly the respondents in this study strongly endorsed the formation of uniform expectations for students' performance in the field.

Some variation was seen between field instructors from different schools. (See Table 20) Less field instructors from NYU (63.0 percent) and Wurzweiler (66.7 percent) indicated a desire for uniform standards than those from the other schools (range from 82.8% to 89.7%). Still, the overwhelming majority (over 80 percent) of the sample from the remaining schools did feel that uniform field work standards ought to be established. Since structurally NYU and Wurzweiler were quite different it was difficult to use institutional arrangements to explain the similarity of field instructor views from these two schools.

While 80 percent of the respondents expressed a desire for uniform field work expectations, only 27.2 percent of the sample felt that standards were very similar even for students in the same method. This data indicates a discrepancy between what field instructors felt "should be" and what in reality actually existed.

Influences on Student Education

Field instructors' perceptions of which segments of the school-agency partnership exerted the greatest degree of influence on the education of social work students, was examined. Four significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actors were chosen for this exploration: field instructor, method teacher, field advisor and students. Respondents were asked to rate their influence on a continuum from "very influential" to "not at all". We might note that, in the case of the field instructor, none of the respondents judged this category as not influential. Almost 100 percent (97.8 percent) of the sample rated the field instructor as either very or somewhat influential on the education of a social work student.

Field instructors perceived themselves as the most influential on student education followed by method teachers, the students themselves and lastly the faculty field advisor. Interestingly, the
combination responses of "very influential" and "somewhat" revealed an apparent evenness of influence on the part of the field instructor and methods teacher. Respondents obviously felt that social work education is impacted significantly by staff of both institutions related to practice.

The faculty field advisor was viewed as having the least impact upon student education. Approximately 20 percent more of the respondents saw the students as more influential on their own education than the faculty field advisor. (See Table 21 for a summary of the results.)

**TABLE 21**

**INFLUENCE ON STUDENT EDUCATION OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR, METHOD TEACHER, FIELD ADVISOR AND STUDENTS AS PERCEIVED BY FIELD INSTRUCTOR RESPONDENTS (N=180)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Teacher</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Advisor</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An effort was made to see whether the perceptions of the field instructors regarding influences on student education were affected by school affiliation. Comparisons are shown for the "very influential" category. (See Table 22)
Attention might be directed towards the responses of the Wurzweiler field instructors. More respondents from this school, than from the others, felt that field instructors, method teachers and faculty field advisors were very influential on student education.

The difference for all three categories between Wurzweiler respondents and those from the second highest school was 10 percent. No other group of field instructors assumed such a consistent position in the continuum. In addition, Wurzweiler respondents reflected a greater than average percentage of all field instructors viewing these key actors as "very influential" on the social work education of students. It is noteworthy that less of the Wurzweiler sample than those in other schools rated students as being very influential on their own and on each others education.

### TABLE 22

COMPARISON BY SCHOOL OF KEY ACTORS* JUDGED BY FIELD INSTRUCTORS AS VERY INFLUENTIAL ON STUDENT EDUCATION (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Field Instructor</th>
<th>Method Teacher</th>
<th>Faculty Field Advisor</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key actors = Field instructor, method teacher, faculty field advisor and other students.
More Hunter and Wurzweiler respondents viewed the faculty advisor as "very influential" on education. This might be due to the fact that in these two schools the faculty advisor and the method teacher was the same person. Despite the fact that the same faculty member assumed both roles, the position of method teacher was seen by more field instructors as "very influential" than the position of field advisor. We might conclude from this that the role of teaching faculty was seen as more powerful than that of the individual faculty advisor. (Method teacher: 67.7 percent from Wurzweiler and 53.3 percent from Hunter as compared to 29.0 percent and 20.0 percent for the field advisor.)

School affiliation did not affect the field instructors' perception of the "influence continuum". In all schools the field instructor was viewed as most influential, the method teacher second, other students third and the faculty advisor least effective on student education.

In investigating the influences of school and agency people on graduate training, special attention was focused on the field work experience. The source of expectations for students was seen as a primary factor in judging influence. The following Table summarizes the views of field instructor respondents as to who formulated standards for a student's field work performance.

Clearly, the field instructors viewed themselves as being the most influential in setting expectations for students' field work performance. In fact, when the "very" (88.3 percent) and "quite a bit" categories were combined fully 95 percent of the respondents attributed this high level of power to the field instructor. All other "actors" were given comparatively low influence ratings. Only 22.2 percent saw the advisor as exerting great influence.
TABLE 23
FIELD INSTRUCTORS PERCEPTIONS OF THE DEGREE OF INFLUENCE OF KEY ACTORS* ON EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN THE FIELD (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Advisor</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Executive</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Key actors = field instructor, faculty field advisor, field work department, classroom teachers and agency executive. The category of Dean was omitted from the Table since the median response was equal to "no influence at all".)*

Mean and median scores for each of the key actors highlighted even more the considerable weight given to field instructors as compared to the other staff and faculty under consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Advisor</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Executives</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 = Very influential
4 = Quite a bit
3 = Somewhat
2 = Hardly
1 = Not at all
Control of Field Instruction

Field instructors' responses to specific questions and their narrative comments disclosed a view of field instruction as being idiosyncratic for individual agencies and supervisors. As discussed earlier, only 27.2 percent of this sample perceived field work performance standards for students in the same method as being "very" similar. Yet, almost 80 percent of the group felt that there ought to be uniform standards for performance in the field.

The field instructors saw themselves as pivotal figures in student education. Almost 90 percent described the field teacher was very influential in developing expectations for students' field work practice. In contrast, only 22.2 percent saw the school's liaison, the faculty field advisor as very influential. Even when discussing overall social work education, both class and field, 82.8 percent of the respondents viewed the field instructor as very influential with only 52.8 percent attributing great weight to method teachers.

The sample in this study also saw the field teacher as being the most powerful person in deciding on who should pass or fail field work. A substantial 70.6 percent of the respondents felt field instructors were "very influential" as compared to a score of 48.7 percent for the field advisor and 11.1 percent for the field work department. Although differences diminished when the "very" and "quite a bit" categories were combined, the order remained the same:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field instructor</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty field advisor</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the issue of who made decisions regarding passing of field work, varied perceptions of respondents from different schools was revealed (see Table 24). In four of the six schools the order of influence was seen similarly (i.e., field instructor, field advisor, field work department). More field instructors from Hunter viewed the field advisor (93.4 percent) as having slightly more power in making "pass-fail" decisions than field instructors (90 percent). The field advisor was also seen as more influential (80.7 percent) than the field instructor (73 percent) among the Adelphi group.

Less respondents from Columbia (63.6 percent), Fordham (62.6 percent) and NYU (67.8 percent) saw faculty advisors as influential in passing students in field work than those from the other three schools (range: 80.7% - 93.4%). This might be partially explained by the fact that Fordham and Columbia had a group advisement pattern which might result in field instructors' perception of "diluted" influence. Also, since in NYU only first year students were seen regularly, respondents might easily view field advisors "as need" contact with half the student population as resulting in decreased ability to effect their "grades".

Despite the assignment of such strong influence on student education to the field instructor, the respondents in this study identified a lack of control and accountability of this key member in social work education. Almost half of the sample specified a distant relationship with their school liaison, with 75.5 percent not indicating a close association.
### TABLE 24

**FIELD INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS BY SCHOOL OF STRONG INFLUENCES* OF FIELD INSTRUCTOR, FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AND FIELD WORK DEPARTMENT IN DECIDING WHO PASSES AND FAILS FIELD WORK (N=180)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Field Instructor</th>
<th>Field Advisor</th>
<th>Field Work Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>N=180</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are given for combined "very" and "quite a bit" influential categories.

Respondents were asked to indicate which topics were discussed frequently with their faculty advisors. Four common topics were designated: agency service, student's practice, field instructors' supervisory skills and school curriculum. Findings revealed that not one of these areas was discussed very frequently by a majority of the field instructors. Even "student's practice", which we might have assumed would be the most frequently covered topic, was considered very frequently in only 45 percent of the cases.
Only 6.7 percent of the field instructors identified their own supervisory practice as a very frequent topic of discussion with the school liaison. From this we might infer that how the person teaches was not seen as an essential item in conferences between the field instructor and the faculty advisor. The two might work together on developing an "educational diagnosis" of the student but, what to do about it was left primarily to the field instructor to figure out.

**TABLE 25**

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' IDENTIFICATION OF THE FREQUENCY OF POPULAR TOPICS* DISCUSSED WITH THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR  
(N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Discussed</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Hardly At All</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Service</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student's Practice</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Supervisory Practice</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Curriculum</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Topics chosen on the basis of the investigator's own professional experience and contact with other practitioners and educators in the field.

Although there was some difference related to school affiliation (see Table 26), discussion of the field instructor's performance was never of the highest priority. It was usually second in prevalence to the area of "students' practice" when the "very frequent" and "quite a
bit" categories were combined. Important to note is that only 6.7 percent of this sample met "very frequently" with their faculty advisors around their own supervisory practice. More than half (56.7 percent) of the field instructors rarely, if ever, concentrated on this area with the school liaison person. With the exception of the Adelphi (42.3 percent) and the NYU (42.8 percent) groups, more than half of the respondents in the other four schools never or hardly ever discussed their supervisory practice (see Table 27).

TABLE 26

COMPARISONS BY SCHOOL OF AREAS DISCUSSED FREQUENTLY* WITH FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AS IDENTIFIED BY FIELD INSTRUCTOR RESPONDENTS (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agency Service</th>
<th>Student Practice</th>
<th>Field Instructor Supervisory Practice</th>
<th>School Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages given reflect combined "very frequently" and "quite a bit" categories.
TABLE 27

COMPARISON BY SCHOOL OF FREQUENCY WITH WHICH FIELD INSTRUCTORS DISCUSSED THEIR OWN SUPERVISORY PRACTICE WITH FACULTY FIELD ADVISORS (N=180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequently*</th>
<th>Rarely**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Very Frequently" and "Quite a Bit" categories collapsed into one. **"Hardly" or "Never" categories collapsed into one.

It seems clear from the findings of this section of the study that the field instructors felt the school concentrated minimally on the development of their teaching skills. Previsously presented findings disclosed that the respondents felt that they had a greater influence on their own performance than either their agency supervisors or faculty contacts. The combination of all these results point to the conclusion that the educational component is left to the uniqueness of each field instructor's expertise in teaching or, to his spontaneous, intuitive responses to helping students to learn.
Several respondents chose to comment further on the expectations made on field instructors as teachers and the lack of interest or control in helping them achieve these goals successfully. Illustrative of these feelings are the following:

1. "I feel a heavy burden is placed upon field instructors without adequate supports."

2. "Both school and agency have a limited investment in the ongoing training of field instructors."

3. "Among the most serious problems in the relationship are:
   (a) School's lack of leadership in defining... criteria for student performance and standards for field work training and seeing that these are implemented.
   (b) School's shrinking commitment (financial and otherwise) to field advisement and appropriate standards and accountability mechanisms for such.
   (c) School's pervasive reluctance to fail poor students and to terminate with agencies and field instructors who are not providing training that is consonant with school standards."

4. "Faculty advisors should visit each placement at least once per year."

5. "Different schools make different commitments to the agency. My first field experience with one school was very rewarding and fulfilling. I felt a tremendous concern around the student's education and my role in that process. In-service training was given. My second experience left me on my own and as a result, I felt alienated from the student's academic experience."

6. "I feel there should be more investigation by the school into the abilities of field instructors. The schools of social work seem to have little input into how an agency selects its field instructors."

7. "After establishing a reputation with a school as a strong field instructor the amount of contact with the school decreases too much."
8. "I attempted to involve field people in periodic faculty discussions but the school was not interested, they only wanted a place for their students. Nor did they ever express interest in the work of this agency."

Although there was no question asked that specifically related to the respondents' desire to have more "help" with their supervisory skills, these comments certainly indicated a tendency in that direction. At the very least they showed that respondents wanted some assurance that they were continuing as field instructors because they were skilled and not because the school rarely looked too closely at what they were doing.

**Summary**

The field instructors in this study tended to see themselves as central figures in social work education. In the areas of affect on student education in general, on developing expectations for field work performance and on deciding who should pass field work they consistently viewed themselves not only as very influential but also as having a greater impact than school faculty.

In addition to their affect on students, the respondents attributed their agencies' entry into a partnership with schools as directly related to their own desires to become student supervisors. Almost three-quarters of the sample saw this as a major, or somewhat major, motivating factor. In the ongoing association between school and agency they viewed themselves as making the strongest efforts to integrate class and field teaching content.
Despite the perceived importance of the field instructor, respondents indicated that their accountability to the agency re their own job priorities and to the school re functioning as field teacher was minimal. "How to teach" was infrequently discussed with school or agency people. Much narrative comment disclosed a desire for more concentration on teaching skills.

In addition to the perceived minimal focus on "teaching supervisors to teach" responses indicated that field instructors felt a lack of direction from faculty and agency staff regarding acceptable performance expectations for students' field practice. These perceptions suggest that more work is required by agency and school to define appropriate methodology in the teaching and transmission of professional skills.

Field instructor respondents appeared relatively isolated from school influences. Although each person was assigned a faculty liaison the majority did not enjoy close relationships. There was some indication that more intimate associations were developed only around problem students. Although respondents saw the development of closeness as the primary responsibility of the school, they perceived intimacy as being a function of the work of specific faculty advisors rather than formal institutional arrangements.

Findings revealed that field instructors' connections with faculty other than the advisor were also quite minimal. Very few reciprocal influences of school and agency were perceived. This perhaps resulted in respondents' feelings that strong conflicts in the content taught in class and field did not exist. Supervisors in half of the schools did
not even choose it as an observation.

For this group of field instructors there seemed to be no strong "pulls" emanating from either the practice or academic settings. If role conflicts existed they came from the vagueness of demands rather than contradictory ones. Most respondents in each school did not view service and education goals as contradictory, nor did they feel a real conflict in simultaneously being an educator and service provider.
CHAPTER VI
FIELD INSTRUCTOR SURVEY - PART II
GENERAL FREQUENCIES AND FACTORS
AFFECTING PERCEPTIONS

The major portion of this chapter is devoted to the field instructors' opinions about recurrent issues in social work education and their perceptions of the respective staffs of the two partners in the educational enterprise. The issues explored are: provision of direct service to clients as the vehicle of choice in practice teaching, skills to be taught, generic practice, preferred pattern of field instruction, locus of theory teaching and different emphasis of school and agency in social work practice.

The field supervisors' perceptions of school and agency people were tapped with reference to: comparative competence in practice, social work experience, teaching ability, relationship to current practice and knowledge about the education of students. Respondents were also asked to rate the faculty liaison person as an educator, practitioner and scholar.

In addition, this chapter discusses the effect of years of post masters experience on the perceptions of this sample of field instructors. Also reported on is the reciprocity of effects of various variables such as relationship between school and agency, integration of class and field content, and influence of the field instructor on aspects of academic training.
ISSUES IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

I. Tools Used in Field Teaching and Skills Taught

Field instructors were asked to indicate their perceptions of school and agency opinions regarding some recurrent issues in social work education. The use of observation as a tool in educating social workers was the first issue explored. As discussed in earlier chapters, despite a consensus among educators and practitioners that social work practice is learned through doing, differences exist related to the timing of this doing stage. Student observation of skilled workers has been suggested by some writers as an essential first step to direct practice. Field instructors were asked to indicate the perceived position of agency and school personnel on the validity of observation as a teaching tool in comparison to direct practice as the major vehicle for learning. (See Table 1)

TABLE 1

FIELD INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY AGREEMENT THAT "OBSERVATION OF A TRAINED SOCIAL WORKER IN ACTION IS AS GOOD A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR THE STUDENT AS ENGAGING IN HIS OWN DIRECT PRACTICE WITH CLIENTS, CONSUMERS, MEMBERS OR OTHER PROFESSIONALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Partner</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents saw the school (53.4%) and the agency (53.3%) as generally disagreeing that observation and direct practice provided equal educational payoffs. Conversely, both educational partners were seen by most of the field instructors as supporting the use of direct practice as the primary learning tool for students.

The 1960s and early 1970s was a period characterized by a growing vocal criticism of what was termed "clinical" social work. Unfortunately many educators and practitioners began to "take sides" and to choose the sociological over the psychological orientation, planning and organization over direct practice, and so on. In the 1970s the pendulum slowly began to swing back with professionals aspiring towards being "clinicians" and viewing social action and planning as occupying a lower rung in the ladder of social work practice. There was an attempt in this study to find out where field instructors felt educational partners stood in these debates. (See Table 2)

**TABLE 2**

FIELD INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY AGREEMENT THAT SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION OUGHT TO FOCUS PRIMARILY ON INTERACTIONAL SKILLS* RATHER THAN ON PLANNING AND ORGANIZATIONAL TASKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Partner</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interactional skills are defined as those used by workers in interaction with communities, small groups, individuals, city officials, etc. They are the skills of direct practice.

**Planning and organizational skills include proposal writing, program evaluation, fact finding, etc.
Almost 20 percent of the sample did not respond to the "school" section of the question perhaps revealing their lack of familiarity with faculty views or academic policy. In the remaining group of field instructors almost an equal number of respondents (41.1% as compared to 39.5%) felt that both educational partners would disagree with an emphasis on interactions* skills.* Almost half (49.4%) of the field instructors saw the agency as favoring the teaching of interactional skills as compared to 39.5 percent who thought the school would feel similarly. Neither setting was perceived as strongly endorsing either emphasis.

The examination of responses to the issues of which skills ought to be emphasized in social work education and by what method of teaching, revealed that the field instructors did not see any substantial disagreement in the views of school and agency. Consequently, it might be expected that they would perceive little conflict between class and field about the skills to be taught (i.e., interaction or proposal writing, etc.) or; the method of learning (observation or direct practice).

II. Generic-Specific Debate

The next area of attention in the interview schedule was the popular generic-specific dilemma in social work education. As described in earlier chapters the generic-specific controversy is no longer restricted to field and school. It currently exists both between educators and practitioners and within the respective ranks of education and practice. Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of

*Transactional skills were defined as the face-to-face direct practice intervention with individuals, families and communities.
school and agency agreement with three statements referring to the
notion of generic practice and its implications for professional
education.* (See Table 3)

### TABLE 3
FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY
OPINIONS REGARDING GENERIC PRACTICE
AND EDUCATION FOR GENERIC PRACTICE
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERIC PRACTICE PRODUCES A STUDENT WHO IS JACK OF ALL TRADES, MASTER OF NONE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School: 13.9</td>
<td>Agency: 34.5</td>
<td>School: 67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS SHOULD DROP METHOD CONCENTRATION (i.e., casework, group work, social work practice) AND OFFER MAJORS IN PRACTICE FIELDS SUCH AS AGING, ETC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School: 17.8</td>
<td>Agency: 15.0</td>
<td>School: 62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE SKILLS REMAIN THE SAME IN WORK WITH INDIVIDUALS, GROUPS AND COMMUNITIES. IT IS THEREFORE UNNECESSARY TO PROVIDE COURSES IN PARTICULAR METHODS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School: 31.7</td>
<td>Agency: 26.7</td>
<td>School: 47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: "Agree strongly" and "agree slightly" categories have been collapsed into one "agree category". Similarly, "disagree strongly" and "disagree slightly" categories are combined into one "disagree" classification.

*Generic practice produces a student who is 'Jack of all trades, master of none'."
"Schools should drop method concentration (i.e., casework, group work, social work practice) and offer majors in practice fields such as aging etc."
"Social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups and communities. It is therefore unnecessary to provide courses in particular methods."
Field instructors identified the field as less positive towards
generic education than the educational institution. Only 13.9 percent
of the sample viewed the school as agreeing that generic practice
produced a student who was a "Jack of all trades, master of none."
This compared with 34.5 percent who saw the agency as feeling similarly.
Almost 70 percent of the field instructors perceived school people as
disagreeing with the idea that generic practice produced a student who
was taught many things but became expert in none of them. In fact more
than half (51.7%) saw schools as disagreeing strongly with this notion.
In comparison only 35 percent of the respondents viewed field people
as disagreeing strongly.

Despite their perception that the school was more supportive of
generic education than the field, the respondents viewed both agency
and school as disagreeing more than they agreed that social work
practice skills were generic (i.e., interchangeable) in work with
individuals, groups or communities. More than half (62.8%) of the
field instructors felt that the agency saw social work practice skills
as different with different target groups thus endorsing the need for
courses in particular methods for each unit of attention (i.e., indi-
vidual, group, etc.). Almost 50 percent of the sample viewed the
school as feeling similarly.

Field instructors did not indicate that either the school or the
field would favor an approach to learning which was as "specific" as
fields of practice (i.e., aging, child welfare, etc.). About 75 per-
cent viewed the agency as disagreeing with the idea of dropping
method concentrations in favor of fields of practice. A substantial
majority (62.8%) of the respondents felt that the school advocated
the same position. Less than 20 percent of the field instructors felt
that either class or field would agree with a field of practice
approach over that of method teaching.

The data indicated that this sample did not perceive as much
difference of opinion between school and agency as the literature
related to the issue of generic-specific might lead us to assume.
Although differences did exist, the overall tendencies were seen as
less marked. (E.g., Even though 34.5% of the field instructors felt
the agency would view generic practice as producing a student who was
"Jack of all trades but mast of none" as compared to only 13.9 percent
who saw the school reacting similarly, a majority still saw both
settings as rejecting this opinion.) It was therefore somewhat
surprising that responses to an open ended question soliciting further
views on school-agency relationships focused on the common generic-
specific criticisms:

1. "Most recent students appeared to be less well equipped
to function in a clinical setting...we needed to provide them
with enormous input in psychodynamics, human development etc...
Most of them expressed dissatisfaction with the school's class
work input as it failed to prepare them to practice.

2. "I am gravely concerned at the gap between school and
practice - schools going in direction of over specialization,
especially in planning/administrative areas - not enough basics
taught in working with people individually, in groups and
communities...Want to see a good old fashioned generic masters
degree with practice skills taught in depth."

3. "Schools' educational goals are not tangible or skill
oriented enough."

4. "More electives needed in the field of the aging."
5. "As a field instructor I teach theory as a practical necessity for good practice...and to fill many gaps in classroom teaching."

6. "Lack of teaching psycho-social diagnosis in method class is serious. Therefore field instructors need to teach this..."

7. "Need more short-term crisis intervention teaching in classes to better integrate class and field experience."

III. Locus of Theory Teaching

The next area of analysis was the field instructors' perceptions of school and agency opinion regarding the locus of theory teaching. Few educators or practitioners would disagree that practice is taught in practice classes although there these courses are not aimed at concrete learning but rather at identifying the central notions and concepts that grow out of individual experiences. It is anticipated that this content provides a framework within which students learn to practice.

The corollary that theory is taught in the field seems less easily accepted by both educators and practitioners. It was therefore anticipated that a majority of field instructors would see both school and agency as placing theory teaching firmly within the province of the classroom. This was not the case with this sample. (See Table 4)

Despite anticipated expectations, less than a majority of the respondents felt that school (42.8%) or agency (32.2%) personnel would agree that theory was the primary province of the classroom. Almost 60 percent saw the agency as disagreeing with this notion. However, the high percentage of "no responses" (18.9%) for perceptions of school views seemed to indicate a substantial lack of knowledge about where faculty stood on this issue.
TABLE 4
FIELD INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY OPINIONS THAT THEORY TEACHING IS THE PRIMARY PROVINCE OF THE CLASSROOM RATHER THAN THE FIELD (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Partner</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings raise questions with how respondents defined theory. There are two possible explanations for field instructors seeing theory teaching as very much related to the field. First, a skilled practitioner perceives his skills as conscious and disciplined rather than intuitive. The worker would therefore see himself as operating within a theoretical framework which, in turn, would be transmitted to students. The other explanation grows out of this writer's experience as an educator and practitioner in witnessing a lack of clarity in the specification of practice skills resulting in a blurring of theory (what we know) and practice (what we do). In this case theory and skill are often seen not as supplementary to each other but as the same.

IV. Pattern of Field Instruction

Respondents' opinion regarding the preferred pattern of field instruction (i.e., exclusive or major responsibility for student
supervision, and major or limited responsibility for agency service) occasioned some surprise. Although a substantial majority of the sample (87.2%) indicated that a field instructor should not supervise students exclusively, 62.2 percent also felt that the field instructor should have major responsibility for student supervision. To further complicate the opinion of field instructors on this issue, slightly more than half (52.2%) of the sample felt that the supervisor should have major responsibility for agency service. On both of these questions 10 to 13 percent of the respondents did not respond at all.

It was clear that although 87.2 percent of the respondents believed, in theory, that field instructors should not supervise students exclusively, when asked to be more specific they tended to express contradictory opinions, perhaps reflecting the ambivalence in the field towards patterns of student supervision. (See Table 5)

**TABLE 5**

PREFERRED FIELD INSTRUCTION PATTERNS AS PERCEIVED BY FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor should supervise students exclusively</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field instructor should have major responsibility for student supervision</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field instructor should have major responsibility for agency service</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field instructor should have minor responsibility for agency service</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Differences from 100% are "No Response" answers.
Perceptions of School and Agency People

This study attempted to examine the respondents' views of traditional opinions of school and agency people. A series of rating and opinion questions were asked in order to elicit field instructor perceptions.

A popular conception among many educators and practitioners is that the school person knows more about the educational process and agency staff are more qualified in the practice area. Field instructors were asked to specify their agreement with these opinions by responding to each of the following statements: "School people know more about educating students than agency field instructors" and, "Agency people are more skilled practitioners than faculty." (Table 6 summarizes respondents' views.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School people know more about educating students than agency field instructors</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency people are more skilled practitioners than faculty</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6
FIELD INSTRUCTOR OPINIONS ABOUT THE EDUCATOR AND PRACTITIONER ROLES OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY PEOPLE (N = 180)
Since this sample reflected field instructors who were primarily agency practitioners (90 percent had major agency responsibilities) it was surprising to this writer that slightly less than 20 percent felt strongly that agency people were more skilled practitioners than faculty members. In fact a substantial minority (42.8%) of the respondents disagreed that field staff were more skilled in practice. Although most of the field instructors (53.8%) did agree with the superior practice skill of agency staff, the agreement was not strongly expressed. This data suggests that field instructors viewed the faculty person as possessing skill at least equal to their own in their assumed practice expertise in practice.

This sample generally perceived people in their own position, (i.e., agency staff who were also field instructors), as having at least equal knowledge about educating students as school people. Only 7.8 percent of the respondents agreed strongly that the school personnel was more knowledgeable. Conversely, 66.7 percent disagreed that the school evidenced any superiority over agency staff in student education. This finding seemed to indicate that the field instructors in this sample viewed positively, their ability as educators. Supportive of this assessment is the fact that 60.5 percent of the respondents also saw themselves on a peer level with the field advisor, the faculty person with whom they had the most contact. (See Table 7)
TABLE 7
FIELD INSTRUCTOR AGREEMENT BY SCHOOL THAT SCHOOL PEOPLE KNOW MORE ABOUT EDUCATING STUDENTS THAN AGENCY FIELD INSTRUCTORS (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Agree*</th>
<th>Disagree**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Agree" category is combined "Agree strongly" and "Agree slightly" categories.

**"Disagree" category is combined "Disagree strongly" and "Disagree slightly" categories.

School affiliation effected somewhat the opinion of the field instructors (see Tables 7 and 8). Respondents from Columbia and Hunter tended to see the faculty as more skilled in both education and practice than those from other schools. For example, 40 percent of both the group from Columbia and Hunter agreed that faculty had more knowledge about student education as compared to a range of 18.2 percent – 32.2 percent for the respondents from the other schools. Similarly, a majority of the field instructors in these two schools disagreed most
with the idea of agency people being more skilled practitioners than faculty. We might assume that the field instructors from Hunter and Columbia attributed greater prestige to faculty than respondents from other schools. Reasons for this difference are not clear.

TABLE 8
FIELD INSTRUCTOR AGREEMENT BY SCHOOL THAT AGENCY PEOPLE ARE MORE SKILLED PRACTITIONERS THAN FACULTY (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree*</th>
<th>Disagree**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Agree Strongly" and "Agree Slightly" categories collapsed into one.

**"Disagree Strongly" and "Disagree Slightly" categories collapsed into one.

One half or more of the sample in each of four schools viewed agency people as being more skilled in practice than faculty. The two exceptions were Columbia (42.4%) and NYU (46.4%). However, less than
20 percent of the entire sample agreed strongly that agency staff had greater practice skill than faculty members. Adelphi and NYU field instructors reflected somewhat higher than average percentages with Columbia, Fordham and Hunter indicating a lower than average proportion of respondents who felt strongly that agency staff were more skilled practitioners.

In general, the Adelphi (69.2%) and Wurzweiler (61.3%) field instructors perceived more frequently than those from other schools the superior practice ability of agency people. The Wurzweiler group also revealed the largest portion (77.5%) of respondents viewing field teachers as having at least equal knowledge as faculty in educating social work students. It seemed that the Wurzweiler sample tended most to view the school faculty as less skilled in practice and education than agency people.

The differences in views might reflect how field instructors saw themselves in relation to specific faculty. Those with more positive "self images" would lean towards seeing the faculty person, in comparison to themselves, as less skilled. Discrepancies in perception seemed to be less affected by institutional variations than by how individual field instructors rated themselves in comparison to specific faculty members.

Some of the more persistent opinions about school and agency personnel examined in this study were: faculty are steeped in theory and out of touch with practice, faculty are more sensitive to current practice directions with agency people being more parochial, agency people are more related to direct practice while faculty emphasize the
broader areas of social welfare such as social problems and policy. Another traditionally held view is related to the practice base of teaching faculty, i.e., the view that social work teachers enter academia after a long, positive history in practice. This has usually tended to result in the perception that faculty have more practice experience than agency people. The field instructors in this sample were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with these notions about faculty and field staff. (Table 9 summarizes the responses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty have more practice experience than agency people</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are more sensitive to current practice directions. Agency people are more parochial</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are more concerned with social problems and policy. Agency people with direct practice</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are steeped in theory and out of touch with practice</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, this sample did not endorse the opinion that faculty have more practice experience than agency people. A high 87.2 percent disagreed that faculty's practice experience was greater than that of agency workers. In narrative responses some commented that "the faculty were often taken at a lower stage of their professional development than the agency personnel." Others expressed "...concern about the growing prevalence of people with doctorates but with limited practice experience on faculties...". One or two respondents cautioned that this lack of practice experience "...did not aid integration for students and could lead...to shallowness in methods classes." Perceptions generally remained consistent regardless of school affiliation.

The vehemence with which field instructors disagreed (87.2%) that faculty had more practice experience than field people matched the almost 100 percent (98.9%) who felt that practice experience was an important factor in the criteria for faculty appointments. (See Table 10) Not one respondent saw this as a minor factor or no factor at all in hiring. An overwhelming majority (83.3%) saw practice experience as a major consideration in faculty hiring. Being a skilled practitioner was specified as a major factor in faculty hiring by 72.2 percent of the respondents, second in importance only to the amount of practice experience of the prospective teacher. When including those respondents who felt that skill in practice was either a major or somewhat a major factor in choosing future school faculty, the proportion rose to slightly less than 100 percent. (96.6%).
The demonstration of leadership in practice (90.5%) was viewed as third in importance as a standard for faculty selection. On the other hand, a majority (59.4%) of the field instructors did not rate demonstration of "scholarship" through written publications as a vital factor in hiring. It was clear that this group of field instructors felt that social work educators ought to be recruited from among the most experienced and skilled practitioners.

TABLE 10
FIELD INSTRUCTOR RATING OF STANDARDS USED IN THE HIRING OF FACULTY MEMBERS (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Experience</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Publications</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated Leadership in practice</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked by other faculty</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Practitioner</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Skills*</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This item was not included on original questionnaire. It was listed in the "other" category enough times to warrant making it another classification in the analysis.
The perception of field instructors about faculty having less practice experience than agency people was in opposition to their judgment about what ingredients are vital for an educator in a school of social work. This leads to the inference that the faculty were perceived as lacking in adequate skill and preparation for teaching.

Approximately 60 percent of the sample disagreed in some degree with the notion that agency people were parochial in their outlook on practice as compared to school people who were more aware of and sensitive to the broader current directions of the social work field. Respondents from Wurzweiler (51.6%) and NYU (46.4%) reflected the highest proportion in agreement with the view that faculty were more sensitive to current practice directions than agency people who were more parochial in their experience. (The range for the other schools was 30.3% - 38.5%).) One might assume that these two groups of field instructors viewed the school as more generic, the agencies as more "specific". The reasons for this difference from the other respondents are difficult to ascertain. Since the structure and curriculum of NYU and Wurzweiler were also not particularly comparable it was equally difficult to explain why opinions were more similar among field instructors from these two schools.

The view that faculty and agency staff were interested in different segments of the social work profession was looked at through asking field instructors to indicate their agreement with the statement that: "Faculty are more concerned with social problems and policy, agency people with direct practice". The results indicated that 58.3 percent of the sample agreed with the statement reflecting their
perception that school and agency people focused on different areas of professional concern. One could also infer from this that the majority of the respondents might have felt that the school did not teach areas of importance to agencies.

Caution ought to be exerted in assuming that the difference in emphasis of school and agency on direct practice was perceived as a definitive one. Differences were more visible in comparisons of the "slightly" agree or disagree categories. Respondents offered no strong endorsement of either agreement or disagreement. (See Table 11) Still, a majority (58.3%) generally did agree as compared to 40.4 percent who disagreed.

**TABLE 11**

FIELD INSTRUCTOR AGREEMENT THAT FACULTY ARE MORE CONCERNED WITH SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND AGENCY POLICY - AGENCY PEOPLE WITH DIRECT PRACTICE  
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>N=33</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>N=32</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>N=30</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>N=180</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last "opinion" question was related to the field instructors' perception of faculty as theorists who were out of touch with practice. Opinions tended not to be strongly definitive. Only a slight majority of the sample agreed (53.3%) as compared to 45 percent who disagreed. Yet, more people disagreed strongly (20%) with the premise that classroom teachers were primarily theorists than agreed (13.3%).

Field instructors affiliated with different schools tended to view the faculty's immersion in theory somewhat differently. Adelphi respondents (23.1%) agreed more strongly than those in other schools (range of 0 - 17.9%). Not one person in the Hunter group agreed strongly that faculty were steeped in theory and out of touch with practice. More Wurzweiler (22.6%) and Hunter (36.7%) field instructors disagreed strongly with the view that faculty were out of touch with practice than those from the other groups. (range of 11.5% - 18.2%). This might be explained by the fact that the liaison faculty member from these two schools was also the practice teachers. (Table 12 provides a summary by school.)
TABLE 12

COMPARISON BY SCHOOL OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTION THAT FACULTY ARE STEEPED IN THEORY AND OUT OF TOUCH WITH REAL PRACTICE
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Total Agree</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Total Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td><strong>13.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When field instructors chose to elaborate on their views of faculty as related to theory and distant from practice, they tended to express agreement. Illustrative of this were the following statements:

1. "Schools need to get closer to the practice level."
2. "Classroom instructors should be more involved in actual practice."
3. "Social work educators have generally been a timid lot satisfied in their passivity and reluctant to take a stand on professional issues. They are also not aware for the most part, what the changing nature of the field experience is all about."
4. "The necessity for the faculty to keep abreast of practice and field development through observation, education, experience et al is vital so that their 'view from the bridge' is not...exclusively from neophytes (students)."

It is generally assumed, and in fact has been informally observed, that the faculty member with whom field instructors usually have the most contact is the faculty field advisor. This remained true for this sample even when the contact was relatively infrequent. Furthermore, this was the only relationship which was "institutionalized" by all the schools in this study. It was therefore important to explore how field instructors viewed this faculty person as an educator, practitioner and scholar. It was assumed by this investigator that perceptions of the faculty field advisor might influence the field supervisors' views of faculty in general.

In the examination of the field instructors' "ratings" of the faculty advisor, notice should be taken of the high percentage of "no response" answers, (from 27.2% - 36.7% depending on category). Although not requested, respondents volunteered reasons for not
reacting to these questions. The following are typical of the comments offered: "Liaison practically non-existent", "Don't know much about her", "Not sufficient data", "Limited contact", "Met infrequently", "Person is unknown", "Never met" and so on.

**TABLE 13**

**FIELD INSTRUCTORS' RATING OF THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AS AN EDUCATOR, A PRACTITIONER AND A SCHOLAR**  
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More field instructors (55%) rated the advisor higher as an educator than a practitioner (46.1%) or a scholar (44.4%). Slightly less than 32 percent of the respondents felt that advisors were excellent educators and only 21 percent saw them as either excellent practitioners or scholars.

There were some differences in how field instructors from different schools viewed the field advisor. The following table summarizes these perceptions.
**TABLE 14**

FIELD INSTRUCTORS RATINGS, BY SCHOOL, OF THE FACULTY FIELD ADVISOR AS AN EXCELLENT AND ABOVE AVERAGE EDUCATOR, PRACTITIONER AND SCHOLAR (N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>(N=33)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurzweiler</td>
<td>(N=31)</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelphi</td>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>(N=32)</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.U.</td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>(N=30)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>(N=180)</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hunter (60%) and Wurzweiler (67.8%) respondents saw the faculty advisor as more scholarly than those in other schools (Range: 31.3% - 36.3%). These same field instructors also saw the liaison faculty member as being a better educator than their counterparts in other schools. Since Hunter and Wurzweiler both used the practice teacher as the faculty advisor this procedure might once again have influenced how field people perceived the advisor. In this case students might provide additional feedback on the qualifications of their teacher which might in turn affect the field instructor's opinion.
With the exception of Hunter and Wurzweiler field instructors, respondents rated the advisor higher as a "doer" (teacher or practitioner) than a "thinker" (scholar). In four of the schools less than 40 percent felt their liaison person was an excellent or above average scholar. However, note ought to be made of the fact that more people (33.9%) did not respond to the "scholar" question than those who did choose individual ratings of "excellent" (21.1%) or "above average" (23.3%). We might conclude that the field instructors were not well aware of the scholarly pursuits and abilities of the faculty.

Effect of Experience on Perceptions

Since it was anticipated that field instructors' perceptions of the school-agency relationship might vary with the amount of their past MSW work experience an attempt was made to examine the effect of this factor. The number of years in the field were divided into three categories: (0-5), (6-10) and (11 or more) years of experience. A total of 199 variables were tested of which only 12 were significantly impacted by the length of post masters work.

Those field instructors with the greatest experience felt most strongly that field people were more highly skilled practitioners than faculty members (33.9% as compared to 13% and 10.9%...p = < .05). This seemed to be a logical finding especially if we assume that field instructors evaluated faculty experience in terms of their view of themselves as practitioners and educators.

Respondents who were beginning workers tended to see less difference in the emphasis of school and agency on areas of social
work. They disagreed most strongly with the statement that faculty were concerned with social problems and policy while field people concentrated on direct practice (35.2% as compared to 15.6% for the 6-10 year group and, 25.8% for those with 11 or more years of post masters work). In contrast, 68.8 percent of the respondents with (6-10) years of experience agreed with this dichotomy in focus as compared with 56.4 percent of the most experienced group and 48.2 percent of the least experienced who agreed. (Differences were significant at the .002 level.) Variations might be explained by the assumption that new workers are not sophisticated enough to partialize faculty and field positions and tend to view the entire field in a more global sense. The middle group becomes more enmeshed in their own practice and might therefore perceive the schools as further away from them than when they were recent graduates. Increased experience tends to bring with it an ability to view school and agency in less "black and white" categories.

Views of field instruction patterns were also effected significantly by years of experience (See Table 15). In this case, those respondents practicing the longest saw the least need for field supervisors to have their major job responsibilities in the area of student training. Those in the field for the shortest length of time felt most strongly the need to separate the role of educator and practitioner. These results might reflect the ability of more experienced workers to avoid the "black and white" polar choices. In addition, increased experience also tends to bring with it greater feelings of professional competence leading to greater security in carrying a variety of job responsibilities.
TABLE 15
RESPONDENTS' OPINIONS, ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, THAT STUDENT SUPERVISION SHOULD BE THE MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY, OF FIELD INSTRUCTORS
(N = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Chi Square = 12.119, Df = 4, p = <.05)

The number of years respondents worked in the field substantially affected their perceptions of the influence of the faculty advisor on the development of field work performance expectations for students (Chi Square = 22.410, df = 10, p = <.05) and on the general social work education of students (Chi-Square = 17.751, df = 8, p = >.024). In both situations field instructors with the most experience attributed greater influence to faculty advisors than those with less experience. Also in both cases respondents from the middle group rated the advisor as least influential. Specific reasons for these differences are difficult to identify. It was interesting to note that regardless of experience, the advisor was seen as having a greater effect on overall student education than on field work performance standards.
This was surprising since the advisor's major arena of work is generally related to the field. It seems safe to assume that the respondents saw themselves as having the most effect on field work standards and therefore attributed less to the faculty liaison person.

Somewhat predictable was the finding that the most recent graduates were more likely to have multiple majors rather than method concentrations. This seems to reflect the increased prevalence of generic education in current practice. Another difference (Chi Square = 7.080, df = 2, p < .05) which might have been anticipated was the fact that those field instructors with the most experience revealed the least accountability to another staff member (72.6% as compared to 83.3% and 90.6% for the other two categories).

Despite these relatively few instances it seemed clear that experience made only a minimal impact on how field instructors responded to the issues raised in this study.

Relationship of Selected Variables to Each Other

In an attempt to investigate whether certain opinions and perceptions could be used to predict others, correlations were computed for 29 variables. The variables chosen dealt with:

(a) Common perceptions of school and agency people (i.e., faculty have more practice experience, faculty are steeped in theory, out of touch with practice, agency parochial and so on).

(b) Criteria for hiring faculty (i.e., practice experience, skill as a practitioner, publications and so on).

(c) Relationship between class and field including agency and school personnels' attempt at integration of the two.
(d) Intimacy of the relationship with school people (i.e., contact with faculty advisor, field work department, other faculty etc.)

(e) Field instructors' influence on school (i.e., on curriculum or method class).

(f) Influence of faculty on agency service (i.e., impact of faculty advisor, classroom teacher and so on).

The data revealed very few statistically significant correlations between variables. Many of those items reflected the same general perceptions in different terms. For example, the view that "faculty were steeped in theory and out of touch with practice" was highly correlated (better than the .01 level) with the opinion that "agency people were more skilled practitioners". This was illustrative of relationships which might have been logically anticipated since they were expressing very similar views. Another example of this type of correlation was the strong relationship \( p = .01 \) between those respondents who felt "practice experience" was one criteria in faculty hiring and those who saw being a "skilled practitioner" as another factor.

Some findings seemed to reflect spurious connections. The perception of a distant relationship between the field instructor and the faculty advisor \( p = .01 \) showed a strong correlation with respondents' identification of faculty advisors with whom they discussed school curriculum and their supervisory practice. One might have assumed that the discussion of these areas would cause respondents to feel closer to faculty liaison people rather than distant from them as statistically indicated. The only possible explanation might be that these discussions were perceived as unsatisfying and consequently
created a feeling of distance. Experientially, however, this
correlation seems unfounded.

Worthy of note was that perceptions of the faculty advisor
tended to be highly correlated with perceptions of other faculty.
For example, those who saw the faculty advisor as influential on
agency service also saw the classroom teacher (p < .05) and the field
work department (p < .05) in a similar light. Another illustration
of this point was that when field instructors saw the faculty advisor
as making attempts to integrate the class and field experience, they
also viewed the method teacher as doing the same (p < .05). This
data points to the tentative conclusion that the way in which agency
supervisors perceived the school liaison person influenced their
perceptions and opinions of school faculty generally. Therefore,
views of the faculty advisor could be used to predict how the field
instructors would see school faculty.

Also worthy of mention was the positive correlation between
field instructors' discussions with faculty advisors of their
supervisory practice and their perception of the faculty advisor
as making efforts at integration of class and field (p = .01) and
on influencing agency service (p = .01). As the faculty person
became more involved in the field instructor's teaching function he
was seen as having a greater impact on the service function and, at
the same time perceived as bringing class and field components
closer together.

However, as indicated at the start of this section, correlations
of the selected variables provided very little help in understanding
or predicting cause and effect relationships between perceptions of field instructors.

Summary

The data presented in this chapter revealed that this sample of field teachers did not perceive as much difference between academia and the field of practice as the literature suggested. They saw both school and agency as choosing the student's provision of a direct service, rather than observation, as the most effective learning vehicle. Although the school was seen as somewhat more positive to generic education, both settings were perceived as being doubtful about the existence of skills which were equally applicable to work with individuals, groups and communities. Respondents also saw both school and agency as generally disagreeing with the "field of practice" approach to education. Less than 50 percent of the field instructors identified either institution with the opinion that theory teaching was the primary province of the classroom.

Contrary to the critics of agency based field instruction that dual education and service roles result in role conflict, a substantial majority of this sample felt that field instructors should not supervise students exclusively. Practice involvement was seen as desirable rather than detrimental to the field teacher's performance.

Field instructors viewed the practice component as essential in hiring and evaluating faculty. Practice experience, demonstration of leadership in practice as well as skill as a practitioner were identified as more vital factors in faculty appointments than demonstration
of "scholarship" through written publications. Respondents were in vehement disagreement with the idea that faculty had more practice experience than field people and indicated that they were sometimes hired at a lower stage of professional development than the field teachers used in student supervision. From this we might infer that, given their high premium on practice factors for faculty hiring, the field instructors in this study saw faculty as somewhat lacking in skill and preparation for teaching. This might also explain why a majority of the sample did not endorse the notion of the school's superior knowledge about student education resulting in the view of field instructors that they were on a peer level with their faculty advisors.

Of importance to this study was the fact that perceptions of the faculty advisor were highly correlated with views of other faculty. This finding underscored the importance of the advisor in class-field relationships since perceptions of this faculty member tended to have an impact on views of academics and academia in general. It was significant that discussion of the field instructor's supervisory practice with the faculty advisor was closely related to their view of the advisor as someone who influenced agency service and brought class and field more in contact with each other. This finding suggests the possible benefits of becoming more intimately involved with the teaching function of the field instructor, an area many educators traditionally approach with great reluctance.
CHAPTER VII

SCHOOL AND AGENCY IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION:
PERCEPTIONS OF DIRECTORS OF FIELD WORK

This chapter is concerned with the perceptions of the directors of field work in the six New York City schools of social work. Respondents, due to their assumed intimacy with both class and field components in the social work teaching relationship, were viewed as "key informants" in this study. Although falling within the ranks of academic faculty, they tended to have more frequent associations with field people than their classroom teacher colleagues. It was therefore anticipated that the perceptions of the directors interviewed would have particular value in illuminating aspects of the relationship between schools and agencies.

Information reported in this chapter was obtained through face-to-face interviews with each of the respondents. The topics covered include: the process through which school and agency begin their relationship, responsibility for, and control of the field work experience, linkage mechanisms between the two institutions, field instruction patterns and the place in the social work curriculum of the practice experience and the personnel related to it.
Reasons for Beginning

The point that organizations, like people, enter into relationships with each other on a quid pro quo basis needs to be reiterated here. Partners must have a stake in making their partnership work and need each other in order to achieve their task. Although this does not guarantee "success" it is certainly a prerequisite for joining together. This study assumes that the initial decision of schools of social work and practice agencies to engage in a joint educational venture is based on this notion of reciprocity. In this regard, each director was asked to comment on the motivations of agencies and staff people in becoming involved in field work. The reasons identified by the respondents were of their own creation rather than responses to a fixed-choice inquiry setting forth motivating factors supplied by the investigator.

Twelve factors were cited as being influential in an agency's decision to become a field work placement. For purposes of analysis some items were divided into "clusters" which showed similar types of motivation. The categories derived from this method were:

1. **Manpower needs**
   
   *Example:* "manpower", "to help expand or develop services"

2. **Status or Prestige**
   
   *Example:* "Prestige of University affiliation"
   "Good public relations...we're a training agency"
   "Fringe benefit for staff...they see it as status"

3. **Stimulation and Learning for Agency People**
   
   *Example:* "Exciting, stimulating and learning experience for field instructors from faculty contact,"
4. **Staff person wants to become a field instructor.**

Increased status or prestige was identified by each of the six respondents as having influence in an agency's movement into social work education. The second most popular identified reason was an organization's need for manpower (chosen by 5 of the six directors). Four of the school representatives saw stimulation and learning as an important factor. Half credited the desire of a staff member to become a field instructor as making an impact on their agency's decision to become a placement. Other factors tended to be unique to one or two of the directors.

Agencies were seen as entering into social work education for "selfish" reasons involving immediate payoff to them rather than for "altruistic" reasons reflecting long range investment in helping the profession. The term "selfish" is not used in a pejorative sense but to underscore the fact well known in organizational work, that agencies begin relationships with schools because "there's something in it for them."

The responses of most of the directors reflected a belief that social work students provided significant help in delivering the service of the agency. Illustrative of this view are the following statements of different respondents:

*There is a trade off in field instructor time and student output. Figure on the basis of five hours per student. If you do some arithmetic you see that a field instructor who has two students taking ten hours of time, roughly about a day and a half, can assign 20-25 cases to these two students so you're getting six days of work from two*
students in exchange for one and a half days of work and I think that worker would not be carrying six times as many cases..."

Possibility that the student would be able to develop programs that they might not normally have time to develop. ...to introduce new programs, experiment with innovative programs and in some very rare instances they may think of students as a way of having cheap labor..."

...Most agencies see them as a help...not only for ongoing programs but development of new programs that they perhaps can't convince an ongoing staff member to branch out into but if you have a student she'll do it.

See students as manpower. Particularly now with budget cuts, where should they put their priorities in terms of limited financial resources.

Despite the feeling that agencies wanted students in order to fulfill manpower needs some field work directors indicated that "students were underutilized." One respondent expressed the view that they were overprotected rather than abused:

Maybe we ought to put greater demands on our students to...carry more assignments than heretofore...not give up the educational safeguards but not protect them as much...and expose them to what practice is like in agencies.

Only one respondent commented on the "negatives" of having students. Even in this instance, however, the students was perceived of as being "correctly" provocative:

Students sometimes represent different kinds of standards...become critical of the agency...raise questions...want agency to take certain positions or introduce new programs or be different in some way than they are now...

In this example it seems that if the students provide anything negative at all it is that they "rock the boat" of the establishment.

The overall view of the field work directors was that students were a positive addition to agencies and made more of a contribution
Field work directors seemed to be surer in their knowledge about the reasons for agencies deciding to engage in social work education than they were about the factors causing staff to move into student supervision. Discussions of field instructors' motivations were more limited with most of the factors seen as influencing decisions not widely shared. The only repetitive item viewed as making an impact on staff was that of anticipated status. This factor was identified by each of the respondents with such comments as:

"Status"
"Status and prestige"
"Contact with University for important contacts and...advancement"
"Competition of colleagues"
"Step towards promotion"
"Recognition of achieving a certain level of skill"

Other influential factors noted were staff members' desires to "Expand their service", their feeling of "...responsibility and identification with the profession" and the "satisfaction of giving something to others or to the profession." Only one respondent discussed the desire to be a field instructor as emanating from a negative view of the utilization of students "...to do things the staff person doesn't want to do...".

The data indicated that the field work directors perceived field instruction as a prestigious position and viewed the status derived as the primary attraction of staff members to the student supervisor role. Illustrative of this point were observations such as: "...from the agency point of view...it's used as a reward..."
Several opinions regarding the motives of field instructors were volunteered. These implied that regardless of the initial reasons for entering into field instruction, most staff were quite serious about the undertaking once involved.

By and large most of them are quite committed, quite devoted, quite conscientious and really have a positive feeling for the student and a positive feeling for the school when they feel and sense that the school is trying to reach out to them and understand some of the problems of the agency.

...they are very serious about this job. They come regularly to seminars and some of them come long distances in weather which I wouldn't go out in...

The schools' involvement with agencies was perceived by respondents as a pre-requisite to the educational process: "There's no way of learning to be a practitioner unless you practice and...you have to practice in a place...". Although patterns of instruction and school-agency relationships varied from school to school there was no doubt that these field work directors could not conceive of social work education without the presence of the practice piece in a real agency.

The Place of Field Work in Social Work Education

The directors of field work in this study endorsed the commonly held assumption that the field experience was central to the education of neophyte social workers. Benefits accruing to students were seen as the major payoff of field practice.

What's the student getting out of it? He's getting a piece of experience that he could never possibly get any other place...The issue is that there is no way of learning to be a practitioner unless you practice. Therefore you have to practice in a place...Even if he
got all the wonderful education at the school he couldn't be a practitioner..."

"...You learned a great deal about practice, the question is did you learn how to do it. Did you develop skill around it. If your focus is knowledge you can set up a structure to do it one way...If your piece, however, is to say that social work is action oriented, it is practice...then you have to translate cognition into action. You therefore have to have cognition but you also have to have that arena for practice.

"...Skill only comes out of being able to do.

The preceding illustrations make a distinction between learning about practice and learning to practice with the field work placement seen as the setting for the latter. A conclusion might therefore be reached that the respondents saw field work as indispensable to the education of professionals whose function is to provide a service to people. If the purview of this study were broader one might examine this dichotomy more closely to see if certain classroom teaching skills could be used to develop an approach which was more practice focused and less intellectually oriented without losing the more "scholarly" aspects of graduate study.

The importance of the field experience was illustrated in the reluctance of some schools to give up the three-day-a-week requirement. They continued to desire that greater time emphasis be given to practice, rather than to academic school work.

Why spend three days a week in field work? is a question that comes up repeatedly. Why not have other forms like laboratory training, whatever that is...

Clearly, this respondent felt that the practice experience provided greater educational benefits than "laboratory training" in the university. Similarly, other interviewees saw face-to-face contacts
with clients as a far superior learning tool when compared to the 
observation of skilled workers:

I don't think observation is a substitute for doing.

Observation is a good experience but the...student 
has to test himself out...We may not have used the 
technique of observation enough but that does not 
preclude the student having to engage for himself.

Yet, other responses indicated to this investigator certain 
subtle changes in the views of academia towards the importance of 
field work. One example is the reevaluation, by some schools, of the 
number of days assigned to field learning. Another is illustrated by 
an observation made by one director:

...the academic model versus the practice model...field 
agencies are correct in complaining about it, but they 
better do more than complain...It's theoretically possible 
that you can train a social worker who never goes out to 
practice at all...Schools have a right to confer degrees. 
All you have to do is set up labs in the classrooms...I 
wouldn't be happy with it because it's ridiculous. It's 
like training doctors only in the laboratory method... We 
might be moving toward the medical model where you get 
your MSW and then go out for a year as a resident social 
worker.

Although this observation was not substantiated by the comments 
of other respondents it was, according to the director who made the 
statement, a current topic in academic circles. This, combined with 
the movement by some schools towards a two instead of three day 
placement requirement, could well reflect a changing faculty view 
of the prominence of field work in social work education.

Important to observe in interviews was the recurrent notion of 
the dichotomy between academic, theoretical or intellectual learning 
about practice and the learning to practice. Only one interviewee
spoke repeatedly of the complementary relationship of classwork and field work. He discussed attempts to bring field work within the realm of the academic curriculum as contrasted to his colleagues who, more often than not, stressed the differences between the two:

My strong feeling about field work has been not field work for the sake of field work. It is contemplating how we can keep turning it into an educational, feasible, viable, existing experience and more and more not do what the class does but provide a proving ground and opportunity for the students to use the complex material from all parts of the curriculum...in the service of others.

Regardless of the importance attributed to the field work experience by faculty, this aspect of graduate training was perceived by some respondents as having the greatest impact on students.

Every study we've made about how students value their educational experience, how graduates value field work as against other parts of the curriculum...it has come out over and over again by far, with all the bitching, griping and whining about field work, field instructor and agency...that field work is the most important part of their school experience...

In examining academia's perception of the status of field work interviewees were questioned about the "institutionalization" of this aspect of student education. Yardsticks used to determine an "institutionalized" approach to field work included: the existence of an administrative structure whose function was clearly the field experience, the number of faculty members operating out of this structure, differences in expectations, status or promotional and tenure opportunities for field work faculty in comparison to classroom teachers.

Interviews revealed that all six schools had a separate department of field work. The number of departmental faculty ranged from one
director in Hunter and Wurzweiler to a director, an assistant, a
part-time person, 14 field work coordinators employed in Adelphi's
elaborate educational center format.

In addition to the variation in the number of departmental faculty
other differences included the nature of the appointment, tenure
potential, relationship of field work personnel to other faculty members
and collateral classroom teaching responsibilities. The Adelphi person
reported that field work positions were "...all tenured line positions
with the same requirements as teaching positions, that is 'up or out
after 7 years'". In contrast, the Hunter respondent commented that
the Coordinator of Field Work was not a tenured line. Rather,
"...tenure is given to the person who holds the position but not to
the position...this person is tenured." The N.Y.U. Director indicated
for his school that "...all have faculty rank...in these tenure
eligible positions...but that a doctorate is not required for faculty
in the field work department...".

In some instances the directors identified field positions as
administrative appointments, in other cases they were seen as faculty
appointments. The key difference specified was whether the person had
class teaching responsibilities. In this regard the Wurzweiler person
stated, "It's got to be a faculty member not an administrative post...
therefore it is a potentially tenured position." In comparison, the
Adelphi respondent indicated that the field work positions were "con-
sidered administrative appointments yet they're also faculty appoint-
ments since...all teach at least one course each semester as part of
the required job load...". The Hunter Director is considered adminis-
trative faculty with no teaching responsibilities. Fordham people have faculty rank, all tenured but teach only as an "overload" option for additional money.

The involvement of classroom faculty in a field work function also varied from school to school. At Wurzweiler, prior to 1972, and the appointment of a Director of Field Work, certain faculty members in each method sequence (casework, group work, C.O.) were given responsibilities for the coordination of field work placements in their respective areas. The Director has now taken over the responsibility of coordinating sequences and assumed the primary role in developing field work experiences. Hunter reflected a reverse trend. They began with an overall Director (Coordinator) and then assigned faculty representatives from each of their five "modules"* to help in the development of field placements. Regularly scheduled meetings were held between the Coordinator and the module representatives.

Another variation discussed was the involvement of other faculty in the field work task. For example, in Fordham, "the primary responsibility for reaching out to the field is delegated to other faculty members...The responsibility of the field work department staff is to monitor, encourage and enable that function to occur." These "faculty coordinators" represent each of six fields of practice.**


**Mental Health, Individuals and Families, Child Welfare, Educational and School Settings, Corrections, Organization-Planning and Administration.
They are responsible for recruitment of placement agencies, evaluation of agencies and placement of students. The Director of field work and his associate are described as only "occasionally" performing these functions. In comparison it is the field work department (i.e., Director) at Wurzweiler, Columbia, N.Y.U. in whom these responsibilities are vested. At Hunter appropriate module representatives check out new placements but only make recommendations to the field work department.

In summary, information obtained about the departments of field work revealed that each school had developed different structures to carry out the functions of providing practice experiences for their students. It was clear that in their approach to the use of faculty in the field work enterprise, the schools reflected more differences than similarities. There seemed to be no single model for organizing field work since schools tended to shift from one to the other (e.g., Wurzweiler began with faculty sequence people and then moved to a special Field Work Director responsible for placement securement. Hunter showed the reverse pattern).

Attitudes of classroom faculty toward field teachers was also explored with the Field Work Directors. Although this study focused on the relationships between class and field one respondent broadened the issue to include faculty opinions of field people employed by the university as well as their views of agency paid field personnel. His comments are restricted to the experience of his own school. However, this writer would suggest that to some degree these attitudes of classroom teachers towards field teachers exist in all of the schools. The experience of the respondent referred to is summarized below:
Prior to 1947 a separate group of faculty were employed to do only field advising with very little going on between them and the classroom teachers. As far as impact of field work on classroom instruction or on the rest of the faculty you can forget it. It was a kind of elitism, the alphas and the betas were the teachers and the others were the gammas....

....chronologically more recent...I felt...that if field work really would take its rightful place with the rest of the curriculum that there had to be a change in the perception of field work, that it wasn't "work" but was as academic as the rest of the curriculum, that it needed to have substantive content that would be complimentary and reinforcing to class work but also have some unique content that could only come out of the direct practice experience. And also, for...the field instructors there would have to be other rewards, other recognition if they're going to make a career out of it that would be very similar to classroom teaching.

The illustration continues with a history of this Director's desire to raise the status of the field teacher (Unit Supervisor) to academic rank and the resistance of other faculty towards moving in this direction...

The opposition was severe...It took 10 years...by our own faculty. They voted it down...They didn't feel that field work was ready or field instructors were ready...When I became Associate Dean I was able to work with other people on the faculty who were concerned that field instructors get academic rank...I was able to get other members of the hierarchy to help in changing the statutes of the University permitting the appointment of field instructors giving them academic rank..."

The material cited clearly shows field instructors perceived on a "lower" level than classroom teaching. This remained true even when the instructor was hired by the University and in spite of the "clout" of an Associate Dean. Interestingly, the field instructors who viewed academia as a career choice tended to have the same perception of their position as other faculty: "...they moved into doctoral programs and... when they came back they moved into classroom teaching."
In a school with as rich a history of respect for the field experience as the one referred to in the above example the only school where an Associate Dean was assigned to field work, the person doing the teaching was still perceived as a less integral part of academia and as a less competent educator than the classroom teacher. We may conclude that if a school field instructor was viewed this way then agency staff were certainly seen as less skilled appendages to the educational experience not only at the school cited but at the other schools as well. This conclusion finds support in the opinion of one of the Directors of Field Work interviewed:

I think that one of the attractions of field instruction is that the faculty member seems higher...Even if you've been a field instructor for 15 years there's still more prestige in being a faculty member.

Also substantiating the described experience are the comments of another respondent discussing how faculty view those people assigned to the field work department:

Peer relationships, here, are very good. Field work has a great deal of status. I think a lot of it has to do with the high degree of credit the Accreditation Committee gave it. There are a couple of things we do that further and underscore the relationship. First, a lot of the field work people are teaching classes and they participate as classroom teachers with the other classroom teachers....

Important to note is the fact that classroom teaching is seen as the "equalizer" in the relationship with teaching faculty and those assigned to field work.
Process of Beginning

According to the field work directors interviewed, the institution taking the first step in formulating a relationship could be either the school or the agency with neither side consistently assuming the initiator role. More important than who initiated the contact was the basis upon which they specifically chose each other. Respondents felt that a major consideration for an agency was the alma mater of the staff person interested in social work education. As one interviewee stated: "...if the field instructor is a graduate of our school and leaves we often lose the placement..." Another agency consideration specified was "...ideology...certain practice teaching... a Jewish piece."

The impact of students on a school's process of placement selection was discussed by half of the respondents: "Increasingly, now about 10 percent of the students tell us about a placement they're interested in...", "Students know a placement that's convenient, they worked there or it has high status. If it's congruent to anything we're interested in we'll reach out to them."

Differences or similarity of ideology did not appear to be an issue of major concern to schools in their choice of field work placements. Only one respondent commented on this area at all ("...it was a psychoanalytic placement...training therapists...which we weren't going to get in touch with...").

Two essential factors in choosing agencies were specified. One was the potential field instructor:
Yes, I think that the field instructor is the most important thing. If you have a good field instructor then you'll have a good placement. If you have a terrible field instructor then no matter how good the agency is you will not have a good placement. The one single factor which is most important is the field instructor.

The other consideration viewed as vital in the school's choice of placements was the agency itself:

If we buy the agency and the institutional flavor of the agency we also generally buy the field instructor...because our relationship is an institutional one not a field instructor one. We're not particularly interested in the field instructor, we're interested in the relations with the agency... Supervisors come and go... Still we wouldn't buy a field instructor we didn't approve of.

Although these two statements seem to reflect polar positions, in practice the schools' procedures were more similar than the comments might indicate. Both developed agency (administrative) contact, both discussed certain expectations for the field instructor, both visited new placements to assess the agency and both generally interviewed prospective field supervisors.

The remaining respondents, perhaps not as vehement in either direction, identified the agency and the potential field instructor as warranting investigation prior to deciding upon a field placement. A number of comments seemed to indicate that it was the field instructor who was viewed as the crucial deciding factor in placement choices. It occasioned surprise for this investigator since her own professional experiences indicated that many field instructors were used by schools without prior "screening", upon the sole recommendation of a known agency administrator.
All of the Directors agreed on certain minimal, easily stated, standards for field instructors:

1. "...accessability to the student i.e., regular supervisory conferences that are substantive, that include reading student's records...who gets in touch with the faculty person...on time if there seems to be trouble..."

2. "Supervisor has to pass muster in certain kinds of ways...must be a certified social worker...available to students..."

3. "...at least two years post masters experience" (Some schools identified 3 years as the minimum expectation)

4. "An interest in teaching based on ability to gain satisfaction in the professional growth of other people..."

5. "Development of assignments...."
   (a) "An assignment consistent with social work"
   (b) "Real assignments not make believe work"
   (c) "Demonstrate that he takes the educational contract with the student and the school seriously by doing the leg work of developing appropriate assignments."

6. "Proven knowledge and skill in practice."

Despite the fact that the field instructor was often verbally referred to as the field teacher, only one respondent verbalized teaching ability as a criteria for selection:

Potential field instructor should...demonstrate knowledge of content and an ability to teach the content in a way that the student can take hold of it...understands that he's teaching not his own school of social work but out of curriculum.

Most of the interviewees tended to concentrate most on the more "concrete" abilities of the potential field instructor such as frequency of conferences, credentials, even assignments for students. There was only minimal discussion of teaching skills or practice skills as a necessary prerequisite for field instruction. One respondent shared his school's written material in this area. That document did specify
teaching and practice ability, as well as other factors necessary for field instruction.

Teaching capacities and abilities... These include associative capacity, ability to communicate, ability to analyze and synthesize. These involve imaginative and creative use of one's professional and life experience, facility in making associations and seeing connections. Clarity of thinking and facility in expression are necessary. Ability to identify particular elements and examples of a general principle; and conversely, to evolve general principles from a number of particulars and examples... These capacities and abilities may be judged from previous practice, previous use of supervision, previous written or oral expression in individual or group situations, and analytical skill previously brought to bear in individual, group or community situations.

Interviewees, it should be reemphasized, hardly discussed anything involving the expectations of field instructors as teachers.

It is revealing to note that with the exception of "...institutional flavor of the agency..." no other views were shared which specifically related to the ingredients of a "good" placement agency. One school supplied a written statement on "Criteria for Selection of Field Work Agencies" which included such "ingredients" as "broad philosophy of training shared by School and Agency, acceptable level of practice, soundness of administrative structure and functioning as related to student training, adequacy of student supervisory planning, and appropriate range and depth of educational content...". Despite the completeness of the written statement, the respondent from the school mentioned that there was criteria but spent no time discussing it. It seems as if agencies are chosen for more intangible reasons such as reputation, knowing someone, use as a field placement by another school and so on. For the writer, the question arises as to whether the relationship between school and agency is more personal than institutional.
The Relationship

The notion of practice and academia as partners in the education of social workers is severely questioned by the consistency of the complaints of agencies that they are not intimately involved in the process and are only used as appendages to the basic mission of the school. The Field Work Directors did not have this precise outlook but viewed the school as the primary planner of the educational experience with the agency placement seen as one part of the general curriculum. They did not support the notion of an equal partnership.

One respondent felt that equality was not a prerequisite of partnerships: "There are junior and senior partners - firsts among equals."

Another described a relationship where the school sets the boundaries and has the official sanction for education:

Partnerhips has to be defined very clearly... they have a role to play but we can't give a double message... You have to involve and respect what your field training centers can offer... If you give the wrong message and say whatever you tell us we can do, it's not accurate. You have to be clear about what is appropriate and who bears the responsibility of the University... The school is the senior partner because it carries the contract with the students and the University.

At times there seemed to be reluctance in saying that the partnership was not an equal one. Still, the underlying message was that it was the school who had the greatest responsibility for the educational component with the agency deciding whether they wanted to enter into or continue the association.

... It doesn't mean that when you say equality of partnership that the school isn't going to retain some prerogatives
and the agency other prerogatives... We will still control the grade and still have a great deal to say about whether or not we consider an assignment appropriate - but on the other hand the agency will control other things such as deciding if they want... students and what they're able to offer...

The field work faculty interviewed did not see the "use" of agencies as something to be avoided. Rather, there was an acceptance of a quid pro quo in any inter-organizational relationship. Illustrative of this view was the following statement:

There's always a question that everyone of us has: 'What's in it for me?'... There isn't a transaction that takes place without that component... There's nothing negative about being used... absolutely nothing... When I have a relationship with another human being I am being used as well as making use of. That's a transaction. There's nothing wrong with my own vested interest in this... The intention... is the complementary needs that both parties come together around...

The opinions of the Field Work Directors seemed to substantiate the "accusations" of agencies that they were not treated as equals in the educational partnership. In this regard, half the respondents raised question with the assumption that agencies, in practice, really wanted to be involved in the life of the educational institution and were being prevented from doing so by the school.

The agency's contact with the school is a 'necessary evil' type of contact... no payoff to the agencies. They do what they have to do but they won't devote any resources beyond that...

... They're eager and conscientious... then they find it too demanding...

Agencies have forgotten that the development of social work education as a specialized function occurred because the agencies delegated it to the schools and now they think that since they've delegated it they no longer have a responsibility for it. As a result what happens is you develop... schools of social work... who are increasingly serving one master, not two, and this master is the university rather than the field... I think the field better wake up real fast and start pushing...
their weight around and getting the schools of social work to be much more responsive to the field. But, this will only happen when the field understands that the training of social workers is related to the goals of the agency...If they don't see it as related...obviously they're not going to be involved and so what they get are practitioners trained according to some academic model...

An additional observation made was that regardless of stated desires, in reality there was no involvement of school or agency people in each other's institutional systems:

They don't really ask their faculty advisor's opinion about the service, the way we don't really ask their opinion about the school.

Relationships between school and agency were perceived as "primarily around field work." In only one school did a respondent report on the recent formation of a "task force" of faculty and agency executives to look at curriculum, student characteristics and assignments. Another Director referred to an experience like this involving one agency with a school student unit. In most instances, however, the field instructor was the main contact person and field work the major area of discussion.

Recurrent Strains and Tensions on Relationships

Attention is now directed to an examination of issues causing strain in the school-agency relationship from the perspective of Field Work Directors. Of major interest in this section is how organizational differences, ideological conflicts, variations in class and field teaching content and the "generic-specific" debate are viewed as effecting the association between schools of social work and placement agencies.
Differences in Organizational Structures and Goals: The Bureaucratic Versus the Collegial Issue

Field Work Directors were divided in their assessment of structural differences of universities and social welfare agencies. Some felt that there was no difference between the two and therefore not a cause of tension in the relationship.

I think that there are some schools that are very bureaucratic and authoritarian and the collegial input is really form and not substance... Some agencies have more collegial input than you give them credit for... not much of a difference between the two.

The collegial-bureaucratic distinction is a myth perpetuated by the Universities. Schools are certainly as bureaucratic and possibly more competitive than agencies. The competition between faculty members is covered up... it's more covert and more implicit but it is there. The schools are complex bureaucracies with all of the complications of bureaucracies. So whoever puts forth this collegial myth is gilding the lily.

Other respondents accepted the existence of organizational differences but stressed the fact that areas of cooperation were available and numerous.

I buy part of it. There are differences, we're not the same but even though we're not the same there's a place for togetherness and we have to cooperate...

The two institutions are not identical... Each institution's difference has to be respected but it doesn't mean that they result in complete antagonism. There are grounds for cooperation so long as we... don't expect that there's going to be complete congruence... that's ridiculous.

Two of the interviewees felt that the organizational structures of school and agency were clearly disparate.

... a school by its nature is more collegial. There's such a thing as academic freedom... Agency is more bureaucratic... has a supervisory structure... school has no 'mentor' system but faculty may use each other for consultation.
There are differences which grow out of function... One is the delivery of something while the other is really the pioneering of ideas and there's a much broader allowance of freedom and independence in that... Agencies are set up in terms of a vertical hierarchy... a passing down... In a school there is also a vertical hierarchy but it is... indented by the collegial relationships... The faculty in concert really set policy whereas in an agency that's really a theoretical notion... policy is set by Board and Executive with staff people being the heir to policy...

Responses were more related to whether variations in organizational structures existed rather than to a specific examination of how these differences might effect the school-agency relationship. As a result, discussion of this issue tended to be "theoretical" instead of dealing with observations of actual transactions between the two institutions. There was no identification of strains which could be specifically attributed to organizational differences. The theoretical discussions identifying differences between "collegial" and "bureaucratic" organizational forms seduced respondents from citing specific problems which might be caused by these variations in institutional structures.

A recurrent theme was discerned throughout the interviews. The topics of academic freedom and faculty accountability were raised repeatedly. Respondents' diverse views and perceptions of these issues are illustrated by the following comments:

The University gives tremendous freedom to every faculty member to teach what he wants... since this is really a community of scholars... rather than representing 'someone up there'...

... university furthers the autonomy of the teacher who has responsibility indirectly to his colleagues and not to the bureaucracy... On the other hand this system may just be a cover-up for a lot of incompetent faculty members who... maintain the same level of teaching over a period of many years...
Although the issue of "teacher accountability" seemed to be an intra rather than inter-organizational concern it is referred to here because of its impact on the school's attitude towards, and expectations of, the field instructor. As different patterns of field advising were discussed, the notion of academic freedom for a field teacher, from an outside system, became a crucial area of investigation. Field Work Directors' responses reflected the conflict between independence and creativity in teaching on the one hand, and the need for standards an an acceptable level of teaching skill on the other. The basic dilemma was how to insure the latter (quality of teaching) while maintaining the former (creativity).

**Generic-Specific Debate**

Three observations ought to be made about the comments of the Field Work Directors regarding the most popular "argument" between practice and academia. First, there was a lack of agreement among respondents on a definition or acceptance of generic practice. Second, there was doubt expressed about the reality of teaching generic practice when most placement agencies were not generic and could not provide assignments varied enough to include work with individuals, groups and communities. The last observation was that almost all of the respondents felt that methods education should not be dropped in favor of "field of practice" majors (e.g. aging, child welfare etc.). This remained constant even where the Field Work Directors came from a school using the field of practice approach.
Comments follow which are illustrative of respondants' differing views of the reality of generic practice:

I never use that word...I don't know it it's real...

I have no argument with the two track system...I don't think when we say generic that in includes planning or CO...but...to split groups and individuals at this point is regressive...

I don't know if there is a common core of social work skills...I think you have some core things...values are core...but there are unique methods and each one of those methods carries with it something unique in terms of its way of working and logic of thinking...

There is a core of social work skills cutting across method lines...

...We feel there is a general base to what all social workers have to know...

The preceding opinions reflect the absence of a monolithic perception held by all schools that "generic is best" perhaps dispelling the idea that the generic-specific argument is only between practice and academia.

The view that schools could not teach practice from a generic base, because the field by its very nature curtailed it, is highlighted by the following examples:

I know it's in the curriculum but I don't think we've been able to provide generic assignments in the field...

Generic placements aren't really generic...It's easier to get individual and family placements than those providing group or community assignments...

Despite the differences and problems put forth in defining, accepting or teaching generic practice, the Field Work Directors interviewed were more consistently united in their negative opinion about the more "specific" field of practice approach.
I think it's wrong. The key thing is to learn both
generic and specific aspects of method...Nobody trains
specifically for a field of practice which they enter into
for their entire careers...most professionals are involved
in at least two or three fields of practice in their lives.
That says that the field is able to train people for their
field of practice.

I think it's too narrow. The students should have as broad
a base as possible in order to give themselves the utmost
access to the employment market. They need a little time
to learn about where they want to specialize...there's an
increasing drive towards specialization after graduation.

The discussion of strain between school and agency as a result of
differences about generic or specific education was not handled directly.
Rather the focus of each respondent was on his/her own view of this
issue. One might infer, however, that tension would exist when the
unanimity of feeling about not engaging in field of practice education
clashed with the field's classic criticism that schools turned out
students who knew a "little bit about a lot of things" and not enough
about any specific setting. Also reflecting tension was the lack of
"generic" assignments to meet the school's need of a "generic" practice
curriculum.

Conflicts in Ideology and Content
Between Class and Field

In general ideological conflicts were not seen as provoking
tensions between school and agency:

I can't get too excited about these issues.

No problem at this school.

It comes up occasionally. It's not rampant, not by any
means. What comes up more often is that even where the
framework of practice is the same between classroom teacher
and field instructor they might manage the case differently.
The one area of ideological strain identified was that between the agency teaching "therapy" and the school teaching "social work". Respondents emphasized that not all agencies did this. However, their perception about schools was that they were educating social workers for employment in agencies and not therapists for private practice. One Director indicated that "...some agencies don't choose us because we're not psychoanalytic enough..." Another felt that the strain was caused more by students than agencies -

...Some come to school in order to go into private practice. We're going to train them they way we want but if they want to hang a shingle out after they graduate we can't stop them.

Interviewees indicated that whatever "ideological" conflicts did exist were reflected in a lack of student assignments which would fulfill curriculum needs:

The right learning assignments are not provided and the student feels he's not getting what's being taught in the classroom.

Assignments in agency don't fulfill school needs.

In general there was a surprising lack of awareness of conflicts in ideology or teaching content between class and field. Based on her own experiences as a field instructor and faculty advisor, this writer suggests that the view that ideological issues and teaching content were not in conflict might reflect a lack of intimacy with both class and field personnel around these areas rather than a factual assessment.
Field Instruction Patterns

Interviews revealed a varied picture of field instruction patterns and preferences, with each school utilizing one or more of the following forms:

1. **Traditional** - One to three students supervised by an agency staff person.

2. **School Unit** - Four to six students placed in an agency with a field instructor and salaried by a specific school of social work. The person may also have a "professor" title.

3. **Agency Unit** - Four to six students not necessarily from the same school but all placed in an agency with a field instructor selected and paid for by the agency.

4. **Educational Center** - A number of agencies grouped together either geographically or by fields of practice. Although the school provides a Field Work Coordinator, the field instructor is still an agency employee with responsibility for the supervision of from one to three students.

Multiple student placements, whether from the same or different schools, were judged by all respondents as providing better learning experiences for students and increased benefits to agencies and field supervisors. Examples of this point of view were:

...I have very, very firm convictions that students learn and the field instructor also grows educationally and professionally when there is more than one student...

...It's better, as a matter of preference, I wouldn't say policy, that a student not be isolated in an agency, particularly the younger student, that there's peer support. There is mutual learning from one another where you have
two or more students. Where you have a group of students either all from one school or from several schools there's a lot of teaching that can go on in that Unit that is time saving for the field instructor and the agency...

The endorsement of multiple placements was tempered by precautionary comments which would preclude making it a set school policy.

The policy needs to be flexible since...in some instances I believe that having a single student with a particular single field instructor is better, more tailor made. But the pattern generally should be multiple placement as well as Unit.

Interviews revealed that a school's choice of field instruction pattern was effected by a variety of factors in addition to the preference of a perceived "best" approach.

We would like everyone to be in an Educational Center but that's not real...it takes away a lot of your flexibility for example political settings might not fit into a Center or there's agency turnover and we need individual agencies to make up for those we lose each year...

Finances were seen as a constraint on choice of field instruction pattern. In a school where Units were the preferred method almost half of them were supported through government grants or private foundations. These external funding sources were often time limited or "fickle" in the sense of changing their allotment of funds as one need became more "political" than another.

A conclusion might be reached that the educational "philosophy" of a school was impacted by such factors as need for placements, agency readiness and finances. Therefore, a Director might view the optimal educational experience in a way different than practiced by the school. For example one respondent spoke at length about a preference in having "...students in Units of 6-8 consisting of students from other schools...
where the field instructor would be an agency employee". His rationale for an agency hiring a special student supervisor was:

I assume the agency is interested in contributing to the solution of social problems facing society and the training of competent social workers is a step in that direction... Here's your chance for about $20,000...

This conclusion, however, would be questioned by another respondent who felt that despite other constraints an examination of the number of students educated in a particular pattern of field work would reflect the policy and position of the school.

Statistics are by design not happenstance... They are based on educational philosophy...

And supporting this point of view...

... We have no units by design... predicated on the... notion that social work had to be done... had to be anchored in a real agency and that a social worker therefore had to be part of the staff of that agency... that the issue of developing a Unit immediately built in protection for the student which made it an artificial experience.

Historically, discussions of school-agency relationships have revolved primarily around the traditional field work association between the two, (i.e., Agency supervisor, 1-3 students). One of the major criticisms of this pattern has been that the field instructor suffered from a role conflict between educator and service provider.

The result of this conflict was seen as either a loss of the educational function, or the service function, depending on whether the field instructor wore the practice or academic "hat". A choice between the two is seen, by proponents of this view, as inevitable. Field work Directors, as representatives of faculty who hold this view, discussed it in the following ways:
...Sometimes the agency unfortunately doesn't lend the kind of sanction for the time...that the field supervisor ought to have for the handling of two students...

...They do it as a contribution to social work education but if demands of the agency become heavy, they still feel the employee should be giving the service first...

The strain is upon the number of hours in the day. Our responsibility is education. We want to see that the student gets well educated. Our secondary and minor interest is the service. The agency's major preoccupation is service delivery, education is a sideline. And that's the strain. It gets expressed in the fact that while we ask that the field instructor be relieved of other responsibilities in a lot of instances this becomes an extra that a field instructor takes on as an interest in professional self development.

As might be expected faculty perceptions were not monolithic. Different views were reflected in the opinions of other Field Work Directors on the same issue of field instructor role conflict:

I think it's bull...making a mountain out of mole hill.

I...like the service and education idea...I'm always skeptical of a doing profession that isolates the educational component too far away from the doing component...I would want the field instructor to be involved in practice as I would want people teaching in a school of social work to be involved in practice...

I think it's overplayed. I have really yet to see, and I'm not even talking about the experienced supervisor...where the student gets the short end of it because agency priorities or pressures interfere...

Despite the expression of some views indicating no perceived role conflict for the field instructor, all but one of the respondents felt that the Unit pattern of field instruction yielded the greatest integration of service and educational goals as well as the most intensive educational experience for students. In addition, the content of field instruction and the competence of the supervisor were seen as
more susceptible to observation and control by the school. This was viewed as a vehicle through which quality field instruction could be insured.

Certainly when a person is full time this is their full commitment and I think they have a great deal more to offer. In the student unit there's a great deal of peer support and peer learning that goes on. I think there's a greater connection with the school and it becomes real field teaching.

Unit has greatest integration of practice and education... field and school... Field Instruction Center is next with individual agency having the least...

...with faculty paid supervisor there is greater communication because person is on campus...

...the identification with education becomes much more profound. It think it facilitates the integration of the curriculum at the school as well as the field curriculum. I think these are people who are... cohorts in relation to education out there... The priorities... of an agency whose raison d'etre is not education, its service... keeping the educational component in the forefront is supported enormously by having someone who has the continuity of experience and the depth of the experience. That person becomes invaluable at least from the standpoint of the school...

The connection of the field instructor to the University seemed to be the most important single factor causing respondents to favor this pattern of field instruction above others. Contact, communication and control were obviously more easily attained in a school sponsored student unit. However, agency units were seen as providing an educational experience of equal quality. In this case the supervisor's full time commitment to field instruction and his being part of the agency system were seen as legitimate trade-offs to direct involvement with the University.

I will not differentiate between the quality of field instruction provided by someone who's a faculty field instructor or someone who's the unit field instructor...
on an agency staff. I really don't think there is any difference... The people who stay with it...obviously must have demonstrated their competence and their commitment and their motivation becomes very clear both to the educational institution and the employing agency...

At the same time as the school unit pattern was seen as a solution to educational concerns, it was also viewed as creating tensions in the agency:

...When we have a school unit there's more potential for strain...because it's not seen as part of the same system. On the other hand it does give the field instructor freedom because the field instructor is wearing the University hat...

...The extent to which faculty field instructors...become part of the staff, not just experts in education but also involved with policy formulation...workers' practice...so that they begin to talk about WE and the agency begins to talk about WE in the relationship to them, that's not easy. I really think there are more strains in having a school unit assimilated within the setting than an agency unit and the trade-off is a little more in the direction of the agency unit in terms...of being considered in the system and not somebody who reports outside...

**Control of Field Instruction**

Interviews with Field Work Directors reaffirmed the view that the field experience occupied a central position in social work education. Generally respondents felt that learning *to* practice, as distinct from learning *about* practice, could only be accomplished through direct contacts with clients. The importance assigned to field practice made the issue of who "controls" the field work experience vital to address.

Historically, staff from academia and practice tend to concur that the school, not the agency, is primarily responsible for the education of future social workers. Insuring a certain quality of learning and teaching in class and field is then the task of the educational institution.
Since the locus of the practice experience is not on "University grounds" it becomes more difficult to monitor than the content taught to students by different professors in the classroom situation. Despite the notion of academic freedom, Field Work Directors tended to view class curriculum and instructors' performance as more easily amenable to examination.

The following is one example of this opinion:

...field instructor is different than classroom teacher... the difference is that the classroom teacher is...kept within bounds by his collegial relationships...and gets the sense, by participating in committees and other faculty meetings, what's expected in a course, whereas the field person obviously has no interest...or has less of an investment in keeping abreast of current developments and expectations...so there has to be a telling of what these are...

Other observations which distinguished class and field teaching emphasized the lack of proximity of field instructors to each other. Faculty were seen as having more frequent contact because they taught in the same geographic location. In comparison, the field teachers were generally isolated from each other since they operated out of different agencies. This situation diminished the factor of peer control, standard setting which respondents felt was more common in academia.

Respondents were asked to identify the vehicles used in their school for monitoring the field instructors performance and the field instruction experience. It was interesting to note that no distinction was made between faculty or agency field instructors. Monitoring devices common to all the schools included: the students, the faculty advisor, some form of required educational seminar for new field instructors (in some schools a course in another school was accepted
as fulfillment of this requirement), some form of group meetings with other field instructors.

If the goal of these vehicles was to be more knowledgeable of the field work experience, their effectiveness seemed dubious. Most respondents saw the Field Instruction Seminars as an educational tool for the new supervisor rather than as a method of examining the field experience. One might argue, however, that if supervisory records were used in the seminar then the leader (a school faculty person) would gain an intimate knowledge of the way in which a particular field instructor worked with students as well as the content covered. Perceptions of the purpose, focus and content of the seminars follow:

...emphasis is on skill development in supervision... like a practice course utilizing the material of the supervisors...live case material...

I think they are looking for some kind of consultation... particularly for a new student supervisor...I will not give up field instructors seminar, particularly for people who are new and may not have proper supports in their agency and where maybe there are some deficits in the relationship with the faculty advisor...

The major materials used are the production of the field instructor...asked to do process notes on one student and submit them to the instructor so as to formulate basic educational issues and methodology...The purpose is not to supervise the field instructors on their supervision but to extract the educational component and to help them identify everything from the level of where the student is, what some of the learning blocks may be, what some of the effective or ineffective pedagogical techniques used by the field instructor are and then an effort to help them begin doing an educational diagnosis or assessment so that student can get some idea of his patterns of learning...

All respondents saw this seminar as an indispensable part of contact with new field instructors. Only one noted that at times this "results in conflicts with agency supervision." It seemed that Field
Work Directors assumed that agencies did not provide supervision to
their staff around their new role as field teachers.

In spite of a school's use of school-agency linkages, interviewees
perceived the outcome as agency controlled field work. Most respondents
identified a student's ongoing comments to faculty advisors or classroom
teachers as an important vehicle for finding out what was happening in
field work. The shortcoming of this method was highlighted by one
respondent's observation:

...Students are some of my best sources of information...
but if the student thinks it's the cat's meow and keeps
his mouth shut we may never know what's happening. This
is much truer...when we don't automatically go to the
records. I get much less feedback from the faculty when...
they don't visit agencies.

In the majority of the schools students participated in a formal
evaluation procedure of their placement and field instructor. In one
of the schools this was a policy that had been dropped because..."...we
got flak from the agency...field instructor had to read it and sign
it...then students put down less and less...because they didn't want
to confront the field instructor...and it became nothing...with 300
students we got maybe 100 back."

Only one respondent identified a formal procedure in providing
feedback to individual field instructors. This raised a question of
the use of these evaluations in the development of better placements,
more competent supervisors, closer relationships and so on. When
asked whether field instructors knew about the existence of evaluations,
responses included, "I assume they know", "faculty advisors should be
telling them." Since there was usually no formalized procedure, we
might conclude that these contacts with agency people were not known first-hand to the Field Work Directors. It seemed to this writer that evaluations tended to remain "In-House" and were generally shared infrequently.

Group meetings varied in frequency and form and were viewed by most respondents as not having high enough priority in agencies for them to allow field instructors the necessary time to attend.

The problem basically is getting time from the agency for field instructors...to come to these meetings. Everyone is busy and people are reluctant to give up their time.

Despite field instructors' meetings, student evaluations and educational seminars for new field teacher, Field Work Directors felt a lack of school control over the field work experience. Some felt this was a necessary condition...

I would agree that it's the agencies who control...we can't live 24 hours a day with that field instructor...we can't get inside of him...it's always dependent on good will - people do this because they want to do it...

...do we know it (field instruction) in its most intricate fashion? Probably not but you know what, that's not our function to know it...It is assumed that the supervisor who is really representing the service really knows it in its most intricate piece...

Other respondents saw lack of knowledge about field instruction as a serious indictment against the school:

The content of field instruction is under the agency's control and the schools don't even know, most of the time what is done, what is being said and what is provided. They should know more...The reasons schools don't know is because of...economy. They've given it up. It's a cheaper way of doing it. But in the long run what I see happening is the erosion of the importance of field work and the schools devoting less and less resources ot it. I think that would be disastrous in the long run, to the field as well as to standards.
One respondent voiced the opinion that if the University was not fiscally responsible for field instruction it could not expect to control it.

I think the schools have got to make up their minds that if they want to control the whole thing they have to pay for it...If they want to pay for it then they can talk about all this control, otherwise they better bring these agencies in as partners or as close as possible.

The faculty advisor was seen as a pivotal person in establishing connections to field work. Respondents tended to discuss the advising role in terms of three target groups: the student, the field instructor, and the agency. Regardless of the intimacy of the association described the Field Work Directors placed greater emphasis on the advisor-student relationship. A possible impact of the advisor on agency service or field instructor learning was not discussed at all.

In two schools an assumption was made that getting closer to the student would simultaneously yield greater intimacy with placements. In these instances the faculty advisor was also the method teacher.

It's an attempt to bring school and agency closer... more opportunity for communication.

Before instituting this advising pattern the issue was that no matter how close an advisor was to his student he didn't know his practice, he had to go through an intermediary...The focus here is that the practice course is really closer to the field...that the practice teacher can begin to pick things up much sooner...The faculty person can be more helpful to the field person because... of having a similar practice experience.

Interviews revealed varied attitudes towards the "traditional" field advising pattern (i.e., one faculty advisor meets at regular intervals with one student and one field instructor). Some respondents supported the notion that students and field instructors should be seen
once or twice a semester regardless of the existence of "critical" problems. The focus of contacts was viewed as the discussion of the normal learning problems of all students.

Other Field Work Directors felt this approach was based on erroneous assumptions regarding students as learners:

We do selective advising based on the assumption that not every student requires highly individualized attention for 2 reasons: (a) Most of our students are not problematic learners...and...(b) Greater trust in the competence and judgment of the field instructor. Our old pattern was based much more on 'residual' - namely, everyone is problematic rather than on actual experience.

One respondent described his school's position as providing "professional advising" in the first year (individual meetings with students and supervisors on regular basis, group meetings for students, record reading and so on) with "as needed advising" in the second year.

We feel that if we've done a good job on the first year student...he doesn't need that much attention nor does he want it so we ask that the student, the field instructor or the agency invoke the aid of the advisor if necessary.

There was no consensus expressed about the most effective form of field advising. For each opinion stated a counter point of view was enunciated. For example, one respondent felt that ongoing advising for all students regardless of problem manifestation resulted in "dependency on the advisor". Another Director disagreed:

I never experienced that either as a field instructor in the 7 schools of social work I was a field instructor for... nor as a faculty advisor visiting agencies...I would not refer to it as an infantalizing process...No one can make you dependent unless you haven't resolved your own problems around dependency.
In another case, some Field Work Directors felt that even when a school's policy was the traditional, rather than "problem" advising pattern, the actual practice was dependent on faculty inclination and investment:

Everyone that had...students in field advising would be relieved of teaching a course...The tendency was to make more of an investment in class...I think the group work faculty...took it very seriously and they made a very heavy investment...but that was not true of faculty in general.

We did a survey of faculty advising about 2 years ago and there was a differential in how frequently faculty advisors see their students. Casework tended to see them more often than group work, CO and Administration...also dependent upon the style of the faculty advisor.

Implied in these two accounts was the view that since faculty were inconsistent, then the system needed to be changed. It was interesting to this writer that setting expectations for advisors to make more of an investment was not perceived as an option.

Contrasting views revealed that some respondents felt that the formation of group or selective advising was chosen more for economy of finances and faculty time than for efficiency and quality.

School is caught in a bind because faculty advising is one of the most expensive kinds of services to students and agencies.

Years ago when we were a smaller school we used to have faculty advisors go out the beginning, middle and end of the semester...Now faculty advisor is required to make only one face-to-face contact a year which personally I feel is limited.

I was one of the people opposed to the change...I saw it as an erosion of standards in that I felt there would be less individualization...If you ask me I would have to say that a large factor in the introduction of this model was that it was more efficient not necessarily more effective...you could see more students this way...
Respondents' perceptions of the faculty advising role with agencies were more consistent than their views regarding students. Agency-school contacts through the advisor and field instructor tended to be seen as rather fragile, lacking in mutual trust, and necessitating a slow, cautious approach. A sample of comments reflecting these opinions follow:

Faculty advising is one of the biggest strains to agencies... Agency person resents when the faculty advisor asks the field instructor to come to the school.

Field advisor's visit is sometimes viewed as a visit from the 'inspector general'...there is a distrust of faculty... Some field instructors like consultation, others resent it.

At the beginning when the faculty member comes in regardless of whether it's a competent or incompetent faculty member, the beginning supervisor will have trouble...as if they are being evaluated.

...Some agencies become petrified when the advisor comes because...the advisor is liable...to discover their own projections about lousy practice...or they feel themselves vulnerable...On the other hand...they feel themselves to be such a hot shot agency, with such great status, when the school comes in they say 'who are you? we don't need you'... Who does not feel some degree of anxiety when you're being posed questions...always an element of defense...

From the faculty members point of view...he is struggling with conflict...On the one hand the faculty member is a colleague-consultant who's working collaboratively...On the other hand, he's also an evaluator...how effective is the field instructor, how effective is the agency.

The Field Advising function was perceived as both a "blessing" and a "curse" in its attempt to get close to students and their field experience.

Uniform standards of students' field work performance could be seen as another way of insuring some control of the field experience. This group of respondents questioned the reality of developing such
standards. One obstacle identified was the absence of consistent expectations in teaching content for all schools which in turn effected the expectations for student performance...

The Council on Social Work Education has now allowed almost everything to take place in social work education. Each school can almost teach what the hell they want.

Another problem referred to was the differential way in which people learned which was viewed as precluding uniformity in performance expectations.

...It's the old rashamon story. You can have 40 students sitting in the same class, having the same stimulum...and one student will learn and another won't and someone will pick one piece out of it etc. etc. etc...

Student differences were also suggested as obstacles to uniformity...

"...Problems of student evaluation are that what's good for one student is not good for another..."

Some respondents concluded that teaching skills, or style, did not determine the learning ability of students. This view seemed to this writer, to imply that uniformity in teaching skills was not needed. Illustrative of this opinion is the following statement:

You can structure education a thousand different ways and people learn. The history of education has demonstrated that people learn inductively and deductively; they learn from the socratic method; they also learn the way the Jesuits taught; they learn the way my Talmud Torah teacher helped me to learn - you just sit and learn; you learn by rote, you learn by Dewey's philosophy...I can send you to every school of education in the country and get 14,000 educational points of view. So learning takes place. In fact, if we had no schools people would learn anyway... if there's a will to learn...the structure is supposed to facilitate that - that's all...

Most educators and social work practitioners would agree with the preceding premise that the student, or the client, has to want to learn
or to work on a specific task in order for learning or helping to take place. Still, this investigator was somewhat surprised at the lack of emphasis placed on the impact of the teacher's skills on the student's learning. The comments of some respondents indicated that learning could occur with a variety of educational methods. Others expressed "commitment..." to their school's "...interest in pluralism and diversity to develop innovative ways..." but felt that there "had to be some degree of sameness among all...". In both cases no distinction was made between classroom or field teaching.

Although the development of uniform expectations for students' performance in the field and the effect of an instructor's skills on learning, were perceived somewhat questioningly, the respondents consistently felt that the teaching of interactional skills ought to be a major focus in social work education. Some respondents discussed the importance of interactional skills in relation to abilities in budget making, funding and so on...

I think that's what makes it possible for us to be involved in policy...the fact that we should have better interactional skills than other professions doing the same thing...

I think we can do both but I don't think we should devote so much time to proposal writing.

...I think that interactional skills should still be on the masters level. Those MSWs who want to go into other skills such as budget writing, budget proposal or budget management can do so...but the greatest need, I still feel, in direct service is for interactional skills...How many jobs are there for people with those other skills. Look at the size of our 2 Tracks...170 odd in Psycho-social Treatment, 20 in Administration...

Some respondents viewed the "action" skills of the worker as more vital than the analytic ones:
The important thing is that I know lots of brilliant people who can't make it at all... It's not only the brilliance of analysis which is important but it's the ability to be able to interact with people... I don't doubt that there is a modicum of truth in the notion that there are other types of skills that a social worker might be taught... but if you're anchored in the notion of service then none of them should be at the expense of the interactional skills...

Based on these views, we might anticipate that at least broadly, these Field Work Directors would expect social work students to demonstrate what they have learned through using observable action skills in direct work with clients. The perception of the respondents that more refined standards could be developed was not hopeful. It ought to be noted that the Director from Columbia referred to the work of faculty-field committees on refining the expectations of first, second, third and fourth semester students in their field work performance. At one point minimal standards were specifically spelled out. However, how these standards are used with field instructors is not clear. The issue of uniform field work performance standards therefore remains unresolved.

Summary

The Directors of Field Work from the six metropolitan New York social work schools because of their knowledge of both class and field teaching were viewed as "key informants" and seen in face-to-face interviews. This chapter has reported on their perceptions of the school-agency relationship in their joint enterprise of educating social workers.
Respondents unanimously reaffirmed the view that the field experience occupied a central position in social work education. They enunciated the opinion that learning to practice could only be accomplished through direct contact with clients for the purpose of providing an agreed upon service. The use of observation and "laboratory training" (simulated practice situations) were seen as yielding substantially less educational benefits to students.

Field Work Directors viewed the practice experience as a prerequisite to the social work educational process and assessed agency involvement as essential. This view of field practice as an essential component in social work education acted as the chief motivating factor in a school's search for agency placements.

The Field Work Directors believed in the "quid pro quo" notion of inter-organizational relations and identified status, prestige and manpower needs (in that order) as the most important factors effecting an agency's movement into social work education. The anticipated prestige of university affiliation was the only factor agreed upon as influencing agency staff to move into student supervision. What seemed indicated from the respondents' perceptions was a view of relationships with schools as being prestigious and enhancing the status of both staff member and agency.

Respondents tended to view the benefits accruing to the agency as greater than the effort involved in being a field work placement. The students were seen as making more of a contribution to the service of the agency than they "cost in clerical or staff time."
Agency and school choices of each other were seen as lacking any "scientific" basis. A staff member's alma mater was considered as a more important factor in choosing a particular school than ideology, methodology and so on. Similarly, ingredients of a "good" placement agency were either not specified or referred to in a most general, abstract manner. Yardsticks for judging an agency were absent. Despite the importance attributed to field work, an agency's reputation, use as a placement by another school, availability or "knowing someone" seemed to be given greater weight in a school's choice to become involved with an agency than specific criteria measuring quality of supervision or practice. The ability of the potential field instructor was evaluated in terms of "concrete" factors such as frequency of conferences and credentials rather than in terms of supervisory or practice skills.

School-agency relationships were seen as revolving primarily around field work. Regardless of any stated desires of either party, no involvement in each other's systems was perceived. Respondents questioned whether agencies really wanted to be involved in the life of the school since no payoff to them was seen by the interviewees.

The relationship was not viewed as an equal partnership. Rather, the school was perceived as the primary planner of the students' educational experiences. Respondents felt that students, classroom faculty and even field instructors themselves perceived field people as less skilled appendages to the educational process than academic personnel.

In spite of their position that field work was indispensible in social work education and, that the school was the institution
primarily responsible for this education, respondents identified a lack of school control over the field work experience. Mixed reactions to this state were expressed. Some interviewees saw it as a serious indictment against the school while others felt that agency control was the "way it should be".

Field Work Directors felt that the school also carried the responsibility of insuring a certain quality of field teaching. The belief in academic freedom for classroom teachers was not extended as easily to the field instructor. Respondents felt that classroom teachers were kept within certain boundaries because they were influenced by the opinions and pressures of their colleagues. The field teacher, however, was seen as more isolated resulting in more idiosyncratic performance. In general the field experience was viewed as difficult to monitor with the field instructor seen as lacking the necessary accountability to either the school or the agency.

Certain field instruction patterns were viewed as providing greater school control over the student's practice learning. Most respondents saw the highest integration of service and educational goals and the most intensive educational experience for students as occurring in Units. In this form the content of field instruction and the competence of the field instructor were seen as more susceptible to control and evaluation by the school. School Units were thought to provide the closest contact between school and agency. Agency Units, although not directly involved with the University were seen as avoiding the tensions created in an agency when a group (i.e., School Unit) representing an outside system was introduced.
The traditional pattern of field instruction (agency supervisor with one or two students) was still the most common. It was perceived as providing the least contact between school and agency resulting in a heavily agency controlled field experience. Each school used a variety of field instruction patterns regardless of the form preferred. Choice of pattern was effected not only by school philosophy but also by finances, placement and supervisor availability and so on.

Students, faculty advising and various forms of seminars and meetings were described as the most common vehicles used by academia to gain more information about and make an impact on the field work experience. Despite the use of these linkages interviewees still perceived the outcome as agency controlled field work.

The faculty advisor was seen as the pivotal person in establishing connections to the field experience. The philosophy about advisement varied among schools. The basic dilemma identified was whether field advising should be available to all students as part of an ongoing process or provided only when "needed" as defined by the student, the advisor or the field instructor. Advocates of "selective" or "crisis" advising felt that not all students were problematic and should not be treated as such. Regularly scheduled advising in cases where no problem existed was perceived as fostering dependency. Other Directors disagreed that dependency was an outgrowth of working with students on their "normal" learning experiences. They also suggested that ongoing advisement provided the school with more knowledge and control of the field experience as it unfolded throughout the year. No consensus could be inferred regarding the most effective form of advisement.
Relationships between faculty advisor and field instructor were perceived as relatively fragile and lacking in mutual trust. Respondents felt this condition necessitated a slow, cautious approach in reaching out to each other. In general, interviewees devoted little time to discussions or comparisons of agency and school people. Questions asking for ratings (e.g., greater status, more practice expertise...) elicited "It depends on the person" type responses.

Little emphasis was placed on the impact of teaching skills on a student's ability to learn. Rather, respondents felt that learning could take place with a variety of educational methods. No distinction was made between class or field teaching.

Since this group of Field Work Directors viewed learning as individual rather than effected by any particular method of education, it was not surprising that they generally questioned the reality of developing uniform standards for students' field work performance. Again, the individuality of students was given as the major obstacle to standardization of expectations.

In discussing the recurrent strains and tensions in the school-agency relationship no respondent saw a conflict between service and educational goals. They saw education as learning to deliver a service.

Some of the Field Work Directors acknowledged the differences in organizational structures and goals between the two institutions, while others felt that the University was as "bureaucratic" as the agency. None of the respondents identified specific strains which were directly attributed to organizational differences.
In exploring the Field Work Directors' views of the traditional generic-specific debates between academia and the field, a definition of generic practice could not be agreed upon. Interviewees felt that regardless of what the school thought it was teaching, most placement agencies were not generic and could not provide assignments that would offer students the opportunity to test out skills with groups, individuals, communities and so on. Almost all of the respondents were negative about "field of practice" teaching in lieu of methods education. In this regard they seemed to represent the more generic view of teaching usually attributed to faculty people.

Respondents suggested that the teaching of interactional skills (what the social worker does in concert with clients) be given primary emphasis over skills in budgeting, fund raising, proposal writing and so on. Some viewed these "action" skills as more vital in practice teaching than diagnostic skills directed towards understanding client behavior.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study has attempted to illuminate the relationship between schools and practice agencies as they collaborate in the process of educating tomorrow's social workers. It was assumed that a more complete picture of the nature of inter-organizational interactions would be obtained if the perceptions of actors in both settings were studied. The student, the field teacher and the director of a university's field work department were seen as heavily influenced by, and in turn influencing the educational task shared by academia and practice. Because of the active involvement of each of these people in the process under investigation, it was anticipated that they would be knowledgeable reporters of the needed data.

The sample was drawn from the six New York City graduate schools of social work (i.e., Adelphi, Columbia, Fordham, Hunter, N.Y.U. and Wurzweiler). Data from students and field instructors were collected through the administration of questionnaires. Field work directors were seen in face-to-face interviews. Inquiries were directed towards acquiring information about sources of harmony as well as the recurrent issues of strain in the relationship between school and agency and toward identifying the characteristics of the interaction.
The task of this concluding chapter is to summarize, compare and recommend without boring the reader. To arouse interest in closing is a demanding task. Yet, as earlier chapters were re-read, the writer was struck with the fact that the dynamic process of data analysis takes on a life of its own and develops its own specific focus within the more general areas of investigation. This chapter will focus on the author's assessment of significant issues in social work education which were highlighted by this investigation.

Control of Field Instruction

Although this was not a study of the field instructional enterprise it emerged as an issue of prime importance for the students, field teachers and field work directors represented in the sample. Field work was judged by all respondents as central to social work education. It was also viewed by most respondents, in all categories, as being more influential than class work in shaping a student's professional training. Given this fact it was not surprising that the field instructor, when compared to other school and agency people, was described as the person having the greatest influence on the learners. A majority of the respondents viewed the field teacher as being very influential.

Despite the perception of the primacy of the field instructor, all three categories of respondents were in solid agreement that little control was exercised over this key person by the school or the agency. Responses to perceptions of influence on a field instructor's work tasks, development of performance standards for this student supervisor and
closeness to a variety of school people, all indicated that the field
instructor was a relatively isolated and unsupported agent in his role
of inducing social work students into the skills of professional practice.

Contradictory to the anticipation that the role of student, field
teacher or faculty field work director would yield different perceptions
of school-agency relationships, the issue of who controlled the field
experience was consistently identified as a problem by the three types
of respondents. The saliency of field work creates a compelling need
to address in depth this question of the control of the field experience.

Regardless of role, all three classifications of respondents in
this study saw field work as agency controlled. Most felt that this
was the school's responsibility and that it was remiss in carrying it
out. The findings of this investigation suggest to the author that the
field experience was neither agency nor school controlled. Rather, the
field instructors without specific guidelines for acceptable performance
standards for themselves or their students, found themselves in the
position of being primary planners of the content to be taught and
primary judges of their own and their students' competence. The field
is therefore relying upon individual field supervisors, with only a
tenuous accountability to the school or the agency system, to transmit
those practice skills which would guarantee the responsible entry of
workers into the profession of social work.

The phenomenon of the isolation of the field instructor was
identified as constituting a flaw in the educational arrangements. It
resulted in an idiosyncratic process of education and created the problem
of how to insure at least a minimal quality of learning and teaching in
the field. The problem is further complicated by the locus of the practice experience in an "off campus" setting. Classroom faculty, while enjoying academic freedom, are frequently influenced by collegial relationships. The lack of proximity of field instructors to each other acts as a deterrent to the formation of boundaries and guidelines through the exchange of ideas and methods with teaching colleagues. Confirmation of this lack of peer control was supported by the perceptions of field instructors and students that field teachers exerted very little influence on each other's performance level.

Interviews with field work directors revealed that field instruction, in the university, was perceived as being on a "lower" level than classroom teaching and that field instructors were seen as less skilled appendages to the educational process. This acceptance of a major component of student training being controlled by what was perceived of as less adequate personnel seems contradictory to the school's desire to insure high quality social work education. This contradiction remains a source of wonderment to this writer; it suggests that this situation might reflect a lack of real conviction about the importance of field work despite what may be expressed to the contrary. The absence of close, frequent consultative relationships between faculty members and field instructors further reinforces a sense of estrangement and low regard characteristic of the relationship between the parties.

Teaching The Field Instructor To Teach

Education for any profession involves the transmission of specific, identifiable skills and knowledge from one generation of practitioners to
another. The field experience in social work education is recognized as the most vital arena in which students are taught to practice. Question ought to be raised with an educational system that allows teaching to take place which is perceived as lacking in uniformity or ongoing accountability to a standard setting group. This defeats the goal of the profession to transmit a body of skill and knowledge to future practitioners. The author suggests that the reluctance of the school to provide consistent vehicles through which idiosyncratic teaching could be avoided, and higher quality skills insured, emanates from the social work field's overall attitude towards supervision of their professionals-practitioners or educators.

The message of Gitterman and Miller (1977), speaking from the vantage point of educators, is reiterated by the conclusions drawn from this study.

The educational role and task of the social work supervisor has historically received both theoretical and conceptual emphasis. However, in agency practice as well as in social work education for supervisory practice, underlying pedagogical theory and skill about how to instruct others to provide services has received scant attention.¹

The criteria for appointment of a worker to a supervisory position or as a student field work instructor tends to be primarily related to his/her success as a direct service practitioner. In earlier periods of the history of social work educators such as Bertha Reynolds² (1940s)


²Bertha Reynolds, Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work
and Charlotte Towle\(^1\) (1950s) took issue with the "sink or swim" approach to learning to supervise or to teach. In the late 1970s Florence Kaslow was still discussing the same point and leveling the same criticism:

Because a clinician was a good therapist or group worker, or leader, it was frequently assumed that he or she would therefore be a fine supervisor...Too rarely has specific training in supervision, staff development, or consultation been a prerequisite for being appointed to such a position. Thus the 'how to' formula was narrowly based on the supervisor's own previous experiences as a supervisee - emulating what was valuable...and trying to do the opposite of what was found to be distasteful or counterproductive. Added to this has been tried and error efforts, also called innovations.\(^2\)

William Schwartz, in a paper presented at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education (1979) discussed the lack of attention given to the skills of university classroom teaching. Although the issues raised are concerned with the methodology of education in the classroom, this writer feels that the basic thesis is easily extended to field teaching.

On the matter of expectations of the new college professor Schwartz commented:

Under the general assumption that the scholarly competence alone, or successful experience in the field, qualifies one to teach his subject to others, most university teachers are turned loose on their students without recognition that teaching is itself an art that requires knowledge and skill.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Charlotte Towle. *The Learner in Education*


Similarly, the field instructor, with only one short course in field supervision, is expected to perform on a level which insures a high quality educational experience for students. Almost by definition, both class and field teachers in their desire to demonstrate the fulfillment of this expectation would naturally be reluctant to risk exposing their practice for fear that their skills would be found wanting. It would seem that a stigma is attached to needing help in teaching or in carrying out supervisory tasks. Just as the fear of stigma has prevented many potential clients from making use of our profession's services, so too it hinders the development of creative class and field educators.

Kutzik, in his article on the recent phenomenon of partnerships and group practice in the medical field, identified the conflict in "asking for help" and "making it alone" in terms of the independence-dependence authority theme:

> The contradiction between the older, predominantly self-controlled mode of interaction among professionals...and the newer, more other-controlled mode of interaction in... cooperative practice...is viewed as a conflict between the basic professional norms of autonomy and collegiality and the basic bureaucratic norms of organizational hegemony and superordinate-subordinate authority...¹

Of interest is the fact that although group practice involves peer "supervision" it is still seen, by some medical practitioners, as a contradiction to independent functioning. Again, to ask for help in learning to practice is perceived as being "subordinate", "dependent" and so on.

The greatest contradiction lies in the fact that as social work practitioners we ask our clients to risk their vulnerabilities with us; as educators and supervisors we ask students and workers to expose and risk themselves with us and; we, the more experienced supervisors and educators are not prepared to risk looking at our own practice. This fear is compounded by what the author feels is an erroneous perception of the role of the social worker to "help" or the supervisor to "teach". It is this view that places the social worker and supervisor in the position of "telling" or "advising". If we could only truly believe that each person is in a "state of becoming" and that our professionals are there to help unleash that person's own creativity in order to move along faster than he would by himself.

It seems to the author that the solution lies in making learning opportunities available which do not stigmatize the learner. This would involve a change in our professional culture which imbues greater status to "making it alone". Bringing it closer to the immediate concern of this study, the writer suggests that field teaching needs to be seen as a complicated process with a series of "normal" (i.e., expected) problems for the teacher and the learner in interaction with each other. The expectation is then that everyone will have difficulties which need to be worked through. This position can be supported only if each field instructor has intimate, consistent, scheduled contacts with the school. "As needed" consultation reflects a contradictory point of view if it is the only approach used.

At the very least it would seem that faculty advisor and field instructor need to meet once a semester. This, however, does not
constitute a sufficient basis to guarantee intimacy or insure intensive work on either the student's or the supervisor's skills. As observed in this study, assigning the method teacher as faculty advisor adds a deeper dimension to the student-advisor, field instructor-advisor, relationships. It also allows for greater integration of the practice and the school setting. Still, the quality of intimacy between the agency and the school person remains very attenuated.

If we assume that knowledge is power then it is the student who has the greatest power since only he knows intimately what is happening in the classroom and in the field. However, knowledge of everything that goes on in the field will never be possible nor desirable. We are not looking for a situation where the field person just "reports" but where he continues to learn and with each step becomes a better teacher. With this in mind it would seem that the school needs to develop other vehicles in order to further the skill development of field instructors.

As the data in this study confirms, field instructors have no ongoing peer group except in their shared title. For many, there is a reluctance to accept the faculty advisor as a supervisory or consulting person with whom their own skills can be examined. On the other "side", many faculty advisors question their own abilities in relation to the field instructor or for other reasons are reluctant to help the supervisor learn and grow. The writer would advocate that the school take the initiative of forming quasi-peer learning groups which would meet a number of times a semester with faculty. The purpose of these sessions would be to develop the teaching skills of the field instructor.
Content might include supervisory records, questions about the level of performance to expect of students, how to write an evaluation, practice skills with individuals and groups and so forth. These meetings would also provide opportunities for faculty and field people to gain experience in working with each other on some issues of common concern. For those readers who doubt whether field people would invest the time I can only say that as a field instructor in one of the New York schools, I was asked to attend approximately one meeting a month. After some initial resistance (who needs it...I'm an experienced worker...) and consistent demands made by the school, I came regularly for a number of years along with a roomful of other field instructors ranging in experience from two to some 20 plus years. These encounters had obvious rewards for those involved.

THE FACULTY ADVISEMENT SYSTEM

Historically, schools have designated the faculty advisor as their primary linkage to the agency system. This perspective was reinforced by this investigation. The field work directors interviewed identified the advisor as a pivotal person in establishing connections to field work. More than 90 percent of the field instructors in this sample were assigned a faculty liaison person. An assumption might be made that the prevalence and longevity of an advisement system are reflections of the importance attributed to it by social work educators and practitioners.

The advisor's real position of importance may be questioned on a number of counts. It is certainly not reflected by the amount of writing devoted to it. During the early 1970s Russell's review of the research
and practice literature on the role of the faculty advisor in social work
education revealed the paucity of material on field advisement.* In her
overview she refers only to the lack of investigation into the student-
advisor interaction. Not even Russell discussed the issue of the
liaison function of this faculty person.

Faculty Advisor as Liaison to Agency:

The lack of attention given to the advisor's liaison function
came as no surprise to this writer. Based on her 15 years experience
as a field instructor and her contact with other practitioner colleagues
it is clear that there is so little investigation of this function
because in reality it is rarely carried out. Primarily, contacts
between advisor and field instructor center on "how the student is
doing." Only minimal attention is given to the effects of the agency
system on the student's experience or on the ways in which the advisor
might provide the field instructor with additional insights into his
own practice, as well as into the social work services offered by the
agency. These personal observations were supported by the findings of
this study. Field instructors identified issues related to the agency,
as well as to their own supervisory skills, as much less frequently
discussed with faculty advisors than those issues related to students.

If the "success" of the advisor's liaison function is measured
by the frequency or intimacy of the contact with the field instructor
than "failure" in carrying out this function is more often the rule
than the exception. Field work directors interviewed, described school-
agency interactions as fragile and lacking in mutual trust. They
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advocated a slow, cautious approach in a school's work with placements. The writer suggests that this method of relating insures a longer stage of superficiality since it encourages polite interchanges and avoids making demands on agency personnel.

Despite the verbal and written criticisms of the distance between school and agency, the author wonders whether the agents of both educational components are not, in fact, engaged in a silent "conspiracy" not to let each other get too close to what each partner represents. The present study sought to identify how faculty, field people and students perceived the present school-agency interaction. More research is needed to determine what educators and practitioners feel should exist, what mutual expectations should be enforced and, what factors mitigate against achievement of these proposals. Some lines of inquiry might include:

1. Given the fact that relationships between faculty advisors and field instructors are described as generally "distant," do people occupying these positions feel that greater intimacy would yield more positive benefits to both partners. What would these benefits be?

2. Given the fact that a field instructor's supervisory practice is rarely discussed with the faculty advisor, would more attention in this area be seen as desirable—as possible, etc.

3. Given the fact that the frequency of contact between the two liaisons is described as minimal, how much time would the respective "actors" be prepared to devote to the relationship and what would they like to have discussed.

4. Given the fact that the field instructor's relationships to school people is generally limited to the faculty advisor, should contacts with other segments of academia be expanded—to whom and for what reasons?
The results of an examination of these questions might determine whether school and agency people are actually desirous of closer contacts or whether they are merely paying lip service to what seems to be the "right" point of view. Although the writer would surely endorse the development of more intimate relationships because of her belief in the educational payoffs to the student and the field instructor, she is also aware that this closeness involves some risk of exposure, vulnerability and conflict for each partner. It is for this reason that the author would argue that while both school and agency representatives criticize the distance in their relationship, they are simultaneously instrumental in maintaining the status quo.

Some clues to a greater fulfillment of the advisor's liaison role emerged from this study. Individual contacts of field instructors with an advisor who was also the student's method teacher seemed to bring school and agency representatives closer together. In those schools where this pattern was employed, the field instructor reflected the highest proportion viewing a close relationship between themselves and their liaison. They also perceived the faculty advisor as a better educator and more scholarly than respondents from other schools. In addition, those field instructors coming from schools where monthly group meetings were held with advisors, indicated a more distant connection between them and the advisors than those who met individually with the faculty person assigned to them. This pattern of individualized contacts with a faculty advisor who was seen as being connected to practice and students on a consistent basis was also viewed by the student respondents as prerequisites to close relation-
ships between the field teacher and the school liaison.

During the period of this study only two of the school followed the "method teacher as faculty advisor" pattern of field advisement. Further research needs to be directed towards identifying those factors influencing the choices schools make (i.e., finances, philosophy, etc.). The perceptions revealed in this investigation cast serious doubt about the actual fulfillment of the advisor's stated function as a major linkage mechanism between school and placement. To safely assure the reliability of this conclusion an investigation needs to be done into the effects of the various advisement forms on the advisor's liaison function. This requires a more specific definition of the components of the "liaison function."

Faculty Advisor in Student Advisement:

In 1956 Dr. Marion Lantz completed her dissertation on the significance of the "School Adviser in Social Work Education" in which she reported that all 54 social work schools offered some kind of advising services to students. This service varied greatly from school to school. In 1963 Samuel Finestone identified a variety of advising practices based on differential value premises and assumptions on how people learn and the role of advising in professional education. The present study, undertaken some 20 years after Lantz's and 13 after Finestone's article revealed no greater standardization of practice.

Since this was not a study of field advising some of the nuances of the patterns employed by different schools were not explored. For

example, some advisors were also method teachers, some taught other
classes but did advising as part of their work load, still others were
hired only for the advisement role with no other class or field
connection. Some schools advocated regularly scheduled meetings with
students to discuss ongoing, normal learning problems; others offered
selective advising around specific concerns as identified by the
student, the field instructor or the advisor. Different patterns were
usually justified in terms of assumptions about learning needs. For
each position taken by one field work director an opposing view was
stated with equal assurance. There seemed to be no consensus on the
"best" form of advising. Consistent with the picture of the advisor
as a liaison to agencies, the advisor's role with the student was not
uniformly defined. It fluctuated from school to school. Most agreed,
however, that ongoing contacts with students and agencies provided
the school with more knowledge about the field experience whereas
infrequent contacts most assuredly resulted in more stringent agency
control of field work.

The majority of student respondents reported infrequent contacts
with their faculty advisors. The purpose of student-advisor meetings
seemed to be restricted to providing solutions to crisis situations.
It was not surprising that the advisor was seen as having less influ-
ence on their education than other people, such as field instructors
or method teachers, with whom they had greater contact. Field
instructors tended to concur with students that the faculty advisor
made the least impact on student learning.
The view of the advisor as having only a minimal effect on the education of the neophyte social worker results in the conclusion that the traditional expectations of the student advisement role is not being fulfilled. This creates a void in the overall learning of the student. Since the faculty advisor is the only school person specifically assigned to an individual student around his/her field work, the advisement system provides a vital vehicle for monitoring the field experience not assumed elsewhere. In addition, the individualized approach to learning which it supplies, allows the student to intensify the integration of what he is uniquely exposed to in the field and in the classroom. Periodically, the advisor may also assume the mediating function of helping students to work on their relationships in the agency or school system. The writer suggests that student advisement plays an indispensable role in social work education. Unfortunately, the full benefits of this role have not been exploited. Further research is assuredly indicated. Factors influencing school choices of particular advisement options need to be examined as well as the effects of different patterns on student education.

The writer would argue that the faculty advisor shares in common with the field instructor and the classroom teacher, the assignment to a position for which he is not well trained and for which there is an absence of standards of performance. Although faculty advisors were not part of this sample (a possible shortcoming of the study) this investigator's experience in this position in two schools certainly substantiates the conclusion. The purposes of
advisement vis-a-vis students and agencies were usually explained in vague terms with little specification of the skills needed to accomplish the purpose. The "how-to" aspects were left to the individual advisor to identify either through his/her own experience or through seeking out the wisdom of fellow colleagues.

Since this faculty person is the major vehicle through which the school is connected to the agency and through which student performance is monitored, serious question might be raised with the lack of a structured, uniform response to this role. The present situation insures the continuance of idiosyncratic field advising where, similar to the case of field instruction, the quality of the advising is predominantly a reflection of the skills of a particular person rather than the standards of a university or a professional body.

RECURRENT STRAINS AND TENSIONS IN SCHOOL-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

A major target of concentration in this study was the examination of those strains in the school-agency association which were assumed to be recurrent because of the emphasis given them by practitioners and educators in the literature on social work education. The results of this investigation provided some cause to question whether the tensions discussed in the written material were as intense as described or were primarily opinions of specific authors rather than examples of majority views.
Conflict in Organizational Goals

Frequently alluded to in the literature as a consistent cause of strain was the fact that schools and agencies had different organizational goals which clashed with each other. The school's primary task being the education of students with the agency established to provide services to its consumers. These disparate goals have in turn been designated as causal factors in role conflicts for the field instructor (i.e., educator and service provider) and, the student (i.e., learner and worker).

These popular assertions were not upheld by the respondents in this study. Education and service goals were generally not seen as contradictory by supervisors or students. Similarly, in neither category of respondents did a majority identify role conflicts provoked by any antagonistic goals.

Field work directors differed on the issue of role conflicts. Some saw agency demands as a possible obstacle to carrying out the educational function. Others strongly endorsed the service and education union and voiced the opinion that students in this system did not suffer. Despite the position taken, all directors indicated a preference for the unit* pattern of field instruction. This choice seemed heavily influenced by the respondents' assessment that the content and competence of the field teacher were easier to monitor in this form rather than a concern with role conflict. It was their

*NOTE: Four to six students placed at the same agency having the same field instructor. The field teaching position is usually school financed with the supervisor primarily accountable to the school.
belief that the unit insured a higher quality of instruction because of the field teacher's closer connection to the university and the potential guarantee of greater school control of the practice setting. The popular notion that field instructors inevitably suffered from a conflict between their practitioner and educator roles was generally not supported by this sample of respondents.

**Conflict in Organizational Structure**

Paralleling the differences in organizational goals was the issue of strain resulting from a variation in structure between the school and the placement. The view popularized in the literature provides contrastive visions of the collegial structure of the educational institution and the bureaucratic form of the placement agency. Only the field work directors were asked to discuss this issue. Interviews which concentrated on the validity of the view of the university as collegial brought forth responses which seemed to reflect doubt about the existence of pure organizational types for either the school or the agency. Current organizational theory would confirm this perception suggesting that institutions are placed on a continuum rather than in particular organizational categories. Still, tension between school and agency continue to exist albeit not caused by the conflict of different organizational structures. The author proposes that strain is to be expected whenever two distinct entities engage together in a common task; in this case, social work education. "Co-leadership," whether between workers or organizations requires a great deal of attention to the role and function of each partner, who makes decisions about what, methods of dealing with disagreements and so on. It is
therefore essential that the initial contractual agreements between school and agency be clearly defined in terms of the work to be done together as well as the expectations each partner may have of the other. It would be the suggestion of the writer that these "contracts" be renegotiated at the beginning of each school year whether or not the liaison people are the same.

It would also seem important to be less "polite" and eager to sell each other on respective "wares." Rather, what seems appropriate is the searching out and identification of the possible problems in the relationship in the hope that this openness would help those schools and agencies who were not committed, to decline involvement early in the process without a sense of failure or frustration. This might forestall what some field work directors described as the "fragile" associations which lingered on into the academic year.

Generic-Specific Debate

The generic-specific dilemma received more attention in the literature than any other cause of strain in the school-agency partnership. This classic debate is based on the assumption that the school is perceived of as providing generic education which agency people feel results in inadequate preparation for the particular fields in which they are engaged. This argument has stimulated the inclusion in the school curriculum of courses in such fields as aging, social work in industry and so on.

In summarizing the perceptions of this sample of respondents two observations should be made: (a) the views of each actor tended to be more alike than different and; (b) school and agency opinions were
not characterized by as much variation as the literature might have led us to anticipate.

Field work directors, as faculty representatives, did not unanimously endorse the idea of education for generic practice, nor could they specify a uniform definition. Even those who felt that social work skills were generic and could be used with individuals, groups and so on, indicated that agencies were not generic and could therefore not offer opportunities to test this out with a variety of target groups.

Three-quarters of the student sample felt that practice skills were not the same in work with individuals, groups and communities therefore making it necessary for schools to offer courses in specific methods. Field instructors saw the school and the agency as sharing the view that social work practice skills were not generic (i.e., interchangeable).

Despite any writing to the contrary a substantial majority of the field instructors and students indicated their belief that both the school and the placement agency would choose to maintain method concentrations rather than changing them to a "fields of practice" approach. Generally, all three categories of respondents did not perceive as much difference in the views of school and agency as the literature related to the issue of generic-specific might lead us to assume.

**Education for Social Work or Therapy**

A dilemma of "social work versus therapy" emerged as an issue in this study. Students described themselves as being caught in a bind
between the "therapy" emphasis in some agencies and the "social work" focus in most of the schools. Some field instructors, when discussing conflicts in teaching content between class and field, referred to the omission of "therapeutic", "clinical" skills in the school's curriculum. Field work directors commented on the phenomenon of agencies rejecting schools because they weren't "psychoanalytic enough." Students were sometimes pictured as entering social work school in order to become therapists rather than social workers. Some schools were perceived by agency staff as heavily psychoanalytically oriented.

Interestingly, in the author's search of the literature related to tensions in the school-agency partnership, this strain was absent from the writing. Yet, it has been a salient issue in the field for at least the 20 years of this investigator's own practice experience. The choice of psychotherapist and psychotherapy rather than caseworker or casework is not a new phenomenon. More recently, group work has become group therapy and the group worker the group therapist. A great deal of faculty time is spent in defining the difference between therapy and social work resulting in more confusion than clarity.

For many in the field the choice of therapy "over" social work is seen as emanating from a desire to achieve a higher professional status than is attributed to social work. In this case the title of "therapist" is perceived as being on a superior level. Some feel that the differences are semantic (i.e., title) rather than substantive (i.e., different skills). Still, the dilemma seems to have gained momentum in recent years necessitating a more concerted effort to
understand better the dynamics of the situation.

The writer suggests that the problem is complicated by the fact that the skills and theory of social work are only vaguely understood and verbalized by many of its professionals. As a result, the perceived differences in the skills of "therapy" and social work remain elusive to specification. The time seems ripe for ending the arguments and looking at whether the variations are in the work, or are basically semantic.

To avoid the usual "theoretical" struggles, the author proposes the use of actual process records written by those who identify themselves as therapists and those who prefer being known as social workers. This method would allow an investigator to designate and compare the helping skills used by each and to evaluate their place within a theoretical model of social work practice.

Conflict in Content Taught in Class and Field

With the exception of the "therapy versus social work" issue this sample of respondents did not indicate any ideological conflicts which were strong enough to produce tensions between schools and agencies. Some assignment difficulties of students were seen as reflecting different ideologies. Illustrative of this was the schools' attempt to teach social work with groups to all students when certain placements were philosophically opposed to this modality or felt that the complications of group work necessitated the assignment of experienced workers. This situation would probably result in greater conflict for the student than the school or the field since it might
interfere with the completion of class assignments related to group work.

It is the writer's feeling that the general lack of conflict might result from the absence of clear reciprocal demands. Contradictions become more obvious as demands become more specific. This makes one wonder if the quest for the elimination of conflict between school and agency takes precedence over bringing the two educational patterns closer to each other in an effort to develop a higher quality learning experience for students.

Integration of Class and Field

Although this study's respondents did not perceive great conflict between class and field teaching content, they also reported only minimal attempts at integrating what was taught in each. The writer would predict that in addition to vague mutual expectations, this lack of relatedness of the learning occurring in the two settings might account for the absence of substantial content conflict. It is, as if each setting did "its own thing" with little awareness of what was going on in the other's arena. Only those people more intimately concerned with practice (i.e., field instructor and method teacher) were credited with making reasonably strong efforts at integrating field and class learning. This seemed to reflect the view that a dichotomy existed between practice and theory in social work education. Note ought to be made, however, that the high percentage of respondents who chose not to comment on the integration issue might indicate a lack of real knowledge about how faculty connect the content of their
class material to field work experience. This suggests that more integration occurs than is recognized by educators or practitioners.

Additional information is needed in order to arrive at a definitive conclusion about the amount and nature of integration that takes place between classroom and practice teaching. A more thorough investigation of this issue might be accomplished through studying actual class sessions and interviewing faculty, other than method teachers. This approach would attempt to compare an instructor's philosophy about the integration of the practice experience into classroom content, with what actually occurs during selected sessions.

At present, the value of integration and efforts at achieving it are not universal but tend rather to be idiosyncratic to particular field instructors and professors. This perhaps implies the need for study groups of educators and practitioners to examine methods of using each others material in their respective settings. (Eg. Use of placement examples to highlight the way in which certain socio-cultural elements effect client behavior and/or worker expectations of clients.)

EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Uniformity of Standards

The establishment of uniform standards and expectations emerged as an area of dissatisfaction in a variety of cases in this study. All categories of respondents commented on the void of clear performance standards for either students or field instructors. Field teachers indicated their desire for guidelines defining which practice skills ought to be taught and at what level a student could be expected
to function during each of the two years of graduate training.

Students, too, identified a need for more uniform expectations for their own performance.

Standards are closely tied to the formation of criteria of competence. In this writer's experience as a field instructor or adjunct professor in five of the six schools under consideration, the faculty, in different degrees, were involved with the issue of defining the criteria for either passing or failing a student. In each case, it was evident that guidelines for competence were dependent upon a clear determination of which professional skills and behavior could be consistently expected of students on each level of their development.

Although this study discussed standards for field work performance this question is also commonly raised at school meetings in relation to grades, expectations for classroom participation, tests and papers. In both contexts there is an obvious cry for greater specification which could yield benefits to the teacher and the learner. The student would know more easily where he stands and where he needs to move. The instructor could more comfortably function within guidelines which would define what he was expected to teach. The profession would lose some of its idiosyncratic educational methods and be more able to transmit specific knowledge and skills from one generation of social workers to another.

Further study is called for in order to establish these standards for performance. The author would suggest that this inquiry first identify how, and what, students grapple with in each of the four semesters. For example, it might be assumed that the beginning student,
regardless of prior experience, would be very concerned with doing the "right" thing. This concern leads to a certain self-centeredness which obscures the worker from hearing the non-verbal, veiled communications of clients. One expectation for learning in the first semester might therefore be to help the student to "listen," to tune in, to empathize, to interpret, to look at his own reactions and so forth.

It would seem to the writer that the process of collecting assessments from experienced field instructors and practice faculty of what their students worked on in each semester would probably yield enough repetition to establish patterns of student performance. This might be followed by securing the field and class teachers' notions about "specific next steps"—where they feel students should move from that point. Obviously, it is not the intent of this writer to develop a research design for future investigations. However, the suggested direction would be explorations focused on actual field instruction practice (i.e., an analysis of what is happening with students as they learn to provide a service).

It is essential in every field aspiring towards professional status that they sanction the competency of their professionals. This can be accomplished only through a clear enunciation of acceptable standards for performance. The social work profession must testify not only to the fact that their workers have acquired a certain level of knowledge but that they are able to deliver a service to the public on a certain level of quality. Standards can therefore, not be left to intuition elusive to specification but must be clearly identified and enforced.
The struggles surrounding the formation of uniform standards of performance are easily extended to the issues of establishing criteria for acceptable field work placements, field instructors, and student assignments. The findings in this study indicated that the field instructor influenced a student's perception of the quality of his placement as an educational experience. However, this factor accounted for less than half of the possible influential components. A demand for further research into the identification of what other segments of the agency system most effect student learning seems indicated.

Given the central role of the field instructor, specification of the expectations for his/her performance are vital. This involves an examination of the supervisory practice of field teachers which this sample identified as a very infrequently discussed item. The issue here is the skill of the teacher and the process through which skills are more highly developed. As discussed earlier, this question is complicated not only by our profession's attitude towards supervision but also by accepting "supervision" from a person coming from an outside system. Still, criteria for "hiring" and "firing" field teachers are crucial to insuring a quality social work education.

Learning to Practice

Despite literature to the contrary, this sample saw the process of delivering a direct service as the most legitimate and effective vehicle for learning the practice skills of social work. Observation of skilled practitioners was not rated as highly in educating students in the "doing" component of the profession. The author suggests that observation enhances the learner's ability to analyze practice. The
student becomes "well educated" about practice. Still, learning to practice is accomplished primarily through the engagement with real people in an effort to provide some agreed upon service.

Simulated "laboratory experience" was not seen by this group of field work directors as a substitute for direct work in teaching students to practice. Like role play, this technique insures greater protection for the "player" than a real life situation can guarantee. Students are not "forced" to respond and tend to slip in and out of their roles. All this suggests that although a variety of learning opportunities must be employed, schools will continue to need agencies in order to teach students the real skills of practice. Anything short of this direct contact with people exposes the student more to an intellectual pursuit of learning about practice which inevitably must be tested out in direct work.

Further research might resolve the conflict by confirming or rejecting the hypothesis that service delivery is the most effective tool in teaching students to practice. However, the writer feels it would be difficult to set up a design which would accurately measure differences in ability resulting from different methods. First, the research would need to assess the "pre-test" practice competence of the students and control for their initial differences. Also required would be an identification of those specific skills which could be used to determine "movement." As we have seen this whole area of performance levels reflects a general lack of clarity. Prior to evaluating the outcomes of different learning tools, more more is called for in defining the specific practice skills needed at increasingly more complicated levels of performance.
THE PARTNERSHIP

It seems fitting that the concluding section of this final chapter be devoted to a discussion of the initial thrust of the study, namely, an analysis of the relationship between schools of social work and their field placement agencies in their joint task of educating future professionals. Interestingly, in no school was there a joint committee related to this task which casts doubt upon the existence of a functional partnership between the two institutions. It appears, rather, that the agency was used as part of the school's total strategy for educating their students. We might therefore expect that field work would be heavily influenced by the philosophy and direction of the school. This was not a reality for those schools under consideration.

It was clear that all three types of respondents in this study felt it was the school's responsibility to structure the field work component of the educational process. To some degree this was the case. Formal field work departments were established by each school. Although based on vague criteria it was the school that approved the placements and field instructors they used. The academic community defined the acceptable level of learning achieved by students through their ultimate right to grant passing grades. Less impact was made on the field experience in the time between the beginning and ending stages. Despite this unfortunate lack of school control over the major portion of the time a student spends in field work, the writer would argue that it is the school who is, and should be the "senior" partner in the relationship. This conclusion suggests that the school become more active and knowledgeable about the total field experience.
Institutional arrangements between school and agency were vague. The field instructor was used as synonymous with "agency" leading to the judgment that most ongoing contacts were evaluated primarily in terms of personal attributes rather than organizational factors. Given that the competence of the individual field instructor and faculty contact are important evaluative criteria, individuals leave while organizations continue, necessitating the development of more stable institutional arrangements. This stability is insured through the formation of standardized reciprocal expectations which do not fluctuate with each change in liaison person. Again, this investigator would suggest that it is the responsibility of the school to take the initiative in creating vehicles which would aid in developing more consistent institutionalized relationships.

In general the school faculty tends to be more knowledgeable about the structure of field instruction. They see the patterns from a broader perspective than just one agency. Field instructors need to be given more information than they presently have in order to effectively evaluate their own performance, or their agency's involvement in the educational task. This supports the argument for more contact between school and agency but still places responsibility squarely in the hands of the educators.

In analyzing the connections of school to agency, one needs to comment on the view of practice held by educators, practitioners and students. Practice was assigned great weight in social work education by the student and field instructor respondents. Field work and the field instructor were seen as more influential on education than class-
work or, any other school or agency staff person. Of all the faculty, it was the method teacher who was viewed as making the greatest impact. Both students and field instructors described a peer relationship between the field and school liaisons. The agency people saw themselves and their agencies as altruistic in their involvement in educating future social work professionals. They saw practice experience and skill as the most important prerequisites for classroom teaching.

In contrast, the schools did not place as high a value on practice as their statements regarding the indespensible character of field instruction suggests. As we canvas the faculty of schools in New York we find more people with doctorates, less appointments made on the basis of practice expertise, more teachers with doctorates and minimal practice experience. No longer is being a "seasoned" practitioner the preferred standard for academic appointments. The school was seen by the faculty representatives in this study as more prestigious than the social service agency. The choice of affiliation as a field work placement and motivation for becoming a field instructor were seen as influenced heavily by the desire for increased status and prestige. Field work directors indicated that regardless of a field instructor's years of experience he/she was seen by school and agency people alike as occupying a lower status position than a faculty member with considerable less practice experience. Similarly, the field teacher was seen as being a less integral part of academic and a less competent educator than the classroom teacher.

The phenomenon of teaching faculty with decreasing practice experience coupled with a low status and resulting minimal expectations
of field supervisors might reflect the future direction of social work education. If so, the training of our professionals would have moved full circle from a primary emphasis on practice experience to a focus on the more theoretical, academic areas of learning. History has taught us that intuitive practice does not constitute a profession. Similarly, the future will prove that academics alone will not be able to insure the achievement of the professional objective of providing effective services to the public. The elimination or down grading of either could prove fatal to the continuing growth of our profession.

The conclusion of this study, like all endings, forces us to look back at what has transpired before. In that vein, it is clear that the class and field settings have been together for a long time. In a sense they have survived the "test of time," with all the hopes, disappointments, frustrations and arguments that characterized the years. Do school and agency stay together out of "habit"?...I think not. Up until this point the relationship has met the individual needs of each setting. It is the writer's contention, however, that the association has remained at the same level of functioning during the more recent past. Even the points of strain and argument have remained consistent. The writer suggests that we have reached a crossroads. Relationships and skills are never static. They either progress or regress. It seems appropriate to move ahead rather than allow a relationship of so many years to deteriorate without a struggle. Perhaps the struggle begins with an attempt to tackle those problematic issues which emerged in this study and have been summarized in this chapter.
Educators and practitioners have suggested a number of approaches designed to enhance the relationship between school and agency. Among the more popular are:

1. Use of field staff to teach courses at the University.
2. Use of faculty to offer courses in the field setting.
3. Joint hiring and financing of a field instructor who would supervise in the agency and carry some teaching responsibility in the school.
4. Cooperative development of teaching material which could be employed simultaneously in class and field.
5. Use of field staff to conduct seminars/workshops for faculty and/or students.
6. Use of faculty to lead workshops/seminars for agency staff.

In all of these approaches the anticipated result is greater closeness between class and field and better integration of the content taught to students in both settings. A comprehensive plan for implementing these approaches has generally not been proposed in the six schools under consideration in this study.

The writer has no quarrel with any of the notions suggested; in fact, she would endorse any or all of them. However, it is the author's belief that the salvation of the school-agency relationship will not be found through the placement of the partners in each other's roles and settings. Rather, field and class people need to maintain their own identities and use each other's complementary skills. Clearly, the writer has advocated throughout this document that agency and school work harder to put into practice what they espouse philosophically.
This would primarily address the areas of control of field instructor, teaching the field instructor to teach and the field advisement system.
**APPENDIX A**

**ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK AND FIELD INSTRUCTION AGENCIES**

**RESEARCHER: SANDRA KAHN**

**STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE**

(Note: This Questionnaire deals with your first year placement not your current placement).

I. Questions Related to Agency Placement

1. Agency category (e.g. family, settlement house, hospital, mental health clinic, welfare department, etc.)

2. Pattern of field instruction (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   a. Agency financed student unit
   b. School financed student unit
   c. Educational Center (agency and faculty staffed)
   d. Educational Center (faculty only)
   e. Agency employed field instructor (1-2 students)
   f. School faculty member
   g. Don’t know
   h. Other (please specify)

In the items below please indicate the degree to which various methods were used in your assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate below the degree to which your assignment was an integral part of agency service and related to your educational experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integral Part of Agency Service</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up specifically as an Educational Experience not normally part of agency service.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How would you rate the placement as an educational experience?
a. Excellent
b. Above Average
c. Average
d. Below Average
e. Poor

12. How would you rate the placement as a social service agency (i.e. quality of services delivered to client)?
a. Outstanding
b. Very Good
c. Good
d. Fair
e. Poor

Who was influential in assignment of work tasks for you as a student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Hardly Influential</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Executive</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of School</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Teacher</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (Yourself)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Staff</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Department</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Questions Related to your Field Instructor

21. Please indicate how many students your field instructor supervised.
   a. 1-2 Students
   b. 3-4 Students
   c. Unit (4-6 Students)
   d. Educational Center (6+ Students)

22. Did you have planned conferences with your field instructor: (CHECK ONE)
a. No  b. Yes, Very Regularly  c. Yes, Irregularly  d. On a Need Basis
e. Other (Please specify)
23. Average length of planned conferences with field instructor:
   a. More than 2 hours a week
   b. Two hours a week
   c. One hour a week
   d. Less than one hour a week
   e. Every other week
   f. Monthly

Please indicate the pattern of conferences held with your field instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exclusively</th>
<th>Somewhat Often</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the frequency with which the following items were discussed with your field instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Assessment of your practice skills</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Your learning problems</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Problems in supervisory relationship</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Personal developmental problems</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Process records</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Agency functioning</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. &quot;Client&quot; problems</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. How available, to you, was your field instructor outside of planned conferences?
   a. Very available
   b. Fairly available
   c. Access with Moderate Difficulty
   d. Access with Great Difficulty

35. Did your field instructor have any other responsibilities in addition to student supervision?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   If "Yes" please indicate the nature of these responsibilities:
   a. Major agency responsibilities
   b. Minor agency responsibilities

36. Did these other responsibilities interfere with the field instructor's relationship to you?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Does not apply
   If "Yes" in what way
37. In your opinion should a field instructor - (RESPOND TO EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Supervise students exclusively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have major responsibility for student supervision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Carry limited responsibility for agency service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Carry major responsibility for agency service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your perception of the factors that motivate someone to become a field instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor</th>
<th>At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38. Additional Learning Experience</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Affiliation with a University</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Higher status and prestige</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Career Promotional Opportunities</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Increase in Salary</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Desired by Agency</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Furthering the profession</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Enjoyment of teaching role</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Other (specify)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your field instructor as an educator, practitioner and role model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Educator</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Practitioner</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Role Model (Someone you might want to emulate)</td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>e.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Questions Related to Your Contact with School Faculty

50. Was there a specific faculty member assigned to work with you around (CHECK THE ONE THAT APPLIES)
   a. Field Work
   b. Class Work
   c. Same person for both
   d. No one assigned

51. If you had a specific faculty field adviser did you usually meet with him/her
   a. Individually
   b. With Group of Students
   c. Both
   d. Other (Please specify)

52. How often did you meet with your faculty field adviser? (Check whatever applies)
   a. Once a Semester
   b. Once a Month
   c. More than Once a Month
   d. On a "Need" Basis
   e. At Evaluation Time
   f. Other (Please specify)

Please indicate the frequency with which the following items were discussed with your faculty or faculty field adviser:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Assessment of your practice skills</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Assessment of your class work</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Evaluation of field tasks assignment</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Evaluation of suitability of placement</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Problems experienced with field instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Problems in practice skills</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Attempt to integrate class and field work</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Personal developmental problems</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. Was there any other faculty member(s) with whom you discussed field work?
   a. Classroom teacher (which class)________________________________________
   b. Member of Field Work Department
   c. Other (Please specify)________________________________________________
   d. No one other than faculty field adviser.

63. Did any of these contacts influence your field performance?
   a. Very Much
   b. Somewhat
   c. Very little
   d. Not at all

IV. Questions Related to What you Were Taught

Please indicate your opinion about the following statements and then specify the view promulgated in class and field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your View</th>
<th>View Promulgated in Field</th>
<th>View Promulgated in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ Yes</td>
<td>__ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__ No</td>
<td>__ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. There is a common core of social work theory that distinguishes it from other professions.

65. This common core of theory is readily identifiable.

66. There is a common core of social work practice skills that distinguishes it from other professions.

67. This common core of practice skills is readily identifiable.

Please indicate the extent to which theoretical material related to the following areas was taught in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Deal of Theory</th>
<th>Some Theory</th>
<th>Hardly Any Theory</th>
<th>None At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Group Work
69. Casework
70. Organizational Theory
71. Role Theory
72. Social Change
73. Community Organization
74. Psychopathology
75. Family Therapy
76. Policy and Planning
77. Other (specify)________________________
Please indicate to what extent practice skills were taught in the classroom. Practice skills are defined roughly as the "how to" repertoire of the social worker...the step-by-step movements of the worker in helping the client to solve his problem(s) or in helping to organize social services in response to need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>78. Diagnostic (Problem &amp; Need)</th>
<th>Very Extensive</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79. Interactional</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Social Action</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Social Service Organization</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Administration</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who was most influential in your education as a social worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84. Field Instructor</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Hardly Influential</th>
<th>Not At All Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85. Methods Teacher</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Fellow Students</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88. Please indicate the degree of influence the following structures had on your education as a social worker. RESPOND ONLY TO THOSE THAT APPLY TO YOUR SCHOOL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Integrative Seminar</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Hardly Influential</th>
<th>Not at All Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Group Field Advising Seminar</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Educational Center</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. One-to-one Field Faculty Advising</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
89. In comparison to other students in your class and method (or track) was what you were taught in the field...

90. In comparison to other students in your class but in different methods (or tracks) was what you were taught in the field...

91. Are there uniform standards for performance in field work? Yes ___ No ___

92. Do you feel there ought to be uniform standards? Yes ___ No ___

Following are some common opinions regarding social work education. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with each statement as well as your perception of the extent of agreement of School and Agency.

93. Observation of a trained social worker in action is as good a learning experience for the student as engaging in his own direct practice with clients, consumers, members or other professionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>1 Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94. An emphasis on the teaching of generic social work practice produces a student who, like the old saying, is "A Jack of all trades, master of none".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>1 Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95. Social Work education ought to focus primarily on interactional skills (i.e. the worker in interaction with communities, small groups, individuals, city officials, etc.), rather than on tasks such as proposal writing, criteria for program evaluation, fact finding, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>1 Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. Schools should drop method concentrations (i.e. casework, group work, social work practice, etc.) and offer "majors" in particular practice fields such as aging, child welfare, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>1 Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97. Social Work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups, communities, etc. It is therefore unnecessary to provide courses in particular methods as long as the generic practice courses are sensitive to all methods and not biased towards one or another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. Conceptual and theory teaching are the primary province of the classroom rather than the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99. Indicate the extent of influence classwork and field work had on your education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Classwork</td>
<td>a._____</td>
<td>b.____</td>
<td>c.____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Fieldwork</td>
<td>a._____</td>
<td>b.____</td>
<td>c.____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Questions Related to Integration of Class and Field

Please indicate the extent to which your faculty and field instructor attempted to integrate classroom content with field experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made Effort</th>
<th>Made Some Effort</th>
<th>Made Any Effort</th>
<th>Made No Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Methods Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Other Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104. Based on your experience last year please check the statement(s) best describing the relationship between class and field.

a. A great deal of conflict in content
b. Some conflict in content
c. Hardly any conflict
d. None at all
e. Mutually exclusive
Classes can roughly be divided into two sections: Methods classes (casework, group work, social work practice, community organization) and non-methods classes (psychopathology, research, growth and behavior courses, social welfare, history, etc.). Please indicate the extent to which your field instructor made attempts to integrate, into the field experience, content from methods and non-methods courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105. Methods Classes

106. Non-Methods Classes

VI. Questions Related to School - Agency Relationships

107. Please indicate which of the following best describes the relationship of your field instructor to the faculty field adviser. Check all that apply.

- a. Peer relationship
- b. Hierarchical relationship
- c. Faculty member in superior position
- d. Field instructor in superior position
- e. Distant relationship (infrequent contacts or contacts generally related to crisis situations rather than ongoing student development).
- f. Close relationship (phone calls and meetings at regular intervals rather than only at crisis points).

Who do you feel was influential in setting expectations for your field instructor's performance as a student supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108. Agency Executive

109. Faculty Field Adviser

110. Field Inst's Supervisor

111. Other Field Insts.

112. Field Work Department

113. Dean
Who was most influential in setting expectations for your performance in the field?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Agency Executive</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Dean</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who was influential in deciding whether you should pass or fail field work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Dean</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Agency Executive</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Committee of Students and Faculty</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the extent of influence the following school people had on how service was delivered in your agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Students in the Agency</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are 4 educational areas. Please indicate the degree of influence the following agency people have on each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>131. General Curriculum</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>132. Content of Methods Classes</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>133. Choice of Field Agencies</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 134. Criteria for Student        | Great Deal | Some What | Hardly | Not At All |
| Performance                      | (a)        | (b)       | (c)    | (d)        |
| A. Field Instructor              | (a)        | (b)       | (c)    | (d)        |
| B. Executive Staff               | (a)        | (b)       | (c)    | (d)        |
| C. Other Social Workers          | (a)        | (b)       | (c)    | (d)        |
Please rate your faculty field adviser as an educator and practitioner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135. Educator</td>
<td>a. ___</td>
<td>b. ___</td>
<td>c. ___</td>
<td>d. ___</td>
<td>e. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Practitioner</td>
<td>a. ___</td>
<td>b. ___</td>
<td>c. ___</td>
<td>d. ___</td>
<td>e. ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your methods teacher as educator and practitioner. (If you had 2 teachers choose the one you consider most important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137. Educator</td>
<td>a. ___</td>
<td>b. ___</td>
<td>c. ___</td>
<td>d. ___</td>
<td>e. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Practitioner</td>
<td>a. ___</td>
<td>b. ___</td>
<td>c. ___</td>
<td>d. ___</td>
<td>e. ___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the degree of "scholarliness" of your field instructor, methods teacher and non-methods teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scholarly</th>
<th>Not Scholarly But Widely Read</th>
<th>Hardly At All Scholarly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Methods Teacher</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Other Teachers</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are some statements relating to what educators and practitioners think about themselves and each other. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT OF YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH STATEMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>142. Faculty have more practice experience than agency people.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>143. Faculty are more concerned with social problems and social policy...agency people with direct practice.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>144. Faculty are more sensitive to current practice directions than agency people who are more parochial in their experience.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>145. Faculty are steeped in theory and are out of touch with real practice.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>146. Agency people are more skilled practitioners than faculty.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>147. The school's goal of education and the agency's goal of service are contradictory.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>148. School people know more about educating students than agency field instructors.</strong></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td>b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
149. Please indicate the statement which best describes the relationship between your roles as student and service deliverer in your placement.
   a. Strong conflict
   b. Moderate conflict
   c. Minimal conflict
   d. No conflict

150. Are there any additional comments you would like to make about school agency areas of conflict or cooperation. Please do so here.

SOCIAL WORK EXPERIENCE

1. Your School of Social Work ____________________________ (Name)

2. Major area(s) of Concentration
   a. ___ Casework
   b. ___ Group Work
   c. ___ Community Organization
   d. ___ Policy and Planning
   e. ___ Administration
   f. ___ Other (Please Specify term used in your School)_____________________

3. Years of Full Time Social Work paid experience before school admission ________

4. Years of Part Time paid or volunteers social work experience before school admission__________________________
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age at Last Birthday
   ____________________________ (Years)

2. Sex
   ________________ Male
   ________________ Female

3. Marital Status
   ________________ Single, Never Married
   ________________ Married
   ________________ Separated
   ________________ Divorced
   ________________ Widowed

4. Do you have Children of your Own?
   ________________ Yes
   ________________ No
   ________________ Number, if "Yes"

5. Religion
   ________________ Catholic
   ________________ Jewish
   ________________ Protestant
   ________________ None
   ________________ Other (Please Specify)

6. Ethnicity
   ________________ Native American
   ________________ Puerto Rican
   ________________ Asian
   ________________ White
   ________________ Black
   ________________ Other (Please Specify)
FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I - Questions Related to Your Agency and to You as a Practitioner

1. Agency category (e.g. family, settlement house, hospital mental health clinic, planning etc.)

2. How would you rate your agency as an educational experience for graduate social work students?
   1. Excellent
   2. Above Average
   3. Average
   4. Below Average
   5. Poor

3. How would you rate your agency as a social service agency (i.e. quality of services delivered to client)?
   1. Outstanding
   2. Very Good
   3. Good
   4. Fair
   5. Poor

4. Are you accountable to another staff member? 1. Yes 2. No
   If you are accountable to another staff member please indicate the frequency with which you hold formal (one hour or more) conferences.

5. Once a Week
6. Once a Month
7. More Than Once a Month
8. Less Than Once a Month
9. On a Need Basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Quite Often</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCHER: SANDRA KAHN
Please indicate who was influential in the assignment of your work tasks. Respond to all items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agency Executive</th>
<th>Yourself</th>
<th>Your Supervisor</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Influential</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Influential</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardly Influential</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who is influential in the development of policy in your agency? Respond to all items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agency Executive</th>
<th>Administrative Staff</th>
<th>Social Work Staff</th>
<th>Other Professional Staff</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Other (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Influential</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Influential</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hardly Influential</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At All</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II: Questions Related to Your Agency as a Field Work Placement and to You as a Field Instructor

1. Please check the school(s) of Social Work with which your agency is affiliated.
   (1) Adelphi (2) Columbia (3) Fordham (4) Hunter (5) Stonybrook (6) Wurzweiler (7) Other (Please specify)

2. Number of field instructors in the agency?

3. Pattern of field instruction in your agency. (Check all that apply)
   1. Agency financed student unit
   2. School financed student unit
   3. Educational Center (Agency and Faculty Staffed)
   4. Educational Center (Faculty Only)
   5. Agency employed field instructor (1-2 students)
   6. School faculty member
   7. Don't Know
   8. Other (Please Specify)
4. Please indicate how many students you supervise.
   1. ___ 1-2 Students
   2. ___ 3-4 Students
   3. ___ Unit (6-8 Students)
   4. ___ Educational Center (6+ Students)

5. Do you have any other responsibilities in addition to student supervision?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No
   If "Yes" please indicate the nature of these responsibilities:
   1. ___ Major agency responsibilities
   2. ___ Minor agency responsibilities

6. Did these other responsibilities interfere with your relationship to your student(s)?
   1. ___ Yes
   2. ___ No
   3. ___ Does not apply
   If "Yes" in what way ________________________________

7. In your opinion should a field instructor - (RESPOND TO EACH ITEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Supervise students exclusively</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Have major responsibility for student supervision</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Carry limited responsibility for agency service</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Carry major responsibility for agency service</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Please indicate your perception of the factors that motivate someone to become a field instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Additional Learning Experience

9. Affiliation with a University

10. Higher Status and Prestige

11. Career Promotional Opportunities

12. Increase in Salary

13. Desired by Agency

14. Furthering the Profession

15. Enjoyment of Teaching Role

16. Other (Specify)
Who do you feel was influential in setting expectations for your performance as a student supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Agency Executive</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Your Agency Supervisor</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other Field Insts.</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dean</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Yourself</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Please indicate the statement which best describes the relationship between your roles as educator and service deliverer in your agency.
1. ___ Strong Conflict
2. ___ Moderate Conflict
3. ___ Minimal Conflict
4. ___ No Conflict

25. Please indicate your primary aspiration for your own career development. **CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER.**
1. ___ Agency Administrator
2. ___ Social Planner
3. ___ Social Work Faculty Member...Classroom Teaching
4. ___ Social Work Faculty Member...School Field Instructor
5. ___ Private Practitioner
6. ___ Generic Social Work Practitioner
7. ___ Group Worker
8. ___ Caseworker
9. ___ Community Organizer
10. ___ Other (Please Specify)______________________
11. ___ Uncertain

**Additional Comments**

**Section III: Questions Related to Field Instruction**

1. Do you have planned conferences with your student(s)? (CHECK ONE)
1. ___ No  2. ___ Yes, Very Regularly  3. ___ Yes, Irregularly
4. ___ On a Need Basis  5. ___ Other (Please Specify)______________________
2. Average length of planned conferences with your student
   1. More than 2 hours a week
   2. Two hours a week
   3. One hour a week
   4. Less than one hour a week
   5. Every other week
   6. Monthly

   Please indicate the pattern of conferences held with your student

   3. Individual Conference
   4. Group Conference
   5. Both

   Please indicate the frequency with which the following items were discussed with your student(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite Often</th>
<th>A Bit</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   6. Assessment of practice skills
   7. Learning Problems
   8. Problems in Supervisory Relationship
   9. Personal Developmental Problems
   10. Process Records
   11. Agency Functioning
   12. "Client" Problems

   Who is influential in setting expectations for student performance in the field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite Influential</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Hardly No Influence</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   13. Field Instructor
   14. Faculty Field Adviser
   15. Agency Executive
   16. Dean
   17. Field Work Department
   18. Classroom Teachers
Who is influential in deciding whether a student should pass or fail field work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dean</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Agency Executive</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Committee of Students and Faculty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV: Questions Related to Contacts Between School and Agency

Please indicate your perception of the factors that motivate your agency to become a field work placement. (PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To obtain additional manpower</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To save money on staff</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff member wants to be a field instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Furthering the profession</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increased prestige</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Responding to request from School</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your perception of the factors that motivate Schools of Social Work to initiate and maintain relationships with independent practice agencies in the education of students. (PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat a Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor</th>
<th>At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Field work is indispensable to social work education.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Schools' limited financial resources prevent them from establishing their own teaching agencies.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Limited finances prevent Schools from hiring their own field instructors for units.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Faculty do not want to do field teaching.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Belief that practice should be learned from agency practitioners in their own agencies.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To help raise level of practice</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other (Specify)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. With reference to your assignment this year was there a specific faculty member assigned to work with you around student supervision?</td>
<td>( \text{Yes} )</td>
<td>( \text{No} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you had a specific faculty liaison did you usually meet with him/her?</td>
<td>( \text{Individually} )</td>
<td>( \text{With Group of Field Instructors} )</td>
<td>( \text{Both} )</td>
<td>( \text{Other (Please specify)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How often did you meet with your faculty field adviser? (Check whatever applies)</td>
<td>( \text{Once a Semester} )</td>
<td>( \text{Once a Month} )</td>
<td>( \text{More than Once a Month} )</td>
<td>( \text{On a &quot;Need&quot; Basis} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Agency Service</td>
<td>( \text{Very Frequently} )</td>
<td>( \text{Quite A Bit} )</td>
<td>( \text{Hardly At All} )</td>
<td>( \text{Never} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Student's Practice</td>
<td>( \text{Very Frequently} )</td>
<td>( \text{Quite A Bit} )</td>
<td>( \text{Hardly At All} )</td>
<td>( \text{Never} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Your Supervisory Practice</td>
<td>( \text{Very Frequently} )</td>
<td>( \text{Quite A Bit} )</td>
<td>( \text{Hardly At All} )</td>
<td>( \text{Never} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. School Curriculum</td>
<td>( \text{Very Frequently} )</td>
<td>( \text{Quite A Bit} )</td>
<td>( \text{Hardly At All} )</td>
<td>( \text{Never} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your faculty liaison as an educator, practitioner and scholar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Educator</td>
<td>5.____</td>
<td>4.____</td>
<td>3.____</td>
<td>2.____</td>
<td>1.____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Practitioner</td>
<td>5.____</td>
<td>4.____</td>
<td>3.____</td>
<td>2.____</td>
<td>1.____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Scholar</td>
<td>5.____</td>
<td>4.____</td>
<td>3.____</td>
<td>2.____</td>
<td>1.____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Please indicate which of the following best describes your relationship to the School's faculty field adviser. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

1. Peer relationship
2. Hierarchical relationship, faculty member in superior position
3. Hierarchical relationship, field instructor in superior position
4. Distant relationship (infrequent contacts or contacts generally related to crisis situations rather than ongoing student development).
5. Close relationship (Phone calls and meetings at regular intervals rather than only at crisis points).

Please indicate the frequency with which you had contact with the following School people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Hardly At all</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Dean</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the extent of influence the following school people had on how service was delivered in your agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly At all</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Faculty Field Adviser</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Field Work Department</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Students in the Agency</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are 4 educational areas. Please indicate the degree of influence each of the following agency people have on each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Great Deal</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. General Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Content of Methods Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Standard for Selection of Field Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Criteria for Student Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Executive Staff</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other Social Workers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are some statements relating to what educators and practitioners think about themselves and each other. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT OF YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT WITH EACH STATEMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38. Faculty have more practice experience than agency people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Faculty are more concerned with social problems and social policy...agency people with direct practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Faculty are more sensitive to current practice directions than agency people who are more parochial in their experience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41. Faculty are steeped in theory and are out of touch with real practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42. Agency people are more skilled practitioners than faculty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>43. The school's goal of education and the agency's goal of service are contradictory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. School people know more about educating students than agency field instructors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the degree to which you feel each of the following standards should be factors in the selection and hiring of faculty members. RESPOND TO ALL ITEMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Factor</th>
<th>Somewhat A Factor</th>
<th>Minor Factor</th>
<th>No Factor At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Experience</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Publications</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated Leadership in Practice</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked by Other Faculty</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Practitioner</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section V: Questions Related to Integration of Class and Field

1. Based on your experience please check the statement(s) best describing the relationship between class and field.
   1. ____ A great deal of conflict in content
   2. ____ Some conflict in content
   3. ____ Hardly any conflict
   4. ____ None at all
   5. ____ Mutually exclusive

Please indicate the extent to which you, faculty members and other field instructors attempted to integrate classroom content with field experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Made Strong Effort</th>
<th>Made Some Effort</th>
<th>Made Hardly Any Effort</th>
<th>Made No Effort At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty Adviser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methods Teachers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other Field Instructors</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classes can roughly be divided into two sections: Methods classes (casework, group work, social work practice, community organization) and non-methods classes (psychopathology, research, growth and behavior courses, social welfare, history, etc.). PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU MADE ATTEMPTS TO INTEGRATE INTO THE FIELD EXPERIENCE CONTENT FROM METHODS AND NON-METHODS COURSES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Some What</th>
<th>Hardly</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Methods Classes</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Non-Methods Classes</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section VI: Questions Related to What is Taught to Students:

Who is most influential in the education of a student in becoming a social worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Influential</th>
<th>Somewhat Influential</th>
<th>Hardly Influential</th>
<th>Not At All Influential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Field Instructor</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Methods Teachers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty Field Advisers</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following are some common opinions regarding social work education. Please indicate your perception of the extent of agreement of School and Agency.

5. Observation of a trained social worker in action is as good a learning experience for the student as engaging in his own direct practice with clients, consumers, members or other professionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. An emphasis on the teaching of generic social work practice produces a student who, like the old saying, is a "Jack of all trades, master of none".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Social work education ought to focus primarily on interactional skills (i.e. the worker in interaction with communities, small groups, individuals, city officials, etc.), rather than on tasks such as proposal writing, criteria for program evaluation, fact finding, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Schools should drop method concentrations (i.e. casework, group work, social work practice, etc.) and offer "majors" in particular practice fields such as aging, child welfare, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Social work practice skills remain the same in work with individuals, groups, communities, etc. It is therefore unnecessary to provide courses in particular methods as long as the generic practice courses are sensitive to all methods and not biased towards one or another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Conceptual and theory teaching are the primary province of the classroom rather than the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. School</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Agency</td>
<td>4. Strongly</td>
<td>2. Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete the following statements by checking the answer you feel is most appropriate.

11. Field work performance standards for students in different major methods or fields of practice are...  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Similar</th>
<th>Similar</th>
<th>Slightly Different</th>
<th>Very Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Field work performance standards for students in the same major methods or fields of practice are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Similar</th>
<th>Similar</th>
<th>Slightly Different</th>
<th>Very Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you feel there ought to be uniform standards for performance in field work?
1. Yes
2. No

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

1. Age at Last Birthday  
   (Years)  

2. Sex  
   1. Male  
   2. Female

3. Marital Status  
   1. Single, Never Married  
   2. Married  
   3. Separated  
   4. Divorced  
   5. Widowed

4. Do you have children of your own?  
   1. Yes  
   2. No  
   3. Number, if "Yes"

5. Religion  
   1. Catholic  
   2. Jewish  
   3. Protestant  
   4. None  
   5. Other (Specify)  
   6. Other (Specify)

6. Ethnicity  
   1. Native American  
   2. Asian  
   3. Black  
   4. Puerto Rican  
   5. White  
   6. Other (Specify)

**EDUCATION**

1. Please check all that apply  
   1. Bachelor's Degree  
   2. Master's in Social Work  
   3. Master's in Another Field  
   4. Post Master's Courses  
   5. In Process of Doctoral Work  
   6. Doctorate Completed

2. Please indicate college major  
   1. Psychology  
   2. Sociology  
   3. English  
   4. History  
   5. Education  
   6. Pol.Science  
   7. Other (Specify)
3. If you have an M.S.W. please indicate your concentration
1. Casework
2. Groupwork
3. Community Organization
4. Administration
5. Policy and Planning
6. Other (Specify)

4. If you have a Masters in a field other than social work, please indicate the field

5. Please indicate the field in which you are doing or have completed your doctoral work.

SOCIAL WORK EXPERIENCE
1. Number of years full time experience post M.S.W.
2. Number of years part time experience post M.S.W.
3. Number of years full time experience in a social service setting prior to M.S.W.
4. Number of years in present agency
5. Present position in your agency (i.e. Administrative, direct practice, planner, health representative, etc.)

PLEASE USE THE SPACE BELOW TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS YOU WISH RELATED TO SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL AND AGENCY.
TO: Second Year Students
FROM: Professor Morris Gadol, Director of Field Work

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn, a field instructor at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is, an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. N.Y.U., along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any field instructor or faculty member.

I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
February 1976

Dear Social Work Student:

As Professor Gadol has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that students, along with school faculty and field instructors are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached student questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to Professor Morris Gadol in the Field Work Office.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for students in a number of schools to speak as a group on various aspects of their education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sandra Kahn
TO: Second Year Students  

FROM: Professor Reva Fine Holtzman  
Coordinator of Field Work  

DATE: March 9, 1976  

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn, a former field instructor at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is, an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. The Hunter School of Social Work along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education. Our School Senate approved this endeavor.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any field instructor or faculty member.

Dean Lewis and I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
March 1976

Dear Social Work Student:

As Professor Reva Holtzman has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that students, along with school faculty and field instructors are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached student questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next week to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to Professor Reva Fine Holtzman in her office (Room 501) or in the Field Work Office - Room 506.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for students in a number of schools to speak as a group on various aspects of their education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Sandra Kahn

SANDRA KAHN

SK:mt
Dear Social Work Student:

As Dr. Barbara has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that students, along with school faculty and field instructors are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached student questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to Professor Helene Fishbein in the Field Work Office.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for students in a number of schools to speak as a group on various aspects of their education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

SANDRA KAHN

SKimt
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
FIELD WORK DEPARTMENT
3 Washington Square North
New York, New York 10003

June 1976

TO: New York University Field Instructors

FROM: Professor Morris Gadol,
       Director of Field Work

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn a field instructor at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is, an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. N.Y.U., along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any other field instructor, member of faculty or administration in School or Agency. When completed please return to Miss Kahn in enclosed envelope.

I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
Dear Field Instructor:

As Professor Gadol has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that field instructors along with school faculty and students are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for field instructors to speak as a group on various aspects of social work education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

SANDRA KAHN

SK:mt
Memorandum

June 1976

To: Adelphi University School of Social Work
    Field Instructors

From: Prof. Fred Barbaro

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn, a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. Adelphi along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any other field instructor, member of faculty or administration in School or Agency. When completed please return to Miss Kahn in enclosed envelope.

I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
Dear Field Instructor:

As Professor Barbaro has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an *Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.*

It is assumed that field instructors along with school faculty and students are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for field instructors to speak as a group on various aspects of social work education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

SANDRA KAHN

SK:nt
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Social Service

memorandum

to: Fordham Field Instructors
from: Professor Harold Robbins
Director of Field Work

date: April 12, 1976

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Prof. Sandra Kahn, an adjunct faculty member at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. Fordham, along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Prof. Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any other field instructor, agency staff, or faculty member. When completed please return to Prof. Kahn in the enclosed envelope.

I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.

HR:jc
Attachment
Dear Field Instructor:

As Professor Robbins has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that field instructors along with school faculty and students are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for field instructors to speak as a group on various aspects of social work education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

SANERA KAHN

SK:mt
TO: Wurzweiler Field Instructors  
FROM: Prof. Samuel M. Goldstein  
Director of Field Work  
DATE: May 27, 1976  

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Prof. Sandra Kahn an adjunct faculty member at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. Yeshiva, along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Prof. Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any other field instructor, agency staff, or faculty member. When completed please return to Prof. Kahn in the enclosed envelope.

I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
Dear Field Instructor:

As Professor Goldstein has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that field instructors along with school faculty and students are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for field instructors to speak as a group on various aspects of social work education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

SANDRA KAHN

SK:mt
TO: Hunter College Field Instructors  
FROM: Professor Rava Fine Holtzman

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn, a former field instructor at our School and a doctoral student at the Columbia University School of Social Work. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. Hunter, along with the other metropolitan area schools of Social Work, is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education. This endeavor was approved by our School Senate.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any other field instructor, member of faculty or administration in School or Agency. When completed please return to Miss Kahn in enclosed envelope.

Dean Lewis and I urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
Dear Field Instructor:

As Professor Holtzman has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that field instructors along with school faculty and students are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for field instructors to speak as a group on various aspects of social work education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

SANDRA KAHN

SK:mt
Dear Social Work Student:

As Dean Setleis may have indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that students, along with school faculty and field instructors are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached student questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next week to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to your Jewish Social Philosophy instructor.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for students in a number of schools to speak as a group on various aspects of their education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

Sandra Kahn

SK:mt
Dear Social Work Student:

As Professor Robbins has indicated I am asking you to participate in a research project related to an Analysis of the Relationship between Schools of Social Work and Field Work Agencies in the Enterprise of Social Work Education.

It is assumed that students, along with school faculty and field instructors are the chief actors in the social work education business. I will be asking all three parties to fill out questionnaires dealing with their perceptions, attitudes and opinions of the various facets of the school-agency relationship.

The attached student questionnaire will take approximately one half hour to complete. I hope you will take the time within the next two weeks to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope to Professor Harold Robbins in the Field Work Office, Room 726.

Your opinions about social work education are sincerely asked for, urgently needed and will be faithfully and carefully reported in the completed research. It is an opportunity for students in a number of schools to speak as a group on various aspects of their education.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

SANDRA KAHN

SK:mt
MEMORANDUM

January 20, 1976

TO: Second Year Students

FROM: Sidney Berengarten
Associate Dean and Director of Field Work

Attached is a questionnaire developed by Sandra Kahn, a field instructor and doctoral student at our School. This questionnaire will serve as an important part of her dissertation project which is an Analysis of the Relationship Between Schools of Social Work and Field Placement Agencies. Columbia, along with the other metropolitan area Schools of Social Work is cooperating with Miss Kahn in this project which we feel may yield some significant insights into social work education.

Your responses on this questionnaire will be used only for this study and will not be shared with any field instructor or member of faculty and administration.

I would like to urge your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire.
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