INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8319790

Phillips, Lucretia Jett

A MODEL FOR TEACHING MINORITY CONTENT TO FIELD INSTRUCTORS: THE INTEGRATION OF MINORITY CONTENT IN THE FIELD INSTRUCTION CURRICULUM

City University of New York D.S.W. 1983

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1983

by

Phillips, Lucretia Jett

All Rights Reserved

A MODEL FOR TEACHING MINORITY CONTENT TO FIELD INSTRUCTORS: THE INTEGRATION OF MINORITY CONTENT IN THE FIELD INSTRUCTION CURRICULUM

by

LUCRETIA J. PHILLIPS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in Social Welfare in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Doctor of Social Welfare,
The City University of New York

1983

© COPYRIGHT BY

LUCRETIA J. PHILLIPS

1983

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

April 27, 1983 — date

Chairman of Examining Committee

April 27, 1983 — date

Executive Officer

Dr. Simon Slavin

Dr. Irving Weisman

Dr. Barbara J. Morrison

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First to Dean Harold Lewis, Hunter College School of Social Work, who helped me to conceptualize this project based on what he identified as my strength, interest and talent, he has my deepest gratitude. I appreciate the advise and consultation offered by the doctoral committee, Dr. Simon Slavin, Chairperson, Dr. Irving Weisman, Adviser and Dr. Barbara Morrison. I am especially grateful to Dr. Weisman, my mentor, who was invaluable to my work. Because of his deep interest in the content of the project, he provided the wisdom, intellectual challenge and guidance for my work. I am grateful to him for critical assistance and consistent faith in my abilities. Dr. Barbara Morrison also is given special acknowledgement. In addition to research expertise she continued to offer a lively interest and sustained support.

The faculty and administration of New York University School of Social Work were of special important - Dean Shirley Ehrenkranz who gave her permission for the project to be conducted at the School, and the Field Work faculty who remained helpful and interested throughout the process. Professor Alma Carten and Professor Robert Sharp served as the experts. I am most appreciative of the time they offered, consultation and critical aid in developing the model responses, along with me, for the pre and post-test measurements.

A very special thanks to Ms. Barbara Swanson, Administrative Assistant for the Department of Field Work, for her support and

ability to protect my time so that the program could be implemented.

Above all, my gratitude to the nine field instructors who participated in the program and who made this demonstration project a reality. Without their commitment, the project might have remained a dream.

My nuturing environment includes a network of family and friends, but especially my husband Henry and son Brian. They both gave me the support, love and freedom to take these years from our lives and to them I am forever indebted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
LIST OF TABLES		vii
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II	METHODOLOGY	38
CHAPTER III	DATA ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION	63
CHAPTER IV	DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	96
APPENDICES		
	A. Letter of Invitation	133
	B. Ethnicity Sensitivity Exercise	134
	C. Log Guidelines and Pretest	135
	D. Curriculum Design and Reading Assignments for the Seminar Participants	146
	E. Role Play Exercise	153
	F. Student Case	154
	G. Post-Test	161
	H. Seminar Certificate	170
BIBLIOGRAPHY		171

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
A, A_1	Field Instructors Knowledge Regarding Minority Content.	65
B	Overall Qualitative Responses to the Pretest and Post-Test	68
C	Number of Occurrences of C/O/A Activity as Reflected in the Logs.	88
C_1	Field Instructor Logs: Analysis of Themes Related to the COA Activity References. . . .	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades the problem of how to most effectively design and introduce courses preparing social work students for fieldwork with minority clients has remained the focus of continued debate within and without many schools of social work. It is, of course, in their fieldwork experience that social work students encounter large numbers of minority group members. In some agencies, in fact, the students may work almost entirely with minorities and in minority communities. For example, although the Council on Social Work Education's "Curriculum Policy for the Master's Degree Program in Graduate Schools of Social Work" mandates the development of concepts and knowledge on minorities throughout the curriculum, and "with the same commitment to academic excellence and sound curriculum planning given other areas of professional training," there is an obvious lack of commitment and knowledge regarding appropriate means for achieving these objectives (CSWE, 1969).

The purpose of this study is to present a strategy for the integration of Afro-American content--that is, course work aimed at the special needs of Black children, women and men--into the traditional field-instruction curriculum. The present study has benefited significantly from the work of previous writers on this subject, including those discussed below.

Aracelis Francis points out that "the pervasiveness of racism in American society in many overt and covert ways makes the achievement of the goal of integrating black content into the social work curriculum difficult indeed" (Francis, 1973, p. 1). Further, she suggests that the endeavor must have, first, the commitment of the total social work education community; second, adequate funding; and third, minority staffing to achieve the needed depth and scholarship in order to encompass the major advances in social work theory, knowledge, and practice. Many schools of social work, especially those in urban areas have accepted the notion that the experience of Blacks and other oppressed peoples are in part dissimilar from the white majority and, therefore this fact should be recognized in designing curricula for professional social work education (Gary, 1974).

Mary Ella Robertson comments that "social work educators have developed two points of view regarding the development of content on ethnic minorities in curriculum. One point of view asserts that the curriculum, in all of its components, should be enlightened with content about differences and diversity among people, that these differences and variations, cast in a positive framework, are the appropriate and necessary content for every course or sequence of study, and should be reflected in the curriculum" (Robertson, 1973, p. 333). Indeed, there is no single correct way and traditionally the focus has been on the development and integration of content into the classroom, rather than into the field instruction curriculum: "Ethnic content in the practicum is vital but rately reported on.

This may be related to the lack of specificity of the subobjectives, and the lack of concern for any ethnic minority group in overall curriculum objectives" (Leigh, 1974, p. 55).

Some authors have suggested that racial and ethnic justice are inextricably interwoven with social justice, that the connection needs to be clarified, and that it is essential for students to understand the nature of the unjust consequences for the poor, racial and ethnic minorities (Turner, 1976). Furthering social justice is a principal goal embodied in the code of ethics of virtually every social work organization. Racial and ethnic minorities, particularly the poor among them, are victimized by inequities and hence they suffer more than most people from the lack of social justice.

> The changes in modern America have included the majority of people, but the continued existence of large groups in marginal roles represents a serious defect in the fabric of American society. For, despite the ideals of pluralism, there is a basic strain towards conformity, towards standard life styles and values. We have underestimated heterogeneity, variability, and change. The terms "culture" and "sub-culture" are used to describe life styles and behavior under contemporary urban conditions, and often summary statistics alone are employed to explain the social characteristics of an area. Although they are not so intended, these concepts and statistics are frequently interpreted as indicating a kind of homogeneity and a degree of regularity that does not exist (Robertson, 1973, p. 332).

The educators of professional social workers have recognized this fact and have sought, using a variety of techniques, to prepare students to help families, disadvantaged in their effort to achieve social justice, and to assist them with problems in personal, family, group, and community life that result from and further aggravate the injustices that they experience.

The field work practicum, a vital part of social work education, is especially useful in training students in the techniques of helping disadvantaged families. The largest minority group is Black families. James Leigh has urged that

> in practicum sites focused on direct service delivery to ethnic minorities, the ethnic content must begin with a focus on the unique experiences of minority persons. Normative behavior unique to the minority group must be noted and viewed as an indicator of health, not sickness or deviation. We must concentrate on what the patterns of helping really are, who helps whom under what circumstances, and what are the informal social siturations and formal institutions of a particular ethnic group. Underscoring these areas should be the focus on data gathering, assessment, and evaluation of theories as they relate to effective service delivery. Students must be able to analyze critically concepts and theories related to ethnic minority content, and to thesis practicality in helping ethnic minority persons resolve their defined problems (Leigh, 1974, p. 56).

Practicum instruction offers a unique opportunity for revealing facts, for helping students to understand and appreciate the Afro-American experience. Berengarten emphasized field instruction as a major facilitator of learning: "The synthesis of total learning and metamorphosis from lay to professional person takes place primarily in field work. The role of the field instructor in training the student for an uncharted and often uncertain professional future becomes a crucial one (Berengarten, 1961, p. 257).

All too frequently, however, field instructors are inadequately prepared to teach students how to appreciate and successfully cope with the special needs of Black families--"it must be acknowledged that teaching through concept and principle is a difficult assignment for field instructors. The field instructor has to become the

educator 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" (Berengarten, 1961, p. 257). This gap in preparation for teaching minority content extends to both how the instruction is done and what is actually taught.

In devising a specific strategy for modifying the fieldwork-instruction curriculum's methodology and substance, a number of writers have made valuable contributions. In general these authors argue that practice, rather than theory, is the primary problem. For example, Charles Levy notes that professional practitioners are conflicted in their relationships with clients: first, among their own personal values, and second, between their personal and professional values (Levy, 1976, p. 110). Values, he says, "may be conceived along three basic dimensions which would account for the major value orientations shared by social workers and related to all aspects of their professional practice. These are preferred conceptions of people, preferred outcomes for people, and preferred instrumentalities for dealing with people. Distinguished from knowledge, and adequately refined, these categories of values might constitute a guide for planning and action in social work practice and education" (Levy, 1973, p. 34). Thus, he clearly favors a strong value base as part of the foundation of all social work practice.

If we accept the notion that cultures are characterized by behavior- and problem-solving techniques, successful social work

practice would seem inseparably linked to an understanding of the cultural backgrounds of individual clients. In other words, on what other basis should the intervention strategy be selected? If a client is offended because the provider unknowlingly violates a cultural rule, then obviously rapport between social worker and client becomes all the more difficult to establish. Effective assessment and intervention require the skills of understanding and articulation by the social worker not only in regard to individuals, but also in relation to families, cultural groups and communities to be served. Here, the field instructor becomes an invaluable instrument for integrating knowledge, that is, the academic curriculum, to the field in practice. Leigh has said that "ethnic minority content in the practicum is needed to prepare students for diverse roles that may conflict with traditional professional roles in meeting the diverse social service needs of a pluralistic society. This content does not supersede content needed for competence; it parallels other content areas" (Leigh, 1974, p. 60).

Since sociocultural and ethnospecific considerations impinge on the capacity of the practitioner and client to work together successfully, we can infer that the omission of cultural information from field instruction and practice undermines the entire spectrum of social work concerns including strategies of intervention, attitudes, understanding, and appreciation of the various cultural, racial and ethnic groups. In discussing the philosophical base for all social work practice, or the value base, we may include elements such as the nature of values; the implications of individual

conscience in the development of values; basic human needs; the rights of man, individually and collectively, to self-determination and fulfillment; and the social structure related to minority groups that violate achievement of objectives sought. In regard to the ethics of social work, there is most assuredly recognition of both differing cultural values among clients as well as the presence of racism particularly informal and formal means of blocking minority-group progress within the profession. As noted previously, the practice of social work within a pluralistic society has been the focus of continued debate in many schools of social work. Caws notes that to professionals the "complexity and attendant perplexity of decision-making that affects clients, patients, employees and experimental subjects is pervasive' (Caws, 1978, p. 32).

While the focus of the present study is on the Black American experience, hopefully it also will prove applicable to the needs and concerns of other minority and ethnic groups. We note that the problems associated with Black* oppression and the Black experience suggest an underlying distinct historical, social, economic and political perspective, the understanding and appreciation of which cannot but aid the social worker greatly in the performance of his or her duties. Thus, in this study we will scrutinize historical and contemporary conditions, the educational framework, the sociological framework, and the dual experience. A review of the four perspectives follows.

---

*The terms, Black, Black-American and Afro-American will be used interchangeably.

Historical and Contemporary Conditions

Afro-Americans hold a unique position in American society--a position shaped by distinct historical and contemporary influences such as African heritage, slavery and pervasive oppression that has traditionally excluded Afro-Americans from full participation in American life. As John Franklin says

> Measured by universal standards the history of the United States id indeed brief. But during the brief span of three and one-half centuries of colonial and national history Americans developed traditions and prejudices which created the two worlds of race in modern America. From the time that Africans were brought as indentured servants to the mainland of English America in 1619, the enormous tasks of rationalizing and justifying the forced labor of peoples on the basis of racial differences was begun and even after slavery was ended, the notion of racial differences persisted as a basis for maintaining segregation and discrimination. At the same time, the effort to establish a more healthy basis for the new world social order was begun, thus launching the continuing battle between the two worlds of race, on the one hand, and the world of equality and complete human fellowship, on the other (Franklin, 1965, pp. 1, 899).

Historians and scholars have documented the oppressive nature of enslavement, although the adaptive capacities of the enslaved and those born to them and their children are often universally underestimated. These adaptive capacities of Afro-American men and women have for generations been tried and tested through the oppression produced by slavery.

We know racism, both individual and institutional, as a powerful and unrelenting force. It is, in fact, impossible to examine minority

issues in relation to social work practice without exploring the racism which permeates the social fabric of our society and negatively distorts the mental health of every member. Stokley Carmichael and Charles Hamilton define racism as "the prediction of decisions and politics on considerations of race for the purpose of subordinating a racial group and maintaining control over that group. . . .It takes two forms...individual racism and institutional racism" (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, pp. 3-4). Both institutions and individuals, even those who ostensibly reject the notion of dominant - majority passive - minority relations, have unvariably inculcated a racist reflex-response," the end result of which is the rank ordering of minority groups to the bottom of the social structure (Colson, 1980).

If overt racism is rare, then one might well argue that contemporary conditions result in the delivery of irrelevant social services rather than in outright denial of services. Jerome Cohen suggests that the Afro-American "encourages numerous obstacles in the path to service that conspire against /his/ seeking help, against finding it offered under acceptable conditions, and perhaps most tragically, against his utilizing it fully" (Cohen, 1969, p. 99). It is particularly interesting to examine the role of the "helpers" within the historical and contemporary perspectives. Or, as Solomon puts it, the "extent to which these professions themselves have contributed to the negative valuation of Blacks in the past; to what extent these negative valuations continue in the present" and the implications for effecting changes in how social

work profession delivers services to Blacks (Solomon, 1976, p. 73).

The Educational Framework

Schools of social work view field instruction and the role of the field instructor as critical to the professional training of students. Thus, every school of social work has developed one or more models for the training of field instructors. The need to develop detailed training programs grew, in part, from the erratic field-instructor supervision given to social work students in their assignments, the varying knowledge of the field instructors, and a lack of clarity or understanding in carrying out the learning and educational objectives of the schools.

Among the overall objectives in the New York University School of Social Work are the following: (1) to provide students with professional competence, based on a broad range of training courses and initiatives, that includes the development of numerous intervention strategies and techniques adaptable to a wide range of clients and social problems; and (2) to prepare students (as outlined in the self-study document)* to work in urban communities by instilling them with greater understanding and appreciation of the most pressing urban problems including economic deprivation, broken families, slum housing, inadequate medical care, drug addiction, and minority-group status.

---

*The self-study document is the report to the Commission on Accreditation Council on Social Work Education, June 1974.

The specific objectives of field instruction outlined in the New York University School of Social Work "Fieldwork Manual" address both the educational requirements of the master's degree program and the role of field instruction in fulfilling the School's* objectives. The School holds a series of mandatory two-hour introductory seminars for new field instructors. The "Fieldwork Manual" lists the goals of the seminar:

a. To provide a non-threatening peer-oriented learning situation for the integration of new field instructors into the School.

b. To familiarize new field instructors with NYU's integrative perspective in providing direct service to individuals, families, and groups.

c. To orient field instructors to the School-at-large, e.g. rhythm of the academic year, school structure curriculum issues, field of practice issues, professional identity issues and so forth.

d. To orient new field instructors to the range of student learning patterns and to facilitate the development of their skills in making on-going educational assessments.

e. To focus on teaching skills and to provide School support for reflecting on the issues connected with the transition from practitioner to eductor.

In meeting the above goals the seminars cover, among other topics, administrative issues for field instructors, teaching content areas (areas of practice, and areas of teaching skill), field instructor/ student relationships, evaluation as a shared process, working with

---

*The "School" henceforth will refer to the New York University School of Social Work.

students who present atypical learning styles and/or problems, and practice and professional issues. While all seminars cover the same topics, not all topics are accorded the same level of attention. Nonetheless, the School has, not unlike other schools, identified training of field instructors as central to the training of students:

> In training members of professions, the University is training men and women who must possess not simply a certain expertness but also a sense of their social role and an awareness that their professional activities involve them in a wide range of value judgments. The development of men and women capable of understanding their own professional activities in a larger social and moral context must be a fundamental goal of educational planning in any school of the University (Berengarten, 1961, p. 246).

That "sense of their social role" beyond possession of expertness formed a core philosophical underpinning of the present study. As Towle has remarked, "Social work by its nature, in that it rather literally is taken to represent the conscience of the community, in that it is literally thought of as playing a parental role in the lives of people" seems to suggest the need to at least acknowledge social and moral philosophy guiding practice and education (Towle, 1954, p. 79). John Turner in addition further suggested that the notion of social justice was crucial to education for practice with minorities. He states that "tradition and history have made problems of ethnic and racial justice an inextricable part of the more general problem of social justice. The curriculum must make this connection clear to the student, for he who fights for one must be committed to fight for both" (Tuner, 1972, p. 312).

A major goal of the present study was to insure that social work students were thoroughly informed about the distinctive characteristics of the minority groups in their fieldwork practice. Hence accurate information about minority groups combined with a solid grounding in social work-intervention techniques was perceived as beneficial to effective fieldwork practice. Turner states in this regard that the social work curriculum must also help students understand that the way various life chance systems work in this country leads systematically and repeatedly to unjust consequences for the poor, uneducated or under-educated and racial and ethnic minorities.

A related goal of this study was that in order to equip social work students with the proper tools for practice with minorities, the curriculum must address three separate educational needs: (1) minority students should have a systematic and in-depth knowledge of their own groups; (2) all students should have basic information about the major ethnic and racial groups in America; and (3) students should have an in-depth knowledge about the groups with which they expect to work (Turner, 1972). These three highly desirable curriculum components are very complex, and, consequently, difficult to put in place. The first is unusually complex and based on the findings here, rarely accomplished.

In this study, as an example, field instructors were uncomfortable and ambivalent concerning the acquiring of in-depth knowledge about the Black experience. Too, some of the "anger" expressed by minority

members involved in the study probably had more to do with self-hatred rather than annoyance at the prospect of educating the non-minority members. While interesting and meriting further research, this aspect of self-pride and -hatred was beyond the scope of the study and so was not addressed.

Since most educators, students and practitioners believe fieldwork to be the core of professional social work education, it is essential that principles are identified and made usable in particular situations, and that theoretical understanding is increased and translated into specific actions designed to help people meet social needs. The entire social work curriculum is funneled into the fieldwork course, potentially at least (Oswald, 1966, p. 7). At New York University School of Social Work, as in other schools of social work, there are faculty members responsible for the training of field instructors. All new field instructors are required to attend a thirteen-session weekly seminar. The seminars provide peer learning experience designed to orient the field instructor to the educational program, to improve teaching skills, and to promote the integration of field learning with the other curriculum components.

In the study under scrutiny here, faculty and students at the School were warmly receptive to the idea of introducing significant minority content into the fieldwork experience. One may assume that their initial positive responses were conditioned, in part, by wide acceptance of the following within the social work profession:

a. Student learning and supervisory preparation are relevant.

b. Self-development is a requirement for persons seeking to educate practitioners, as an assurance that they will act within the scope of their skill and evidence requisite professional education to do so.

c. There may be some relevancy in the use of some of the principles of andragogy and an effective teaching/learning process that facilitates the educational process.

d. Enhancement of field instructors' understanding of the process and the structure of knowledge will help students to learn how to apply and transfer knowledge.

e. The nature of the field instructor/student relationship is crucial to the teaching/learning process, the relationship being the medium through which learning takes place.

f. Quality field instruction, in part, rests on the field instructors' integration of substantial content knowledge, understanding of learning styles, awareness of varied teaching methods, and the establishment of an effective learning environment.

g. The relationship between the field and class is crucial. Field instruction is an integral part of the social work education program as it provides the opportunity for the integration of theory and practice.

h. Schools of social work can best take the responsibility for training field instructors in order to insure that they acquire knowledge about specific learning objectives of field instruction, and the educational objectives of the school.

The School, through the use of classroom instructors and field instructors, accepted the responsibility of insuring a level of education that maximized social work learning and performance. Berengarten has said that the "transition from practitioner to field teacher involves a different use of knowledge and reorientation to concept and theory. Thus, the field instructor must be given help to become the educator or teacher

who imparts knowledge and skill conceptually. He no longer can demonstrate his own knowledge and skill by doing. He must instead explore and educate others to know and do" (Berengarten, 1961, p. 249).

Models based on traditional learning theories, adult learning theory (andragogy), ego psychological theories, and other theories are quite often used as the foundation for the development of field-instruction programs. Indeed, these models were drawn upon in the present study and were helpful in refining and testing the assumptions discussed below.

Field Instructor Education

Field instructors who acquire and integrate content knowledge (about Black clients), who have an understanding of learning styles, and an awareness of modern teaching techniques are more likely to establish an effective learning environment and effectively teach the student. (These criteria encompass both practice wisdom and educational theory.) Virtually every school of social work assumes some responsibility for training the field instructors who will educate and supervise the school's students. Fieldwork manuals, for example, describe policies, procedures and activities. Although some manuals are more explicit than others, all seek to define the selection, role, and responsibility of the field instructor and the critical role played in the educational process.

A lack of knowledge, understanding and skill can produce a high degree of anxiety for both field instructor and student. Mastery of professional practice requires continuous learning and doing. Lucille

Austin believes that "the recognition of continuity in the process of professional development is in itself important; it gives supervisors perspective on the nature of a particular individual's ability to progress and provides clues to repetitive learning problems. It places on schools and agencies the responsibility for outlining their expectations at different points of professional development" (Austin, 1952, p. 1). The project which is the focus of the present study was classified by the School as an advanced seminar. One of its goals was the clear-cut presentation of the high level of practice expected from those who worked with minority groups. Apropos of teaching the teachers Dewey states that "teaching carries with it the responsibility for understanding the needs, capacities of the individuals who are learning at a given time. It is not enough that certain materials and methods have proved effective with other individuals at other times. It is important to pay attention to what is educative with particular individuals at particular times. . .there is no such thing as educational value in the abstract" (Dewey, 1938, pp. 45-46).

The concepts of Catherine Papell and Sidney Berengarten regarding cognitive activity -- the cognitive, affective, operational, or what is generally called the thinking, feeling and doing have implications for both teaching the field instructors as well as for their teaching the students. Knowledge regarding how individuals learn enhance the learning environment and, in some ways, assures effective teaching. Austin, too, states that if teaching is to be effective

the subject matter to be learned and the students' way of learning must be related to each other. The project addressed the importance for the field instructors of knowing the learning patterns of their students. Since the field instructors had students in training for an academic year, there was ample opportunity for identifying the repetitive patterns of learning. Our time -- that of teaching the teachers -- was too limited for gaining sufficient knowledge about learning behavior.

Educational Principles

An assumption was made that the application of some educational principles and teaching processes would aid the field instructors in their work. The teaching of problem-solving techniques to field instructors equipped them to eventually move their own social work students into independent fieldwork. This fact was borne out and supported by comments from the field instructors (see Chapter IV). Also, understanding the fundamentals of practice with minorities made the issues more comprehensible and was critical to adequate "transfer of training" (Bruner, 1977, p. 25). The study supported a major theme described by Brunner:

> The curriculum of a subject should be determined by a most fundamental understanding that can be achieved by the underlying principles that give structure to that subject. Teaching specific topics or skills without making clear their content in the broader fundamental structure of the broader field of knowledge is unecomonical in several deep senses. In the first place, such teaching makes it exceedingly difficult for the student to generalize from what he had

> learned to what he will encounter later. In the second place, learning that has fallen short of a grasp of general principles has little reward in terms of intellectual excitement. The best way to create interest in a subject is to render it worth knowing, which means to make the knowledge gained usable in one's thinking beyond the situation in which the learning has occurred. Third, knowledge one acquired without sufficient structure to tie it together is knowledge that is likely to be forgotten (Bruner, 1977, p. 3).

The seminar was structured around basic concepts for the understanding and teaching of the content. Clearly, the knowledge was worth knowing, as there was demand for its use with the students in the supervision of their work with Black clients. One might well conclude that the notion of thinking and doing is a very valuable combination in the process of education.

Participant Leadership

Other basic principles of learning were also used. For example, Towle's discussion of the principles of learning makes reference to the adult learner in competition with peers who will not be content with marginal learning. "He will need and want to strive for mastery of skills in lines other than his own but also to contribute to his profession through leadership" (Towle, 1954, p. 30). The study participants did express, in many ways, their positive feelings about being involved in a demonstration project. They assumed leadership roles within their own agencies by conveying seminar content to agency staff, viewing the experience as part of a pioneer effort, and generally enhancing professional practice for themselves and others.

Malcolm Knowles discusses the assumptions underlying andragogical theory. He states four main assumptions:

> a. Change in self-concept. This assumption is that as the person grows and matures his self-concept moves from total dependency. . .to one of increasing self-directedness.
>
> b. The role of experience. This assumption is that as an individual matures he accumulates and expanding reservoir of experience that causes him to become an increasingly rich resource for learning, and at the same time provides him with a broadening base to which to relate new learnings. That discussion, laboratory simulation, field experience, team project and other action-learning techniques are favored. The assumption conveys respect for people by making use of their experience as a resource for learning.
>
> c. Readiness to learn. This assumption is that as an individual matures, his readiness to learn is decreasingly the product of his biological development and academic pressure and is increasingly the product of the developmental tasks required for the performance of his evolving social roles. It assumes that learners are ready to learn those things they "need" to because of the developmental phases they are approaching in their roles as workers, organizational members, leaders. . .There will be a readiness to inquire into areas of content as one confronts problems to which they are relevant.
>
> d. Orientation to learning. This assumption is that adults tend to have a problem-centered orientation to learning. The adult comes into an educational activity largely because he is experiencing some inadequacy in coping with current life problems. . .his time perspective is one of immediacy of application (Knowles, 1972, p. 34).

These assumptions served as the core of the teaching/learning process of the study. The field instructors as adult learners were committed to the program in direct proportion to their influence on it. That is, the greater and more far-reaching the field instructors perceived their influence to be regarding the design and substance of the

program, the stronger seemed their commitment to it. Knowles noted the incongruence of an adult learner with a sense of self-directedness having a decision or activity imposed upon him.

In Knowles' exploration of the process of helping adults learn, one is struck by the critical nature of their creating an educational environment where improved models of their professional roles are encouraged through mutually self-directing inquiry. In the project discussed here, the teacher was a transmitter, but even more so a facilitator. The role of the teacher was to encourage the participants to use the full range of their professional experiences.

As we shall see, Chapter IV deals more specifically with the methods of teaching and the use of the principles or andragogy for facilitating the educational process.

James Bieri, in "Some Principles of Learning in Field Instruction," identifies some theories of learning that apply to the role of field instructor as educators. He recognizes the influential role of the field instructor in carrying out teaching responsibilities. Two types of learning are noted by Bieri to be, first, substantive learning or content learning, that is, the body of technical skills and substantive knowledge which form the student's professional armamentarium; and, second, perceptual learning having to do with learning how to think about what it is we are doing. Perceptual learning includes the ability to make appropriate discriminations, the ability to generalize when transfer is valid, and the ability to

entertain alternative hypotheses about the professional matter under consideration (Bieri, 1963, pp. 2-3).

The value of perceptual learning (or cognitive strategies) is stressed by Bieri because it is always useful in relation to the evolving nature of professional practice and social realities. The field instructors in the program were particularly appreciative of the idea-articulation skills — verbal and written -- which they learned and sharpened during their participation. Teaching students to think about and express information in an analytical and creative way emphasizes clarity and fine distinctions.

Bruner discusses another very complex teaching task that addresses the development of intuitive and analytical thinking, particularly the use of the latter to better understand the former, which we may define as the rather sudden achievement of a solution for which one has yet to provide formal proof (Bruner, 1977, pp. 55-56). Teaching people to think is a very difficult task, one that was certainly not encompassed in the present study. However, in relation to the ideas of Bruner and Bieri, critical and analytical thought was very much encouraged.

Bieri, like others who deal with learning, discusses several learning criteria which the field instructor should consider in working with students. First is the level of motivation for learning; second, the nature of reinforcements provided, particularly the importance of positive reinforcement early in the learning experience;

and, third, the capacity of the learner -- the individual differences in intelligence or capacity to learn. The real value in Bieri's discussion is the strong suggestion that the educators/field instructors and students both learn to think about what they are doing.

Field Instructor/Student Relationship

The relationship is the medium through which learning takes place. This assumption is based on personality and ego-psychological theories. The establishment and maintenance of relationships is, of course, at the core of the social work profession. For this study the emphasis was placed on the relationship as critical to the education of students, particularly in regard to the minority content. The concept of relationship in working with the Black client was stressed in the seminar curriculum. Although not addressed directly, the concept was implicit in the educational process between the seminar leader and the program participants. It was, in fact, the "relationship" with the School and the leader that made the seminar possible. Discussion of the leader's role and position in the School are covered in Chapter IV. One of the seminar components related to the psychological core of the learning experience. The seminar leader wished to present this component in the most effective manner possible. Bernard Bandler suggests that here the educational task is to enlist the student's ego-syntonic personality in overcoming his own inhibitions. He goes on to discuss

developing the optimal educational tension in each student, to avoid setting too difficult a task, on the other hand, and to avoid asking so little that there is a failure to tax and to involve each student's full capacities (Bandler, 1950, p. 127). Bertha Reynolds believes that "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 with the aim of insuring that the conscious attention of the learner will not flag" (Reynolds, 1970, p. 69).

Furthermore, Towle sees the teacher/student relationship as a means to effect a change in the learner, provided that the following conditions are met:

First, the student does not have a deep need to think in old ways.

Second, the student's convictions have not been derived through a relationship on which he still depends for gratification and safety, or which he is unfree to leave because of fear, hostility, and guilt.

Third, the student's old thinking has not been the tradition of an entire social group with which he is still closely allligned.

Fourth, the new orientation does not come from one the student deeply mistrusts or resents. Since the relationship between the learner and mentor is a significant means to the development of

professional competence and integrity, it is well to consider conditions essential for the attainment of its aims, as well as some of the problems that this corrective and integrative means presents (Towle, 1954, pp. 141-143).

In short, one might conclude that the field instructor/student relationship is to develop a heightened sensitivity and awareness of how learning in this context takes place. Then teaching modes may be devised which support optimal learning in the context of practice. Hopefully, ultimate value of theories lies in distinguishing between the psychological conditions in which student learning is most likely to occur and those in which it could be constrained. In regard to the above, a Smith School of Social Work study points out that the ideas aren't weighty enough to guide the optimal ordering of knowledge within a positive psychological environment (Smith School of Social Work, 1978).

Modeling Theory

That the leader's method of teaching enriched the field instructors' learning capabilities was an assumption based on modeling theory. In the present study distinction was made between the means of teaching and the end result. In other words, the leader's teaching style was presumed to effect the field instructors' teaching styles. Indeed, Albert Bandura's research conducted within the framework of social learning demonstrated that one can acquire intricate response patterns merely by observing the performance of appropriate

models. For example, emotional responses can be conditioned observationally by witnessing the affective reactions of others. . . fearful and avoidant behavior can be extinguished. . ., and the expression of well-learned responses can be enhanced and socially regulated through the actions of influential models. These vicarious phenomena, he says, are generally subsumed under a variety of terms, one of which is modeling (Bandura, 1969, p. 118).

A tentative conclusion of the study is that experience in supervision confirms Dewey's statement that educational value in the abstract is non-existent. What appear to be simple steps--imparting knowledge, and then facilitating learning were concerns in this study--as in, for example, the writing of Austin -- conditioned by the individual needs of teacher and student (Austin, 1952, p. 59). It was particularly important, given the sensitive nature of the material, that the leader be conscious of, and sensitive to, the intended (and perhaps the unintended) effects on the participants. The theory suggests that one of the fundamental means by which new modes of behavior are acquired and existing patterns modified, is role modeling. Bandura demonstrates that virtually all learning phenomena resulting from direct experiences also can occur on a vicarious basis through ovservation of another person's behavior and its consequences (Bandura, 1969, p.118). Furthermore, a substantial body of independent evidence exists to the effect that modeling plays a highly influential role in the transmission of self-reinforcement patterns. Modeling has been another dimension termed in

the role of the social intervenor and another component in the social worker/client relationship. Leon Chestang cites the work of Bandura, identifying several hypotheses which merit mention:

a. The acquisition of imitative responses is affected whether or not the model is rewarded for his acts.

b. Learning is more likely to occur when the organism wants or needs to obtain a certain goal

c. Subjects are more likely to imitate the behavior of prestigeful than nonprestigeful models.

Models who are similar to the subjects themselves have a greater effect on behavior than dissimilar models (Mussen, 1979, pp. 31-34).

The leader in our study wanted to convey, in a conscious modeling effort an attitude and behavior pattern that met the following criteria: openness, dynamic presence, flexibility, tolerant of ambiguity and critical comments, encouraging of critical thinking. The leader assumed responsibility for the direction of seminar activities, finding little need to exert close control over the participants or the situation. An additional important aspect was the leader's attempt to encompass the anxiety engendered by the material without seeming to be overwhelmed by it. This attempt, of course, was deemed a critical step not only in the field instructors' training, but also in their contact with their future students. Thus, the field instructors' identification, or lack of same, with the leader, or role model, was a key element at this stage.

As asserted previously, the above combination of theories and principles comprised the framework for teaching and learning with

a seminar leader and adult professional learners. A cornerstone of the study's findings was that the concept of the self-directedness was vital to the field instructors. Chapter IV "Conclusions and Recommendations," a detailed discussion of all findings as they relate to recommendations for the future will be undertaken.

The Sociological Framework

It is appropriate to note here that psychiatry and social work both have been criticized for their failure to rid their theories and programs of racist and class-prejudiced attitude and practices. Alexander Thomas and Samuel Sillen examine some of the ways in which white racism has influenced theory and practice in psychiatry and allied fields by saying that:

> In its long and ugly history in the United States, white racism has improvised a thousand variations on two basic themes. The first is that black people are born with inferior brains and a limited capacity for mental growth. The second is that their personality tends to be abnormal, whether by nature or by nurture. These concepts of inferiority and pathology are interrelated and reinforce each other. Both have served to sanctify a hierarchial social order in which 'the Negro's place' is forever ordained by his genes and the accumulated disabilities of the past (Thomas and Sillen, 1972, p. 1).

White racism, then, influences the type and magnitude of intervention strategies used in fieldwork practice with Black individuals, families, groups and communities.

Minority status can most meaningfully be defined on the basis of access to or distance from the sources of societal power: exclusion from full participation in the majority culture, lack of economic

potency, and awareness of blocked opportunities for upward mobility. These factors contribute to low self-esteem, retaliative anger against power-holders, mistrust of those who do not belong to one's immediate social or family group, and a sense of alienation and powerlessness (Brody, 1974, p. 32).

Afro-Americans and Hispanics comprise the largest minority groups in this country and make up a significant percentage of the poverty population. In 1980 there were 8.6 million (32.5 percent) Blacks and 3.5 million (25.7 percent) Hispanics below the poverty level. ("Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism," 1982, p. 3). Their cultural backgrounds play a definitive part in the adaptive patterns developed to cope with strained living conditions. Both Afro-Americans and Hispanics constitute a heterogeneous group, and it is impossible to generalize about the Afro-American population or the Hispanic population. Although Afro-Americans share the common experience of being oppressed, for example, they differ markedly in their individual life adaptations. A serious error would be committed if one assumed behavior patterns can be stereotyped, denying the idiosyncratic patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving (Gil, 1980, p. 1).

From the era of slavery to the present, components of Black culture -- such as the extended family, specific roles within the family, and strong religious faith -- have been effective coping devices encompassing both social and psychological needs and permitting survival in what Leon Chestang calls the larger hostile

environment. This environment, according to Chestang, includes,

> social injustice -- the denial of rights legally granted; social inconsistency -- the institutionalized disparity between word and deed; and impotence -- the impotence felt by Afro-Americans to affect changes in their lives (Chestang, 1973, p. 4).

There has been a failure by many majority group members to appreciate the psychic impact of these conditions and the development of the character structure as it responds to society's assaults.

According to James Comer, the Afro-American family was expected to prepare its children to accept discrimination, exploitation and abuse. Yet it also was expected to meet the biological, social, emotional, and psychological needs of its members, promoting growth and development of its young. The Afro-American family managed to meet these expectations through unique adaptive means. Dr. Comer, in his writings, has stated that to maintain psychological health and survive the Afro-American family developed a social system in which physical survival, organization, and purpose were maintained under degrading conditions while at the same time promoting a sense of worth and value. He suggests that the Afro-American church became a substitute society (Comer, 1975, p.3), providing an outlet for individual talents, self-realization, and self-expression. The Black church, in fact, functioned as a non-kin extended family and offered mutual aid, compassion, and interdependence.

Robert B. Hill, and Andrew Billingsley, have been most helpful in their descriptions of the Afro-American family structure and its

functions: Hill in his identification of the strengths that support and enhance Afro-American family life; Billingsley in his articulation of a structural typology which transcends the traditional nuclear family concept. Hill suggests that it is not only the strong religious orientation that helps Blacks survive, but also the strong kinship bonds, strong work orientation, adaptability of family roles, and high-achievement orientation (Billingsley, 1968, Hill, 1971). Chestang investigated twenty successful Black Americans (Chestang, 1977), dividing families into two broad categories -- achievement-oriented and survival-oriented, both playing crucial roles in the development of dignity and self-esteem. He contends that both family and social factors must be understood to achieve effective intervention with Black American families.

One might add, in addition to the above, the importance of language and patterns of communication as well as the development and use of other helping networks in the Black community--the local "Mom and Pop" store owners, the numbers runner, the "brothers on the corner," and the host of other community "folk."

Central to clarifying the sociological perspective are problems related to distribution of, and access to, resources. These problems include the effects of culture and race upon intervention planning and techniques. Part of the larger sociological framework also should include the ills of society in general as they impact upon the Black experience.

Each year The National Urban League publishes "The State of Black America". The 1981 edition gives very detailed data on the socioeconomic factors that affect Black Americans. In its far-reaching scope the publication offers stark evidence about denial of rights, including access to essential resources, to Black Americans. "The State of Black America" covers economic status, housing and neighborhoods, education, and health issues as they relate to Black Americans. Some of the major findings noted:

> Black unemployment, particularly Black teenage unemployment, has increased. Blacks are less likely to secure their proportionate share of jobs.
>
> There is a widening income gap between Black and white families parimarily due to the steady decline in multiple earners in Black families.
>
> Blacks are, because of race, still at a substantial disadvantage when it comes to housing opportunities and neighborhood environments. Blacks are denied access to improved housing opportunities.
>
> Blacks are concentrated in publis schools in older urban cities, they are victims of a system beset with major problems of under-financing, violence, teacher fear, hostility and low expectations. Black students are suspended more often than white students. The erosion of support for public education is viewed as a frontal attack on a primary means of upward mobility for Black Americans.
>
> Health care is affected by racism. Health resources for minority community residents have not been available in the types and amounts needed to impact on their health care substantially.

"Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism" (January 1982) supports the above findings and in addition reports that the proportion of Black families with incomes less than $5,000 a year is about three

times that of white families.

> The number of "underclass" Black families and persons has increased over the past decade.

Douglas Glasgow (1980) writes also about the significant expansion of the Black underclass, referring to this population, numbering in the hundreds of thousands, as permanently entrapped poor, unused, and unwanted. They are jobless, lacking salable skills and the opportunities to acquire them. They are, he states, the victims of the new camouflaged racism. Glasgow takes a strong position on the need to develop power through community control and development of Black institutions. The goal, he maintains, should be the development and employment of Black youth.

The Dual Perspective

The conceptual framework is essential to gaining an appreciation of the dual experience: "To be black in our society or to be a member of an oppressed ethnic minority group is to live one's life in two spheres, moving back and forth between them through an invisible shield which bounds them, so that their separateness is clearly understood by those who must travel between them, although it is only vaguely perceived, if at all, by those whose lives are lived primarily in one sphere" (Chestang, 1979, p. 3).

As a concept the dual perspective has been defined by Delores Norton in her work in developing specific content on ethnic minorities to be introduced into the social work education curriculum:

> The dual perspective is the conscious and systematic process of perceiving, understanding, comparing simultaneously the values, attitudes and behavior of the larger societal system with those of the client's immediate family and community system. It is the conscious awareness of the cognitive and attitudinal levels of the similarities and differences in the two systems. It requires substantive knowledge and empathic appreciation of both the majority societal system and the minority client system, as well as conscious awareness of the social worker's own attitudes and values. Thus, the dual perspective allows one to experience each system for the point of view of the other (Norton, 1978, p. 3).

In the work of Norton and Burns, the focus is on substantive content, the ability to "tune in," as well as attitudes for the latter are not separate from ideas. As an example, one might say that the perception of another person, the knowledge or lack of knowledge of another's habits, likes, dislikes, physical features, behavior, language, and the understanding or lack of understanding of another's personality -- all or one can lead to like or dislike (Burns, 1972).

Conclusion

The challenge in the present study was to consider the ethno-specific issues introduced in Chapter I. Failure to succeed, or even to not make the attempt, would be an omission of the first magnitude. Failure to do so precludes the opportunity for a reconstruction of the social, economic, and political relationship between the minority community and the larger society.

Afro-American theoreticians -- Chestang, Billingsley, Hill, Grier and Cobbs, and Solomon -- have developed theories of personality development and social functioning for Afro-Americans. Their conceptual work is an emboldening prism through which minority life and experience can be viewed and understood: the history, heritage, culture and value orientations.

Race, culture and ethnicity are key focii in social work practice, pinpointing the importance of empowerment, and of institutional and societal dysfunction as well as the need to develop self-awareness about individual feelings and values, both positive and negative. The need to practice a dual perspective -- where cultural differences are separated from pathological deviance and treatment strategies are formulated that capitalize on the strengths of individuals, families, groups and communities -- becomes increasintly apparent.

Meyer (1970) has made the distinction between treatment as a clinical evaluation concerned with disease or disorder, and the kinds of help aimed at supporting day-to-day life, that is, dealing with problems of living without implying illness. In regard to supporting day-to-day life one might do well to remember that while social work training and practice prepare practitioners to understand the etiology of pathological behavior, professional distinctiveness is derived from viewing the individual within a holistic perspective, a context centered on the identification of ego strengths, goal-

directed in the sense of building upon and extending those strengths.

In view of the recognized need to integrate content into the student's field experience, and the evident lack of adequate preparation by field instructors who carry major responsibility for such integration, the seminar proposed to bridge the gap between need and reality. The seminar had a dual focus:

> To enrich those teaching skills of field instruction that are most useful in conveying the essential content in this subject area.
>
> To enrich the substantive content over which field instructors must have mastery if they are to help students incorporate the content into their arsenal of professional skills.

This study was guided by two major needs -- the need for minority content, and the need for a method of conveying the content. The conceptual framework encompassed historical and contemporary conditions, sociological and socioeconomic perspectives, and the dual perspective. Each concept was supplemented by specific critical particulars which served as curriculum topics. The overall educational goals of the study were influenced significantly by the educational objectives of New York University School of Social Work, assumptions related to training for the profession, practice wisdom, educational and ego psychological theories, and principles of learning in field instruction. Together the concepts and method became a foundation for the seminar design and implementation.

The socio-cultural, enthnaspecific considerations and the dual perspective concepts serve as the base of the content to be taught, and the educational framework describes the basis for the process of teaching.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The goal of the seminar, as stated previously, was to produce graduates who were appropriately prepared for social work practice with Black clients. As discussed previously, the goal was addressed in a two-tiered methodological approach: first, by enhancing field instructors' teaching skills, and, secondly, by enriching the instructors' knowledge about Black clients so that they could teach students this knowledge and how to use it. More specifically:

a. Develop a model for teaching minority content to field instructors.

b. Increase the knowledge of field instructors about the crucial issues and concerns that impact on Black clients' functioning and services.

c. Increase the field instructors' ability to describe, analyze and communicate information about the development and behavior of Black clients.

If the goals was achieved, then the seminar might be transferable to the problems of other ethnic and racial minority groups.

Various teaching methods were used to enhance teaching skills--discussion, required readings, student material, use of recordings of student/supervisory conferences. There was no separation of the means and the end; the manner in which the leader taught affected how the field instructors taught their students. Thus, as noted previously, how the leader taught was crucial to the program.

One of the fundamental means by which new modes of behavior were acquired and existing patterns modified entailed modeling (see Chapters I and IV).

The seminar was in reality a demonstration project with a carefully selected sample of experienced field instructors. Twenty-five field instructors were invited to participate in eight two-hour sessions held during eight consecutive weeks. Thirteen accepted the invitation, ten contracted to participated, and nine composed the final group. The tenth contractor did not appear for the first seminar meeting and subsequently backed out altogether from participation, claiming pressure from his employer as the reason.

Description of Study Sample

The target population was experienced field instructors who were currently training graduate students for New York University School of Social Work in agencies that served minority clients. They had to meet the criterion as described below. The original plan of doing a random sampling was decided unfeasible given the number of field instructors available and the nature of the agency population served. Further, it was decided that as a demonstration project it would be more appropriate to select a group of field instructors who expressed an interest in an advanced seminar dealing with the minority content to be taught.

All of the participating field instructors met the criterion of having at least three years' experience after receiving a master's

degree in social work. In fact, the participants' post-MSW experience ranged from six to thirty-three years and all of them had supervised students for more than three years. Their ages ranged from 28 to 62 years. Five were Black; four white; two men--1 Black and 1 white; and seven women—4 Black and 3 white.

The participants worked for social work agencies in New York City. The agencies' size ranged from large to small; some were public while others were private. They offered the following services: mental health, in- and outpatient, child welfare, education, public welfare, and alcohol and substance abuse. Each agency served large numbers of Black clients. Assigned to each agency for field instruction internships were students from New York University School of Social Work as well as from other schools of social work in the New York metropolitan area. The assignments were an integral part of the agency-school relationship and were, of course, independent of the seminar discussed here. A total of twenty-one first- and second-year students were assigned to the agencies.

The field instructors were invited to participate on the basis of their demonstrated capacities, motivation and expressed interest in a new advanced learning experience.

Too, one might hypothesis that a further limitation was related to the lack of assurance that the field instructors who agreed to participate had the capacity or readiness for self-disclosure and/or sharing and trusting in a racially mixed group. (Thus, the assumption was made that if the learning environment was positive, then the potential for learning through interaction would be greatly enhanced.) A further limitation was that one person conducted the seminar. No opportunity existed, for example, to compare two sets of learners and two leaders.

In addition to the above, one might surmise that the seminar leader's role as the Director of Field Instruction affected the seminar participants' perceptions of how the seminar leader would evaluate them. The leader's minority status coupled with the emotional laden aspects of the material might well be a strong limitation. Therefore, the importance of the modeling process to be discussed in Chapter IV.

Timeliness, Appropriateness
and Feasibility

Social work education has demonstrated a readiness to respond to identified needs and has increasingly focused on the fieldwork curriculum. In a memo to the deans and faculty of those social work schools participating in Programs in Social Work Education from Carol H. Meyer, chairperson of the Commission on Educational Planning, CSWE,* it was noted that "there was overwhelming support for the attention paid to fieldwork" (Meyer, 1981). A draft of the Council on Social Work Education's Curriculum Policy Statement of April 1981 states that "field instruction is an integral part of the social work education curriculum. It provides for the integration of theory and practice, encompassing all of the foundation areas. Field work practice is a collaborative arrangement which is theoretically informed and educationally directed to produce a professionally reflective, self-evaluation, knowledgeable and developing social worker" (CSWE, 1981, p. 10).

The basic assumption about the relevancy between the preparation of field instructors for teaching and student learning has been tested repeatedly over time, although the methodology and content may vary. In November 1979 the seminar leader planned a meeting for all field instructors in the New York City area around the integration of minority content (Black and Puerto Rican)

*The Council on Social Work Education.

in field instruction. Dr. Leon Chestang, Professor, Alabama University School of Social Work, was the principal speaker. This meeting became the basis for continued faculty interest and support.

Since the School's practice was to offer seminars to new field instructors as well as to experienced field instructors aimed at enhancing their teaching and practice skills, the ground had been laid for negotiating with agencies and field instructors. There was, in fact, the general expectation among professionals within the School's catchment area that the School would offer programs to field instructors that went beyond routine training seminars. Indeed, over time, the strongest and most positive feedback came from experienced field instructors who were eager to participate in advanced seminars.

Evolution of the Seminar

The seminar leader, a minority-group member of the faculty at the New York University School of Social Work, had for many years felt strongly that a more organized and effective approach to fieldwork practice with minority clients, particularly Black clients, should be developed and put in place. The leader's own field work and practice experience over a period of more than twenty years as student, supervisor and administrator had convinced her that fieldwork supervisors and social work students' understanding of their Black clients' backgrounds and culture was often limited and piecemeal. This lack of understanding, the seminar leader believed, seriously undermined service delivery.

In 1978, the seminar leader, in her capacity as Director of Field Instruction for the School, approached Shirley Ehrenkranz, the Dean of the School of Social Work, and suggested that a seminar be organized under the auspices of the School. The goal of the seminar was to train a select group of field instructors on how to more effectively deal with Black clients while imparting their knowledge to social work students who were undertaking their fieldwork assignments. An implicit assumption by the seminar leader was that the students would then dissiminate the knowledge when they became supervisors, thus perpetuating the seminar's primary goal.

The Dean agreed to School sponsorship of the seminar, which the seminar leader entitled "Advanced Seminar in Field Instruction For Teaching and Integration of Minority Content into Fieldwork."

As Director of Field Instruction, the seminar leader had the authority to plan and implement programs, was knowledgeable about agencies, had rather easy access to the agencies, good relationships with administration, teaching and fieldwork faculty at the School. Selecting a cohort of field instructors in sufficient numbers for the eight sessions planned was thought not to be a major obstacle. The seminar leader decided in the early stages that it was important that the number of field instructors be small enough to make use of the material, but also large enough for the analysis. The resistance encountered around participation in the program had to do, one suspects, with the nature of the content.

The structure of the seminar was consonant with other seminars and demonstration projects sponsored by the School. These activities were not part of the School's formal curriculum, but rather were supplemental activities, the overall goal of which was to enhance knowledge within the profession and act as a catalyst for discussion and debate of vital topics within the social work profession.

In choosing the initial pool of twenty-five field instructor participants, the seminar leader consulted with colleagues and looked in her own files. Some of the field instructors were known to the leader for several years. The leader had worked with them, initially, as the faculty advisor for their agencies, and continued to work with them currently as the Director of Field Instruction. After selecting the twenty-five field instructors, the seminar leader contacted each by telephone.

Within the first five weeks of the invitation, thirteen recipients had agreed verbally to participate in the seminar. Interestingly, the first five minority recipients responded quickly to the invitation, that is, at the time of the call to them they all accepted the invitation. It took until the week before the seminar to get five of the eighteen non-minority field instructors contacted to firmly accept the invitation to participate in the seminar. The seminar leader spent a great deal of time talking directly with them. When messages were left, the seminar leader took responsibility for follow-up on the telephone calls. Of the group of ten who agreed to participate, one broke the agreement at the last moment and failed to attend the seminar. Letters were

sent to all of the field instructors who agreed to participate in the seminar.* To be assured as possible of continued field instructor participation, several telephone contacts and a letter indicating the nature and purpose of the seminar, and their agreement to participate, were made and sent before the beginning of the seminar. When necessary, calls were made to agency directors. These calls served to enlist the support of the administrators, to talk about the importance of the seminar and, finally, to thank them for freeing their staff members to participate. The group of field instructors was to be large enough so that should there be dropouts, implementation of the program would not be threatened.

The initial seminar session was held in a conference room at the New York University School of Social Work six weeks after the invitations were made. The field instructors had been informed in the invitation that the first session would be an organizing session to clarify the goals of the seminar, and to establish the contract for our working together.

One may surmise that the nine field instroctor participants were willing, even determined, to participate, but that the sensitivity of the seminar subject matter heightened tensions.

Additional Criteria

In addition to the criterion of three years post-MSW experience for the seminar participants, the seminar leader imposed the following criteria which were deemed necessary in order to select

*See text of invitation letter, Appendix A.

people who would work effectively together and meet the goals of the seminar:

a. Regarded highly by colleagues and supervisors for their professional abilities.

b. Regarded by colleagues and supervisors as being highly motivated in their job performance.

c. An explicit expression of interest in participating in an experimental seminar concerned with an extremely sensitive subject.

Limitations of Sample.

Needless to say, there were obvious limitations in objectivity concerning selection of the original twenty-five field instructors.

First, although the seminar leader was aware of many field instructors in New York City who had three or more years of post-MSW experience, there undoubtedly were others, of whom she was unaware, who met this requirement.

Second, the pool of twenty-five was limited by the seminar leader's desire for a broad representation in age, experience, race, and sex. There was no assurance that the field instructors had the readiness for self-disclosure.

Third, criteria a. and b. above constitured further restrictions and, significantly, these criteria were by definition, subjective and influenced by variables not related directly to the purposes of the present study.

Fourth, another limitation of the study might have been the race of the seminar leader (Black) coupled with the sensitive and, controversial seminar subject matter. This possibly helps to underscore the importance of the modeling process mentioned in Chapter I and discussed further in Chapter IV.

An unanticipated limitation revolved around "Reaganomics," that is, social work programs were threatened by planned cuts in federal funding. Agency staff and administration were forced to plan for the loss of services and reduction of staff. Hence, staff members seemed unusually cautious about being away from the job, presumably because of apprehension about their own job security. For example, those field instructors who both taught students and had agency administrative responsibilities were adament about their inability to attend the seminar. Thus the pool of potential field instructor participants dwindled because of Reaganomics.

Others demonstrated resistance which seemed related to the seminar's subject matter. For example, when the seminar leader attempted to overcome initial resistance by offering to schedule seminar sessions at a convenient day and time, there seemed to be acknowledgement about the difficulty and the importance of the seminar subject matter. Typical responses at this juncture were on the order of "I'll try to free my time, and let you know"; "I'll get back to you if I can work something out"; "My supervisor (or director) won't give me the time, although I want to come"; and "Let me know when you give the next seminar".

Structure of the Seminar and Definition of the Variables

The seminar was conceived as a program in the sense that it was a series of activities, the participants in which were the seminar leader and nine experienced field instructor participants.

Sequencing of sessions. Consideration has been given to the sequencing of sessions. The dual perspective as described by Delores Norton could serve well as the theme of the initial sessions. The framework is excellent for setting the scene for training and practice with minority groups. It, as a beginning, might help the participants deal with a broader perspective before dealing with the specifics of the particular minority group content.

The rationale for the sequencing of the sessions was based on the assumption that learning would be facilitated in the progression from the general concepts inherent in the content to be taught to the specifics of the method of teaching students. Since all of the field instructors were experienced, it seemed important to address the content before reviewing teaching methods.

Curriculum Design. The curriculum for the seminar sessions are detailed in Appendix D. The eight sessions were designed to cover the substantive content to be taught and the method of teaching the content. Each curriculum unit included a selection of readings that would support the themes of the sessions. The process of teaching included a variety of materials and techniques including inductive and deductive teaching; group discussion; use of student process recordings; recordings of the student/supervisory conferences; case presentations; role play and logs. The curriculum units described in Appendix D offer the objectives and content of each session. In Chapter IV, a discussion of the descriptive and interpretative material of the sessions is discussed.

Practice Principles

The following five practice principles were devised by the seminar leader in order to help articulate the primary goals of the project. The aim was to have a readily understandable set of measurements by which the seminar could be evaluated.*

Principle 1: (Governs selection of substantive content.) Field instructors should be knowledgeable about minority (Black) content if they are to enrich those teaching skills that are most useful in teaching this content to students for their work with Black clients.

> Task: Determine whether the field instructors agree, or have questions or concerns regarding what they are to learn and what is to be provided to the students. Discuss and establish agreement regarding the objectives --the contract. Determine what the baseline for knowledge is regarding the content to be taught.

Principle 2: Field instructors must have students in practice in agencies serving Black clients in order that the content can be useful to the field instructor, student and clients.

> Task: Determine that the field instructors are in agencies which are serving Black clients and that their students are working with Black clients.

Principle 3: The substantive content must be learned concurrently with the method to convey it, if both are to be useful to the field instructors' work with students.

> Task: Use an experiential and didactic approach. Teaching from case material, discussion of literature, etc., as well as role-playing and use of designed exercises to provide modeling experience.

---

*The practice principles herein were based on the guidelines contained in The Doctoral Project Manual (New York: Hunter College School of Social Work, City University of New York, June 1982).

Principle 4: The field instructor should experience a method of teaching that can be emulated with his or her students in fieldwork.

> Task: Leader through use of own behavior style will serve as a model for teaching. Leader to create an atmosphere of openness, non-defensiveness, and sharing climate that allows for both agreement and disagreement, where conflicts can be resolved and can serve, where they occur, as an opportunity for growth and change.

Principle 5: The training program for the field instructors should have a specific structure, format and content to be covered in order that the objectives of training are met.

> Task: Develop a training course of study, recruit a cohort of field instructors, monitor the training of the field instructors and performance of the students. Evaluate all of this in light of what the results show about the practice principles that govern the design and the specific content of the program.

Implementation

The seminar ran eight sessions from February 25, 1981 to April 15, 1981. The spring semester was selected because experience had shown that the social work students tended to be more settled and engaged in their work than in the fall semester. Also, the field instructors were perceived to be more connected to their students during this period. One might surmise that this was because they had done their mid-year evaluations, making them more knowledgeable about the teaching and learning tasks of the students.

As the selection process unfolded, it became evident that the significant resistance was from the non-minority field instructors. The first five minority field instructors contacted made an immediate commitment. However, 24 contacts were required to get commitments from five non-minority field instructors, and the instructor making the fifth commitment was the tenth contractors, mentioned previously,

who failed to appear.

The primary sources of data were obtained from the seminar participants. Much of the data collection relied on the pretest and the post-test to channel information about the seminar participants and their knowledge base regarding minority content both before and after the seminar. Logs were kept by the participants and by the seminar leader. In the latter case the log tracked stages of implementation, timing, critical incidents, changes in the milieu, loss of participants, if any, and personal thoughts and feelings. The logs submitted by the participants recorded data related to student contact and supervision, that interaction with each other, their feedback to me, and their impressions of the seminar sessions.

Certificates acknowledging their participation in an advanced field instructors' seminar were given to each of the participants at the final session (see Appendix H for certificate).

Time Phases and Faculty Responsibilities

The pretest and the post-test were designed to encompass the following subjects:

a. Seminar content;

b. Recruitment of the participants;

c. Contractual arrangements;

d. Selection of reading materials;

e. Exercises;

f. Obtaining equipment (tapes and a tape recorder);

g. Developing the content outline for each seminar session.

The fieldwork faculty at the School was apprised during a department meeting of the nature, content, format and structure of the seminar. A process for handling participant concerns and filtering information back to the seminar leader was established. That is, if one of the participants voiced a seminar-related concern to a faculty member, he or she was to inform the field instructor that the matter would be told to the seminar leader. At the same time, the faculty member would encourage the participant to voice the matter with the seminar leader at the next seminar session. Orientation with the administrative assistant to the Director of Field Instruction was perceived as crucial, for she bore major responsibility for carrying out seminar-related administrative tasks.

The overall study was composed of three stages: the seminar, the work stage including implementation and monitoring (see Chapter III), data collection, and analysis. Final reporting (see Chapter IV).

Implementation of the seminar required that both the seminar leader and her administrative assistant absent themselves from some of their normal duties in the Department of Field Instruction. This requirement resulted in an additional cost to the School of Social Work because other faculty and staff were assigned to their jobs as needed on a temporary basis. This cost was compensated for, however, by the seminar which provided strong linkage between the School and the practice community--the teaching agencies. The support of the Assistant Director of Field Instruction was essential particularly in those instances where additional short-term responsibilities were delegated to her.

Evaluation Strategy

The evaluation strategy was designed to explore whether the program produced the desired outcome of increased knowledge about minority content and increased teaching skill--the ability to analyze and communicate the content to the students.

The Pretest and the Post-Test

Five test cases were developed for the pre- and post-tests (see Chapter III). Each case covered intervention related to environmental stress, economics, health, religion and other major issues. Institutional racism was also an identifiable element in these cases. Two of the cases comprised the pretest measurement. The selection of the two pretest cases was based on their containing a greater amount of information. The other three cases covered the relevant issues, but in a more compact, less detailed fashion. EAch field instructor received an identical set of cases. The field instructors, on the answer sheet, had to identify the problem(s): (1) assess the problem; (2) suggest what knowledge was needed to effect successful interventions; (3) specify the type of intervention needed; and (4) discuss the minority content to be taught in relation to the case.

The final item (5) instructed the participant to rate the knowledge acquired in the seminar on a scale ranging from most important to least important as it related to the case. This entry was judged to be tenuous and subjective. Thus, the participants' responses were excluded from the final evaluation.

The participants' logs were submitted twice, first at the midpoint of eight weeks and then at the end of the seminar. Content analysis of the logs were used to evaluate the content and process. In sum, there were two principal sources of information to be evaluated--the case vignettes and the logs.

Two judges, considered by the seminar leader to be experts in fieldwork practice with Black clients, were selected by the seminar leader to assist her in the analysis. The three evaluators separately, and then in concert, agreed on model responses against which the participants' responses would be measured. The model responses identified specific items. Although the participants might identify a number of general areas, the focus was on essentials. The overall adequacy of the responses was based on the number of correct or like responses. Obviously, the seminar leader's teaching methodology also was under scrutiny in the log evaluations and in the tape recordings made of each session.

The two experts were selected because of their long practice experience and because their professional skills were familiar to, and respected by, the seminar leader. Both Black, one was female, and the other male. They were both on the School faculty and had taught social work content relevant to preparation for work in the Black community. One of the experts was, in fact, the coordinator of the six session concentrated course on Black Life Styles at the School and was responsible for the integration of minority content into the School's formal academic curriculum. Their expertise was recognized in the School as well as in other professional circles.

Outcome Measures

The choice of measures for evaluating outcome was quite critical. The possibilities for measurement in fact never exhausted the actual measures that could be viewed as relevant to meeting the study's goals. One might surmise that the decision about what constitutes an outcome measure often is based on feasibility. For example, the goal of increasing teaching skills ideally should have been measured over a longer period and included testing the social work students at the end of their placements with the field instructor seminar participants. Too, under ideal circumstances, such as a larger evaluation staff and staff assistants, there might have been ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the field instructors' supervision and teaching, including a followup sample with a another group of students.

The restricted outcome measures for this project were designed to test whether the study's specific goals had been achieved. The independent variable was the seminar while the dependent variable was the participants' increased knowledge about Black clients reflected in their increased ability to describe, analyze and communicate pertinent information. In other words, the study's presumed causal variable was the seminar while the presumed effects were increased teaching skills and increased knowledge.

Antecedent and Intervening Variables

Important subvariables included the personalities of the field instructors, the seminar leader's ability to evaluate her way of teaching with different kinds of learners, the seminar leader's ability to be open and to share new knowledge with the field instructors, the ability of seminar leader and participants to be co-learners, and the ability to communicate effectively.

A host of antecedent variables were perceived as impacting on the seminar participants. Examples included prior knowledge about supervision or teaching of minority content to students gained through the field instructor's personal supervisory experience, a previous workshop, seminar, or staff meeting, which focused on the teaching of minority content, the field instructors' reading in professional journals, discussions with peers; or some other form of learning in their professional development. Weiss (1972, pp.47-49) defines intervening variables as those which concerned the implementation of the program, linking parts of the program to desired effects. She identifies the latter step as "bridging variables".

The seminar leader perceived that intervening variables could include frequency of exposure, that is, the eight-week consecutive seminar compared to one which might have run, say, for fourteen

weeks, the degree of acceptance by the field instructor participants, the attitudes of the participants and how they felt about attendance, that is, whether they felt coerced or free to volunteer, and the seminar atmosphere and leadership continuity.

Hence, as suggested by the examples cited above, the seminar leader was aware that a host of variables existed which could conceivably affect the outcome of the study. Thus, the overall assessment effort in the study was qualified by constraints on assessing and refining the gross outcome effects, both those generated by the seminar and those generated by variables such as the ones described above.

Assessment of Teaching Skill: The Student Cases

Review of Field Instructors discussion of the "student case" used for seminar discussions was one way of evaluating the seminar's impact on increased teaching ability. This case, too, included all of the relevant minority content issues. The case method afforded the participants an opportunity to discuss techniques and methods that could be used in teaching the content. In the seminar sessions they described and analyzed the information about the development and behavior of the clients in the case. Furthermore, the case method allowed the participants to identify student learning patterns, making a professional assessment in the light of a supported supervisory plan. Again, this was a measurement that yielded gross outcome indicators.

Individual responses to the student cases were assessed in conjunction with the recorded responses on the pre- and post-test instruments. Although each field instructor had to respond to some aspects of the case, not all possible content areas had to be addressed by each participant. The student case, however, provided an opportunity for the seminar leader to encourage open-ended debate. One would do well to remember that the effects of hearing how others responded, of studying the case, and consulting with peers and colleagues outside of the seminar may have influenced the outcome.

Another method of evaluation was the participants' own student cases. Their responses to specific questions about changes in their teaching styles and comments in their logs about use of minority content in supervision of students were additional outcome measures. Since there was no opportunity to directly observe their supervision of students, these self-reports were relied on.

In summary, then, the participants' outcome measures for increased knowledge were based on scores, compiled by judging the participants' responses against model responses, as mentioned previously, in the pre- and post-tests. More specifically, the gross outcome in increased ability to describe, analyze, and communicate the minority content taught in the seminar were measured by the analysis of the following:

a. The student case.

b. Their own student cases presented in the seminar.

c. Responses to questions about the shifts in their teaching of the content.

d. The comments in the logs about the use of minority content material in supervision.

As we shall discover in Chapter IV, attention is paid to the process of role-modeling. The assessment was based on a descriptive analysis of the process as gleaned from the participants' logs, the tape recordings, and log entries by the seminar leader about the process for herself as well as how it seemed to be inculcated by the participants.

Finally, the participants were asked to note in their final log entries what they felt about the seminar generally as well as what was most and least helpful to learning, particularly in relation to the discrete curriculum units.

Evaluation

The study evaluation process included both the judgment of the seminar leader regarding participants' responses to the seminar as well as a systematic process of evaluation. Both the general process of the seminar and its stated objectives were evaluated. The statistical measure used was a nonparametric test for determining the direction and significance of change from the pretest to the post-test.

The seminar was evaluated on two major levels: the acquisition of knowledge and the impact on individual participant behavior as evidenced by how the participants acted on the information and knowledge they received. Other evidence used in the evaluation included feedback from the fieldwork faculty at the School about what they heard from the field instructors concerning the seminar. Feedback from the faculty concerning their responses about the

ideas that the seminar leader shared with them was also sought.

There was, of course, considerable room for individual judgments by the seminar leader and the participants. Although these judgments were subject, as seen previously, to many influences or variables, they were also a measurement for assessing the seminar's outcome. These judgments will be evaluated in the content analysis of the logs and tape recordings presented in Chapter III. Needless to say, seminar atten ance was regarded as critical to the evaluation for anything less than full participation was perceived as undermining the objectives of the study.

The seminar design was perceived as being firm and consistent in its theoretical perspective and in the opportunity it afforded for replication. In regard to theory, Weiss has stated:

> One of the most important elements in producing a useful evaluation is locating the study in a theoretical perspective. Programs are expected work because they meet needs, affect processes, set events in motion... There has to be some reason - some theoretical justiciation to expect a program to succeed. As we make assumptions explicit and test the linkages from step to step, we begin to accumulate knowledge that is usable and transferable to a variety of program settings (Weiss, 1972, p. 84).

Thus, one might tentatively conclude that the initiation of program should always be based on need and supported by theoretical underpinnings. Various educational theories, for example, are the foundation for the methodology of teaching.

In regard to replication, the seminar design and content were conceived as being replicable in whole or in part. The curriculum units could be reordered, limited, or expanded. Each curriculum unit contained sufficient content for in-depth examination, and

therefore more time could be scheduled by another seminar leader. This program can be replicated for a similar target population, but the number of participants cannot be substantially increased. Interaction was an essential component and would be jeopardized by a marked increase in the number of participants.

Furthermore, one might hypothesize that the seminar outcome and evaluation might be useful to other professionals such as agency staff. In other words, it is hoped that the seminar model and the present study, prove useful as a training guide for cross-cultural content related to other racial minority and ethnic groups.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

In Chapter III, our statistical analysis will indicate the differences between and highlight the individual performance of each field instructor. In regard to the social characteristics of the field instructors, as described in Chapter II, the following can be noted:

a. The least experienced (FI 1, with 5 years' experience) of the group made no gains from the pretest to the post-test.

b. The most experienced (FI 2, with 33 years' experience) made the highest gain of the group, +17.

c. The non-minority male (FI 3 with 10 years' experience) made a high gain of +11.

d. The minority male (FI 5 with approximately the same experience, 9 years) made the least amount of gain of all of the participants, +6, except for FI 1.

e. The overall total gain (d_1) of the non-minority field instructors was +49, and for the minority field instructors the total gain was +24. The non-minority field instructors made twice as much gain as the minority field instructors. Yet, both groups, the non-minority (2, 3, 4, 8) and the minority (5, 6, 7, 9) had very similar pretest scores--62 and 65, respectively.

f. No relationships emerged in regard to age in the pretest and post-test response differences.

Structure and Scoring

Both the pretest and post-test were structured as 13-item questionnaires with the first 12 questions given a value of 1 point each, and the last question a value of 5 points for a possible total score

of 17.

The responses for the pretest and the post-test were measured against the experts' model responses. The Wilcoxin, non-parametric, matched-pairs signed-ranks test was used (Seigle, 1956, p. 75). This tests for the direction of the differences within pairs as well as the magnitude of the difference (see Table A, A_1).

On both the pretest and post-test questions 1 through 4 had 4 possible responses, a through d, under each category. Hence the total possible score for each category was 4, and because the last question, 4, related specifically to the minority content taught, and it did not require a specific number of responses, it was given a possible maximum score of 5. The scoring rationale was based on assigning a score of one for each correct response. Specifically, participant responses were measured in the light of the experts' model responses.

Two cases (B family and Mrs. T.) constituted the pretest; three cases (Ben, Edward, Frank) constituted the post-test. The combined scores of the three post-test cases, resulted in the scores described in Table A. The original project design required three cases for both the pre- and post-test. However, since Mrs. T.'s case was long and involved, it was regarded as equivalent to two of the shorter vignettes.

TABLE A

FIELD INSTRUCTORS' KNOWLEDGE REGARDING MINORITY CONTENT

*FI Number	Pretest	Post-Test	d_1
1	20	20	0
2	11	28	+17
3	13	24	+11
4	18	27	+ 9
5	15	21	+ 6
6	23	30	+ 7
7	17	24	+ 7
8	20	32	+12
9	10	24	+14

*Field Instructor

TABLE A_1

d_1	Rank of Unsigned d_1	Signed Rank
+17	8	+8
+11	5	+5
+ 9	4	+4
+ 6	3	+3
+ 7	5	+1.5
+ 7	5	+1.5
+12	6	+6
+14	7	+7
		T=36

Wilcoxin Test

T=36, N=8, supported a basic hypothesis of the seminar, namely, that the post-test scores would be higher because of the training. The T of 36 is significantly higher than the 4 regarded as the .025

level of significance in a one-tailed test. Therefore, another hypothesis--that the substantive knowledge would increase significantly after the training seminar--was supported.

It seemed important to analyze the qualitative difference because value is accorded to depth of knowledge as well as the breadth of one's knowledge base in a substantive area. In our analysis the quality of responses also demonstrated a change. See Appendix C and G for the pretest and post-test cases together with the respective model responses.

The Nature of the Quality of Responses

Table B below reflects the shifts in the responses from the pretest to the post-test and represents the general overview regarding the participants' responses to each question. The responses to the categories of questions were analyzed according to three levels--general/global, adequate, and specific and comprehensive. Each question required at least four responses. The responses were identified in one of the three areas and reflect the category of response rather than the actual score. Specific responses were regarded as the best responses in that they were closest to the model responses; adequate responses were deemed acceptable and were similar to the model responses, although not as refined; and general/global responses were the least acceptable. While a field instructor might receive a point for a general/global response, it was because of accuracy and not adequacy. Illustrations of categorical comments might include:

a. General/global: those responses that address broad notions and principles of practice which are considered basic to social work practice. Responses like environmental stress, multiple stress, economics, depression, need for counseling, etc., are ones that do not identify specificity in relation to a client and, in particular, to a Black client. They lack depth.

b. Adequate: those responses that were similar to the model responses and, although not as specific as the model responses, were more specific than the general/global category. They tended to deal more with depth than breadth, and included content that had a closer connection to the case vignette. Responses like complete evaluation of the child's learning problems, health problems such as lead poisoning, and abuse of alcohol, exploration of the housing problem of the family and its contribution to the child's problems--all add an additional dimension beyond the single concepts of housing, health, or school problems.

c. Specific and comprehensive: those responses that are most like the model responses. They include the essential concepts, and are specific and comprehensive because they cover a range of issues, some of which may be very obvious to the practitioner and others more subtle which may become obvious if viewed in light of the minority experience. They are the responses that encompass the problem, the contributing factors, and the positives, if evident. These responses include needing to assess the individual and family dynamics, and to be careful in discerning the inner and external influences, seeing the mother's response to multiple stress and loss--husband's incapacities as a sexual partner and breadwinner, etc.--understanding the dynamics of the upwardstriving Black family, Black males and the value placed on "being a man," and the possible significance in light of historical concitions--such as torn from families--and identifying the strengths in the family suffering from multiple assaults.

Question one concerned assessment of the problem, question two had to do with intervention, and question three was a knowledge-base question. The fourth question required the identification of the minority content to be taught in relation to the case vignette.

TABLE B

OVERALL QUALITATIVE RESPONSES TO THE PRETEST AND POST-TEST

*Category of FI Response	Pretest					Post-Test				
	1	2	3	4	T	1	2	3	4	T
General/ Global	18	8	8	4	45	15	4	8	3	30
Adequate	15	20	21	7	63	32	28	21	9	[illegible]0
Specific and Comprehensive	18	3	12	20	53	28	41	21	29	119

*Categories of responses to questions 1-4. T=total.

Table B does not consider the individual changes in the responses from the pre- to the post-test. Some of these impressions are considered below.

a. There was generally a slight decrease in the category of general/global responses from the pre- to the post-test. Response to question one, however, remained essentially the same and may have been a function of the general nature of the question.

b. There was generally an increase in the adequate responses from the pre- to the post-test. Question two, however, remained essentially the same. In the discussion of the responses on page 69 , it is noted that the preciseness seemed improved, although the number of responses may not have increased. A response could be judged adequate but may have lacked sufficient specificity to fall into the specific and comprehensive category.

c. The greatest change in all responses was in the specific and comprehensive category. The greatest change in this category was in the response to question two from the pre- to the post-test.

d. The responses to questions one, two on assessment and intervention demonstrated more change from the pre- to the post-test than did the responses to question three regarding knowledge.

These shifts can only be reported as above. Although one might speculate on the significance of the shifts described above, the relevant data are insufficient for analysis and discussion because of factors described earlier on page 67. These factors may also have had an impact on the outcome--that is, the intervening variables, familiarity with the instrument, and the recognition of wanting to link the events of the program to the desired effects. Nonetheless, Table B offers an overview of the judgments made in the analysis of content.

Discussion of the Nature of the Qualitative Responses

In the pretest, the case of Mrs. T. offered comprehensive information and sought responses that were related to health, welfare, and systems (housing, legal) as well as the internal pressures that manifested themselves in Mrs. T.'s drinking. A major theme concerned the impact of poverty, unemployment and lack of opportunity on inner-city minority groups--the environmental and situational issues. If in the responses there lacked the specificity around the assessment, intervention, or knowledge base about the minority content to be taught, then the expectation was that the responses would at least reflect the major themes identified above: the movement from breadth to depth was regarded as a positive qualitative change.

Generally, the five participants who scored high on the pre-test--that is, their scores were 9 to 13 out of a possible score of 17--identified the issues mentioned with some specificity. The highest score, 13, for question 1, had all of the correct responses whole the other four participants had 2 out of a possible 4 identified

as the model responses. When one compares these same five participants and their post-test responses for question 1, it is evident in the case of Edward, which suggests the same problems, that although the scores were lower ranging from 8 to 11 out of a possible score of 17, the quality of the responses was equal in regard to specificity. Each participant in question 1 received a score of 3 out of a possible 4 and correctly identified all but one of the model responses. The specificity of responses was more consistent in regard to the post-test than evidenced in the pretest, exhibiting a degree of sensitivity and subtlety to minority content not found in the pretest.

Question 1 concerns the problems which should be identified by the social worker. One participant, in response to the case of Mrs. T., identified a problem as "response to multiple stress by return to drinking"; in the post-test case of Edward that same participant identified a problem as the "mother's response to the apparent loss of supports; husband's death by violence; no adult family available; isolation in the community; large family with severe financial limitation; physical problems of self and child; poor housing." Clearly, the response to similar issues moved from the global to the discernible, addressing those areas that were often common to the disadvantaged minority family. The seminar leader was careful to make a point of the need to make distinctions between minority content related to cultural behaviors and some of the socioeconomic variables that get identified as "minority content." The environmental stresses, for example, that occur in the case of Mrs. T. do occur in disproportionate number among minority group life experiences. The seminar focused on

demographic data and some of the distinctions related to race, class and poverty.

Another participant, in the pretest case of Mrs. T., identified housing as a problem and in the post-test case of Edward identified the mother as "overwhelmed (depressed) by the environment and her situation, but still is managing six other children who generally are doing well." The response addressed the strengths as well as the realities of the problem.

As noted previously, the seminar did have a major point to make, namely, the need to be particularly mindful of the strengths of Black families. These strengths can be better appreciated when Black families are assessed on the basis of the often onerous stress under which they must function and when pathological behavior is analyzed by noting both external contributing factors and factors rooted in intrapsychic turmoil and conflict.

One might tentatively conclude, then, that the seminar content generated an enhanced appreciation of balanced intervention. In addition the seminar participants were better prepared to ask, and to answer, a central question regarding Black clients and their families: How well has the family or individual performed adaptive tasks?

Another participant, in response to question 2--What interventions should be made?--answered in the B family pretest that one of the interventions should be to "work with parents." In the case of Ben post-test the same participant responded by writing of "counseling for the parents around their own relationship 'at this time', including the problem of their sexual adjustment, but also around their

expectations of Ben as the only Black male child in the family and what they wished and expected for him as a Black male." Here, one might tentatively conclude, on the basis of the two answers, that the participant's sensitivity toward Black families had increased during the seminar.

Question 3 sought responses about the participants' conceptualization of the knowledge needed for effective work with the clients and situations described in the case vignettes. In the pretest case of Mrs. T., the model responses included knowing about alcoholism, principles of advocacy, necessary resources, and collaborative work with insensitive service delivery systems as well as how to identify the strengths of a Black family. In addition, there was to be an understanding of "blaming the victim," a frequent consequence of insufficient knowledge.

One participant revealed in-depth knowledge about intrapsychic issues. Yet this same respondent earned a perfect score in the last question, which focused on the minority content to be taught in the case. While the gap between the two responses was curious, perhaps striking, one should not necessarily draw even tentative conclusions from such an ephemeral difference. The remaining responses, particularly those who had the highest scores, were unremarkable. Most participants got at least two out of four correct. One, the highest scorer, identified all of the knowledge needed and the quality of the responses was comparable to the model responses.

The qualitative difference in the post-test was insignificant, that is, the responses to the knowledge question were comparable to

those in the pretest. There seemed little, if any, change demonstrated in regard to detail or specificity in the responses to the other questions. When a response was judged against the model response, both were quite similar. The number of adequate responses was less on question 3, but the adequate responses were specific and dealt with the essentials. However, one interesting variation was that the responses on assessment (question 1) and intervention (question 2) seemed to change with the participants' seminar training--more so than in question 3, regarding the knowledge needed to work with the case.

Four participants received the lowest scores on the pretest ranging from 2 to 7 out of a possible score of 17. Interestingly, their profiles were not atypical of the entire group. For example, one participant was unable to answer more than two questions in the case of Mrs. T., and needed considerable encouragement to answer the questions on the B. family in the pretest. Essentially, the participant felt that time and information were inadequate, and they seemed threatened by the knowledge tests. However, two among this group represented the highest gain recorded among all participants in the pretest/post-test comparison (+17 and +14).

The qualitative changes demonstrated by this group of four were comparable to the scores of participants who scored higher. For example, the B. family pretest and the case of Ben post-test addressed very similar issues regarding marriage; child-rearing patterns in Black families; expectations for Black male children; systemic issues related to schools and health-care agencies; the impact of disabilities on family functioning; and the need to make distinctions between

genuine pathology and varying cultural patterns. Regarding the B family, the participants were able to appreciate the need for assessment of the parents' divergent views on raising the son and exploring possible racism in the school and community that might impact on his behavior.

In the case of Ben, the assessment responses emphasized problem identification in the light of minority status and family strengths. The "hustling" of the father, for example, was viewed as a coping mechanism, a way for him to deal with lack of opportunity and economic discrimination. The point was not to ignore or pass judgment, but to understand the behavior in the context of the Black experience. In general there was sensitivity to the more subtle issues rather than emphasizing of broad categories. Some responses dealt with the need for assessment of family as well as individual dynamics. There was an effort to assess specifics regarding mother, father, Ben and adolescent siblings including the mother's response to multiple stress and loss, her husband's incapacities as a sexual partner and bread winner, her need for physical care, and the children's demands in response to the crisis. Furthermore, some responses focused on the need to address the adolescent girl's feelings toward Ben and to either clarify or dispel the myths surrounding the family's problems. In the post-test specificity regarding problem identification and intervention was generally improved.

A similar pattern can be traced in regard to intervention. The group of four seemed to differ with participants who scored higher in the quantity of responses--they had fewer responses with more

overlapping. For example, in the post-test case of Ben a model intervention would have been to explore and investigate his condition, that is, his reactive behavior including the impact of his father's accident and subsequent disability. Here, some responses were judged to be credited as one adequate response. In other words, an intervention identified as, say, "(1) some investigation as to how Ben was classified, and (2) exploration of his behavior problems," was not regarded as discrete.

Question 3 pretest responses for these participants tended to be less conceptual in nature than those responses given by higher-scoring participants. For example, the model responses identified in regard to the B. family included the need for knowledge about child development, dynamics of upward-striving Black families, expectations regarding performance for the young boy, and community resource systems and family supports. The four participants focused on knowing more about the boy's academic and behavior patterns. In this case they were less concerned, apparently, about the concepts of child development as a way of understanding family difficulties. They focused on economic stress as opposed to the model response of understanding the dynamics of upward-striving Black families. Some post-test responses demonstrated a similar pattern. One might tentatively conclude that these results might reflect on the very nature of teaching--what teaching methods would be more suitable to encourage the kind of learning needed here.

Concerning question 4, each participant was awarded one point for each accurate response up to a total of five points.* In the pretest

*Table A should be used to identify the participants.

for FI 1, the overall score did not change and some of the clues for this lack of change were evident in the logs as well as in the seminar participation. For the most part FI 1's resistance seemed to be centered on not fully agreeing on the seminar "contract," that is, what the seminar should be about. As there was no evidence of change this respondent was not represented in the Wilcoxin test. Generally, one can say that this participant's response to question 4 was best of all the responses. The responses to the other questions lacked balance between inner and outer forces, and understanding of them was based more on individual dynamics with little or no emphasis on system issues.

FI 2's pretest on Mrs. T. showed no response whatsoever to question 4. On the B family, the minority content to be taught stated "what it is to be Black and middle-class," which did not address, either generally or specifically, the substantive content to be taught. The post-test responses by FI 2--although not as extensive as the model responses--indicated growth in the identification of content vis-a-vis adaptations and survival skills of Black families, male/female roles and relationships, and the impact of minority, lower-class status on family life.

FI 3's written responses complimented his seminar discussions. The pretest responses emphasized (one might even say overemphasized) in the direction of the systems that effect minorities. There was resistance to considering a balance between internal and external influences. The individual was minimized and the situation emphasized. One might view the pretest and post-test responses as having been

closer to the ecological perspective. In the case of Ben, for example, there was no response to the fourth question and the response to the other post-test had a strong systems perspective--"systems fail people; the emphasis needs to be on changing systems, not people." The participant did not deviate significantly in either breadth or depth from this fixation.

In the case of FI 4, the responses in the pretest addressed only a single issue, demonstrated no view toward the gestalt and, therefore, were inadequate. The post-test responses were considerably broader and, although a single issue was addressed, were better developed and included several important components. The change was illustrative of FI 4's heightened sensitivity. To move from a response to the B family of "how a Black family living in a white community can be made to be isolated" to a response in the post-test case of Frank of "the importance of teaching about the concept of the extended family and what the loss of it can mean; how overwhelming the move from southern culture to an urban inner city can be; how helpless our society and its systems made her feel in dealing with her life; isolation brought on by new factors . . . " The lesson learned seems to be one of "attending to," that is, of allowing practice to take on a dual perspective for self as an important dimension for teaching.

FI 5's pretest responses were broad. For example, the teaching content was identified as "reaction of minorities to horrendous conditions," and the "commonality of some experiences for minorities." The latter response did offer, without specificity, an appreciation

of patterns of experience related to social injustice in the lives of minorities, particularly the poor. Although the post-test was not as clearly articulated as responses from some other participants, there was nevertheless a change toward identifying specific content to be taught. One might summarize this change by noting the participant's attention to not-so-obvious assaults of systems (real and potential), the extended family, the high achievement orientation of some families, and, in general, a heightened sensitivity to the many variables, both positive and negative, that have special meaning and significance within the Black experience.

FI 6's pretest and post-test responses exhibited a high level of conceptualization and knowledge about minority content and what ought to be taught. In fact, the responses to the pretest case of Mrs. T. received a perfect score, the only seminar participant to achieve a perfect score on that case. The answers were particularly keen in regard to specificity of understanding: to define content in terms of language (Black jargon) and its use in Black life-styles was regarded as a very sophisticated response. FI 6's minority content to be taught concerning religion and its use in Black families was another high-level response. The responses here were, if not unique, certainly on a level of distinction which set them apart.

The pretest responses for FI 7 were low: only one adequate response in one case, and in another two adequate responses, both stated rather vaguely. Post-test responses did not change substantially, although the clarity was improved. The answers dealt with the nuances of the Black experience and the exacerbation of problems

because of minority status.

FI 8's pretest and post-test responses demonstrated a high degree of knowledge. Pretest responses on question 4 evidenced sensitivity to minority content which, one might reasonably conclude, came from sound practice based on fundamental principles and values of the profession. FI 8 seemed, in the post-test responses, to express a deepened understanding in identifying specific content related to Black family life such as family roles, insensitive systems, institutional racism and its implications, and family strengths. The focus on family dynamics and the family system perspective was pronounced. The seminar's emphasis on family strengths and the potential ability of the family to handle its tasks was reflected in this participant's response.

In regard to FI 9, the pretest responses were of a general nature not specifically related to minority content. They addressed the importance of dealing with concrete issues and emotional problems. In the case of the B family, the responses focused on the importance of advocacy and the liaison role of the social worker. In the post-test, both the quality and quantity of responses improved. Some responses compared favorably to the model responses: survival skills, myths held by some Blacks, stereotypes about Blacks, educational aspirations and the strengths of Black families. In summary, very positive change from the pretest responses.

Overall, the qualitative changes noted in the responses support the major hypotheses concerning the impact of the training program on the field instructors' knowledge base.

Log Analysis

The logs were used as a tool for describing part of the process as well as the participants' responses to the content on three levels--affective, cognitive and operational (practice). Papell studied individual differences in the learning styles of MSW students engaged in the study of direct social work practice. She found that the students needed to be engaged at the thinking-feeling-doing levels of functioning with their clients. This need was assumed in regard to the field instructors in the present study, even though the study did not focus on learning styles. However, Papell's concepts seemed very useful, as did Berengarten's (1957) identification of learning patterns for conceptualizing a way to analyze the seminar logs. Using what she described as a "cognition information processing conceptual framework," Papell defined learning style as the patterned arrangement of three modes of cognitive activity: affective, cognitive and operational (Papell, 1978, p. 1). Berengarten, in a similar way, refers to the intellectual-empathic learner, the doer, and the experiential learners.

The first set of logs was submitted in the fourth session. The information requested consisted of a description of the agency, its purpose, service delivery pattern and the nature of the community served. These brief descriptions were important in highlighting, both for the participants and the leader, the context in which practice takes place, and the significant proportion of minority clients who are being served. All of the populations represented more than 50 percent American Blacks with Hispanics, Italian Catholics, and other

ethnic and racial groups. Most of the clients served were impoverished or working-class poor.

While each log did not specifically address the three kinds of activity mentioned earlier, it was helpful to analyze the logs with these activities as the framework. Thus, all comments were labeled as a thinking (cognitive), feeling (affective), or doing (operational) response to the seminar. Some comments were combinations of the three activities, that is, some field instructors discussed a cognitive matter and its use for themselves and for teaching students.

The logs belonging to FI 1 reflected no gains from the pre- to the post-test. However, they expressed an enormous amount of feeling, almost all of it angry. This participant never really "bought," or was convinced, that the seminar was a valid activity in respect to feelings. This participant believed that the seminar lacked sufficient focus on feelings and attitudes. She carried throughout the sessions her own restricted agenda--"I am extremely tired of having to sensitize . . . " She felt the group was most engaged during the case presentations (the looking at and considering of practice/supervision). The final log commented, for example, on the excellence of the reading material, acknowledging, albeit slightly, the value of the substantive content: "Furious at how the subtleties of racism played out in the group and went unacknowledged." This participant was the only seminar member who did not feel that people struggled; rather FI 1 felt that the "group was allowed to be too safe." The logs seemed to imply that affective behavior was the most rational way to understand and/or change. In summary, the participant's behavior was petulant. There is an unexplored issue around the role that a minority person

plays in a group such as this and is commented on in the guidelines in Chapter IV. In some instances FI 1 seemed so angry that she simply could not make helpful or productive comments. One can tentatively conclude, then, that this was a person who learned and perhaps taught experientially, who pushed for articulation of feelings, and defined resistance in others as not learning or teaching in the same way.

FI 2's comments consistently dealt with cognitive material. This participant presented an exploration and critical analysis of the readings distributed in the seminar. The analysis of the articles gave "food for thought" to this participant. Some material was deemed immediately useful in supervising students (the operational). The log indicated that some articles were designed to enhance the students' knowledge base while others were used to helping the students understand interventions in relation to the content. The log comments stressed the importance of thinking and doing for the student, and supporting what was taught in class by integrating it in the practice experience. In the practice of supervision, this participant was increasingly mindful of the need to encourage students to integrate thinking and doing. The participant made only a few affective comments, responding much more often in a cognitive and cognitive-operational manner. The few affective comments were concerned with how the participant felt about the literature--how the literature reawakened a sensitivity toward minorities.

In the final log submitted at the end of the seminar, FI 2 commented: " . . . found the seminar enriching and stimulating . . . resulting in increased awareness and sensitivity to the content . . . written material excellent . . . tools for teaching driven home--the

levels of learning, and the use of the dual perspective." The final log was quite descriptive when affective comments were made and when the operationalizing of learning was discussed. The usefulness of the seminar in regard to student teaching was emphasized as was personal growth vis-a-vis self-awareness and insight. There were references to cognitive learning, but much less often than in the first log. The log ended with the following: "This is not as easy to do as evidenced by own feelings at putting own work and awareness 'on the table for inspection'." With her final log the participant submitted a paragraph from a book, Black Women in White America, "which shows that the dual perspective is not the tool of only our field." In analyzing this log one can appreciate the impact the seminar had on the thinking-feeling-doing behavior of the participant.

Fl 3's first log can be described as being rather consistent with this participant's behavior in the seminar. There was an overall response to the seminar, especially a greater regard for the experiential component of learning. The log addressed the positive aspects of group exercises--the presentations and discussion of the student/supervisor material. Reference was made to the excellence of the reading material. The impact seemed to emphasize the affective and operational levels of response. For example, "the exercises were good, made one think...I enjoyed the exercise," or "I feel a need to support my students more...students need to experience institutional racism...need to visit and observe the systems that fail minorities ... ." In the final log Fl 3 comments that "these sessions were good in terms of self-analysis, but they stirred up lots of painful feelings

and I came away from them with lots of anger." The comments reflected thought about systems including a lack of hope for changing them. In addition there was a strong assertion concerning the "unrealness" of some non-minority participants. Overall, then, the tone and quality of both logs were focused on affective responses to the experience.

The comments in both of Fl 4's logs centered on the affective and operational. This participant moved quickly to the practice component, first, in the supervision of the students, and, second (perhaps too quickly), to the duplication of some seminar work with agency staff members. The thinking-feeling-doing relationship was most evident in these logs. For example, an entry in the last log stated that "overall reactions are mixed...this has been hard work in many ways...but has also been quite stimulating...sharpens up thinking, too often we are apt to fall back on the familiar sterotypic kind of thinking and not really look at things carefully." Other comments referred to in-depth self-analaysis and the influence of attitudes that might impede learning and subsequent teaching of the material. The concept of the dual perspective was, for this participant, important and highly useful. The logs reflected a tremendous demand for learning and performance intertwined with the struggle to gain awareness and understanding of the participant's own behavior and feelings.

Not unlike Fl's behavior in the seminar, the logs of this participant reflected a very thoughtful and orderly mind. There was in both logs an emphasis on cognitive activity and knowledge to be gained. The readings were portrayed as very useful. This participant

brought a high level of conceptualization and a background of varied experiences including international experience to the seminar. There was a sense of acquiring and using experiences in a meaningful way and an ability to make quick and useful associations. The log comments included the following: "Seminar to deal with minority concent for field instructors is an excellent idea, particularly since a large number of clients in this, and many other urban areas, will be minorities"; and "In order for many of the social workers to understand what racism is about, there must be some educational mechanism...which can provide the opportunity for learning about these phenomena." Overall, the log expressed many cognitive ideas.

In regard to Fl 6, the first log represented thinking responses, making associations, and specifying ways of integrating the content in class and field--the operational response. The participant used the content of the seminar with fieldwork students in an effort to sensitize them and to heighten their self-awareness. A characteristic comment: "Our seminar is most useful re: introducing concepts, fact, and feelings about work with minorities, but also useful re: techniques of supervision beyond the skills necessary for the beginning level." The log's major focus was on thinking and doing, reflecting an excellent ability to conceptualize and make connections between what was being taught and practiced. The final log included the statement that "Again, I really enjoyed the seminar--if that's the proper word for getting challenged and being made to grapple with tough thoughts and feelings. How to create an atmosphere in which content and affect are both approached vis-a-vis minority groups is a question I can't

answer. Your group worked because we were all connected to you; hence, we could take risks opening up..." (a comment supportive of the modeling process). Although the learning patterns of this participant were mostly cognitive and operational, it was obvious that feelings were challenged during the seminar.

Fl 7 seemed most impressed by the cognitive aspects. This participant felt the seminar, especially the readings, added a "cognitive reference to what has been primarily an emotional experience." The logs referred a great deal to affective activity, although there was an acknowledgement of the value of thinking. Feelings were primary for this participant. Where others could move from the feeling to the thinking, here the log comments typically were to query, "can I raise the emotional to a cognitive level as a supervisor?" It (the question) "is a challenge and a very worthwhile one at that." One might state with some degree of confidence that feelings, for this participant, seemed to have blocked learning. In fact, the pretest and post-test scores represented one of the low gains (+7).

There was a very positive response to the seminar on the part of Fl 8 and a number of log references to thinking and doing: "The seminar was extremely helpful as it structured and provided guidelines, both on a concrete level and experientially, through case material for moving in and beginning to integrate minority content into our teaching." There are references to the strengths of the seminar process, the beginning sense of group cohesiveness as important to learning. This participant felt grateful for what was

identified as a "jolt," and felt better prepared "intellectually, to work with the material," more attuned to self-awareness. From the log entries one can glean a sense of this participant being an intellectual, an empathetic learner who was curious, actively pursued the content and easily translated what was taught into practice. This participant brought to the seminar a high degree of understanding about the content and a very advanced level of practice.

Fl 9's logs addressed thinking and doing. The seminar discussions of material were used immediately with Fl 9's students, and some agency staff. The logs provided an opportunity to be self-reflective: "The seminar definitely raised my level of consciousness." The first log dealt almost exclusively with thinking about the substantive content; the final log continued in the same vein, but added an integrative element, a practice component and expressions of feeling. Furthermore, there was a suggestion of a need for more time and more specificity in the "doing". The last comment noted that "we all need to increase our knowledge and understanding of Black families, the impact of racism and personal prejudices, including an understanding of where they come from, to be both effective professionals and effective teachers."

Tables C and C_1 below chart the analyses, to this point, of the seminar participants' logs.

TABLE C

NUMBER* OF OCCURRENCES OF C/O/A ACTIVITY
AS REFLECTED IN THE LOGS

FI number	C	O	A	C/O	A/O	A/C
1	3	0	15	2	0	0
2	11	2	1	12	1	2
3	3	1	7	1	0	0
4	7	1	3	9	1	1
5	5	2	3	4	1	0
6	4	0	2	7	1	0
7	1	0	10	0	0	1
8	12	4	1	11	0	0
9	7	2	6	9	0	2

*The numbers represent every clearly stated activity that described the categories (c)-operational (O) affective (a) activity.

a. Those participants who emphasized conceptual/thinking activity were those who tended to learn and teach agency staff as well as the students. They used some replication of the seminar and material with the agency staff.

b. There were more indications of conceptual, operational and the combination of conceptual/operational than of any other possible combinations or single activity.

c. All participants had feelings about the seminar. In all, there was affective response to and about the learning.

d. Where the affectiveresponse was intense, the participants seemed to have more difficulty in thinking about the process and the doing. When they learned or responded in an affective way, they seemed to do less with the material.

e. All participants regarded the need for the seminar as important. Although there may have been differences about focus, there was agreement about the need for increased knowledge and enhanced sensitivity--the need for improved ability in knowing how to convey the material to students. The comments in the logs supported the goals of the program.

Table C_1 shows some of the major themes related to the cognitive, affective and operational references in the field instructors' logs:

a. The majority of the field instructors made frequent references to cognitive activity.

b. All of the field instructors referred to the knowledge and thinking regarding individual and institutional racism, the importance of knowledge for the planning of intervention and change on both the macro and micro levels, and thought that the seminar content concepts were needed and applicable for use with other minority groups.

c. Almost all of the field instructors (8) found the readings and the content about Black families critical to their learning.

d. All of the field instructors worked with, and thought it important to work with their students in developing self-awareness and eliminating color blindness.

e. Except for one, all field instructors worked with their students, or thought it important to work with students, in teaching them how to partialize the myriad issues that might arise in working with a poor minority client, and in teaching students how to make assessments based on discernible minority content factors.

f. In the area of the affective-global subjective reactions, the field instructors (8) reacted to the seminar as a jolting experience. They expressed fear about risking themselves in the group. In addition, they commented on having some of their own personal life experiences regarding minorities, or what they had been told about minorities, stirred up by the seminar discussions--it was upsetting to them.

The strong feelings that emerged will be discussed in Chapter IV.

It was common to discover comments in the logs about the use of cognitive material. Not infrequently, the material seemed to have pushed the participants to think and to react differently than the seminar leader intended. There were comments related to the changing of systems, of "society," of admissions policies and criteria for schools of social work, especially the kinds of students admitted.

TABLE C_1

FIELD INSTRUCTOR LOGS: ANALYSIS OF THEMES RELATED TO THE COA ACTIVITY REFERENCES

Major repetitive themes (Includes the combinations)	*F	O	R	T
Cognitive				
-readings from all curriculum units	4	3	1	8
-individual and institutional racism	8	1	-	9
-Dual Perspective	3	2	-	5
-personal prejudices; racial differences and biases	4	2	-	6
-Black families (strength, life-styles, coping, adaptation, etc.)	4	3	1	8
-use of case material and presentations	4	3	-	7
-determining specific minority content, dispelling myths, sterotypes	2	4	-	6
-importance of knowledge for planning intervention and change (macro-micro)	4	4	1	9
-overall seminar content concepts including the use for other groups	4	3	2	9
Operational				
-seminar as a model for teaching	2	1	1	4
-developing self-awareness in student including eliminating color blindness	5	4	-	9
-teaching Dual Perspective to students	5	1	-	6
-helping students to partialize and teaching assessment	3	4	1	8
-experiential learning opportunities	2	1	1	4
-focus on treatment issues readings with students	3	2	-	5
-use of minority content in agencies	2	1	-	-
Affective (global subjective reactions)				
-personal and group struggle	3	2	-	5
-angry	3	-	-	3
-impact of experiential exercise	4	-	1	5
-jolting experience; fear and or threat of risking; stirring up personal life experiences	5	2	1	8
-self-awareness	4	1	-	5
-stimulating and demand for learning	4	2	-	6
-feelings re: group members (positive and negative)	2	2	-	4

*F=frequent O=occasional R=rarely, reference to major repetitive themes. The numbers reflect the number of field instructors who made reference to the themes. T=total number of field instructors.

The participants expressed a need for curriculum development, a need to recruit minority students and related needs. Some reactions may have been the participants' way of distancing themselves from the more painful and individual issues, allowing them an opportunity to defend themselves against the anxiety that the material generated.

The Seminar Leader's Logs

For the most part, the themes described below were repeated consistently throughout the seminar. Therefore, it was unnecessary to categorize the activities as was done in Table C_1 for the field instructors. Although the same categories were applicable, the combinations of activities were sometimes less discrete and, therefore, are represented below by symbols.

Cognitive (c)

a. The initial and occasionally recurring thought regarding the seminar membership vis-a-vis color. What kind of response to the content if not a cross-racial group.

b. The impact of the leader's position as Director of Field Instruction on the participants.

c. Ongoing thoughts about assessment of the process, and the participants' motivation for learning.

d. Assessment regarding the emphasis and/or overemphasis on the project objectives.

e. Thoughts about the potential for reordering the curriculum units--for example, beginning with the dual perspective approach to practice.

f. Frequent attention to connections to be made between content, students, and the field instructor's teaching.

g. Issues regarding cross-racial interaction.

h. Frequent attention to the process of role modeling (c/o).

i. Frequent review of the content to be taught and how it ought to be presented in light of the seminar process.

Operational (O)

a. Monitoring of the process, making sure that what needs to happen happens.

b. Frequent activity in relation to handling the group process (c/o).

c. Keeping the process open, allowing conflicts to emerge.

d. Frequent push to focus on tasks and deal with content.

e. Frequent use of inductive teaching as a method in helping in the process of operationalizing the cognitive concepts (c/o).

f. The myriad activities critical to program implementation.

Affective (A)

a. Feelings that needed to be harnessed, those feelings that were too strong or too negative.

b. Positive feelings about the process and work with the participants.

c. Cyclical anxiety.

d. Material sometimes very painful.

e. Frequent and ongoing stress related to the combination of program implementation, covering the content areas, being organized and focused, yet spontaneous.

f. The feelings of excitement, stimulation and enthusiasm that remained throughout the seminar.

Summary

The analysis of data was done in two ways.

First, a non-parametric statistical test was used to show change and direction from the pretest to the post-test. The Wilcoxin

test supported the directional hypothesis that the post-test scores would be higher because of training. In addition to the Wilcoxin test, case illustrations were used to evaluate depth or qualitative changes. Generally, the qualitative content analysis suggested both an increase in knowledge regarding minority content, and in overall heightened sensitivity to the behavior of Black clients described in the case vignettes. Change was demonstrated in the participants' ability to articulate the minority content to be learned and taught to students. While uneveness was a factor in all responses, the post-test responses were directly related to seminar content.

Second, the logs were scrutinized for content and how the participants seemed to learn. Papell's concept of cognitive activity--conceptual, affective and operational--were used as the framework for the log analyses. The responses were, of course, as varied as the participants' personalities. Table B expressed the frequency of cognitive, operational and affective activity. Cognitive was defined as reading, thinking and reflecting, operational as practice, and affective as feeling.

If attendance was an indication of the seminar's usefulness, then one can safely conclude that it was highly useful. Of the nine participants, two were absent once and two twice. The other participants attended all sessions.

The seminar proposed a method of training that would, in a brief period, increase the participants' knowledge base regarding minority content. An increased ability to convey this knowledge was seemingly apparent in the post-test scores, in the log comments, and especially

in the seminar discussions. One should be mindful, however, that what people say about what they do and what they actually do are not necessarily synonomous. Certainly skill, or increased ability, is difficult to assess without written evidence or actual observation. However, one might also state that the teaching/learning process was well documented in the log analyses.

Informal feedback from the fieldwork faculty of the New York University School of Social Work was favorable. The faculty members had been prepared regarding questions that might be asked by the seminar participants. There were no conflicts in this regard insofar as the seminar leader was aware. Thus, an assumption can be made that questions were restricted to the seminar group or noted in the logs.

The method of teaching, addressing thinking, feeling and doing, seemed to be an important aspect of the teaching/learning process. Given the opportunity for intense emotional responses, it was reasonable to have kept a sharp focus on the cognitive and operational components of the task. Heightened sensitivity, self-reflection about bias and prejudice, and soul searching seemed to have been a universal outcome of the seminar experience. The temptation to either avoid or to deal exclusively with, the affective material suggested that one should be cautious about encouraging interchange on all levels and dealing solely with affective material in a brief experience.

The practice principles suggested in Chapter I served as guides to the objective. Learning the substantive content, for example, with a method whereby it can be conveyed was useful to the field instructors' work with the students.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the study discussed in the foregoing pages, an innovative seminar was designed, conducted and analyzed by the author, an Associate Professor and Director of Field Instruction at the New York University School of Social Work. The goals of the seminar were to, first, develop a model for teaching minority (Black) content to field instructors for integration into the traditional field experience, to enhance the field instructors' knowledge of minority content, and to increase the teaching skills. If these goals were achieved, then field instructors' knowledge about the crucial issues and concerns that impact on Black clients would be enhanced. In addition to their own increased effectiveness with Black clients, the field instructors would be better able to prepare social work students to work with Black clients. Implicit in the seminar design was the belief that the seminar experience could be generalizable to other ethnic or minority clients.

The study limitations were as follows:

a. There was a lack of assurance that the participants could function in a racially mixed group.

b. The seminar was designed and conducted by only one person.

c. The seminar leader may not have been aware of all qualified applicants.

d. The participants also were limited by the desire for a broad representation in regard to age, experience, race and sex.

e. The participants had to have been regarded highly by colleagues and supervisors for their professional abilities, and also regarded as being highly motivated in their job performance.

The program began in Feburary 1981 and consisted of eight two-hour sessions. Pretest and post-test measurements were used to assess the content knowledge base and the qualitative analysis of the seminar participants' and the leader's logs were used to evaluate both content and process. Teaching skills were defined operationally, that is, the concept of teaching skill in the seminar meant an enhanced ability to define, analyze and communicate information about the behavior, development, and experience of Black clients. The participants were expected to use the knowledge gained in the seminar effectively as demonstrated in their improved performances in the post-test measurements and in the seminar discussions. The outcome of the field instructors' enhanced teaching skills was measured primarily by the ability to identify, and then communicate, the minority content in the case vignettes, the student case, and their cases worked on by their students. The student case (See Appendix F) used for part of session four, and the participants' own student cases were less direct vehicles for assessment as the

responses here were not recorded systematically.

As discussed in Chapter II, the seminar had a specific structure and format; nine field instructors participated in the program and the overall attendance record was excellent.

The analysis of the data by the seminar leader—the pretest, post-test, logs and seminar discussions--produced the following conclusions:

a. There was an increase in the knowledge base of the field instructors following the eight-week seminar: the post-test scores were higher because of the training.

b. There was a qualitative change in the responses to the content, a heightened sensitivity in understanding the behavior of Black clients.

c. There was an increased ability in the "teaching skill"--the ability to define, analyze and communicate information about Black clients as evidenced in the responses to the case vignettes, the student case, and their own case presentations.

d. There were more combinations of conceptual and operational activity than of any other possible combinations. The field instructors learned primarily by the thinking/cognitive and doing/operational.

e. Those participants who placed emphasis on the conceptual, thinking activity tended to learn and teach concurrently and offered some type of replication of the program and its content to agency staff members as well as to their students.

f. There was, in all responses, some affective response to and about the learning. All participants had some feelings about the content and the process.

g. Where the affective response was intense, the participants seemed to have more difficulty in thinking about the practice. When there was a strong emotional response, less was done with the material in the process of learning.

h. There was agreement about the value of the seminar and about the need for increased knowledge, enhanced sensitivity and improved skill in conveying the content to be taught to social work students.

These overall findings affirm that the seminar goals seem to have been achieved: the field instructor participants emerged from the seminar with an enhanced sensitivity about the needs and problems of Black clients. Furthermore, they were better equipped to deal with those problems and to pass on what they had learned to agency staff members and social work students.

Beyond the affirmation that the overall goals of the seminar were apparently achieved, a number of specific related concerns should be reviewed here. The first of these related concerns is the sample and the seminar leader.

The Sample, the Seminar Leader and Factors Affecting Participation

Beginning with a Department of Field Instruction symposium in 1979 at New York University School of Social Work, there was strong interest in the content and its integration into the field experience. While the seminar leader nevertheless had anticipated some resistance to participation in the seminar, it was greater than expected. As discussed in Chapter II, the original design called for ten to twelve field instructor participants in the seminar. Recruitment began more than a month before the projected starting date. There was an immediate positive response from minority field instructors. As of a week before the starting date, twenty-three non-minority field instructors had been contacted and five had agreed to participate. One of these five backed out at the last minute. The seminar leader decided not to increase the minority group representation because such a move might have precluded the opportunity

for balanced interaction.

While the various reasons given by the non-minority field instructors for their inability to participate seemed plausible, the seminar leader wondered at the large number of declinations. Eighteen of twenty-three negative responses loomed even larger given the immediate and positive responses from the minority field instructors. Life in the agencies could not have been so appreciably different. One cannot, with assurance, determine the full nature of the resistance but rather can hypothesize about the apprehension evoked in the non-minority field instructors' minds by this emotionally challenging material. It does not help to be colorblind, yet it is often difficult for professional social workers to acknowledge the legitimate differences of culture not their own. An individual may deny his racist feelings because they conflict with his self-image as a humanitarian liberal; emotionally challenging material may thus mandate a personal adjustment, that is, a change in self-image. Furthermore, admitting to a problem can be extremely threatening to social workers who have an emotional, professional and economic stake in perceiving themselves as able to cut across class, racial and ethnic lines (Mizio, 1972).

Resistance also can be viewed in relation to the voluntary nature of a request: in this case, no one was required to participate and the choice may have been to not take the risk since it was not required. The foregoing possibility underscores the limitation of one seminar and one leader. One might well ask whether the responses would have been different had a concurrent seminar

been offered, led by someone with less authority than the leader and/or by someone who was a non-minority group member.

Too, one can speculate tnat the threat of the unknown--about the process and coming together with strangers around this difficult and challenging subject--deterred some of the non-minority field instructors. Certainly, it proved to be hard for the actual participants to establish a trusting relationship. At this point in the discussion, one must be careful to note that the original seminar design didn't include an assessment of the participants' readiness or capacity for self-disclosure and/or sharing and trusting in a racially mixed group. Nor did such an assessment become a formal part of the seminar.

On the other hand, the minority field instructors were unusually responsive to the request. Just as one cannot pinpoint the reasons behind the non-minority instructors' resistance, there is a lack of clarity about the minority instructors' eagerness to participate. Nonetheless, all who were asked did agree immediately without reservation. However, one of these became noteworthy during tne seminar sessions for explicit anger and "exhaustion" about always "having to help the white professional to understand" the Black experience.

It was in relation to their social work students' case material that the non-minority field instructors didn't always have the right answers as indicated by their responses during the sessions. In contrast some of the Black field instructors seemed to perceive the seminar as providing an opportunity to "show their stuff." Did

they, in fact, agree to participate so readily because they felt that they had more mastery of the material due to their minority status, and therefore would have an upper hand? To be on top is an experience that many minority professionals do not have in their work.

The role of the seminar leader as the Director of Field Instruction for the School was important for access to the field instructor population. Yet one of the leader's first log entries referred to whether the program would have differed had all of the seminar participants been minority group members. This entry was directly related to the leader's frustration in getting an adequate sample of non-minority field instructors to participate. It had been anticipated during the design period that there would be pressure on the seminar leader--pressure to move the process with sufficient speed so that work could progress, yet to allow for the necessary process in establishing group trust and cohesiveness. What was unanticipated, or not fully appreciated, were the intense racially connected emotions which needed to be harnessed--for the participants and the leader. Since the program was conducted under the auspices of the School, proper seminar relations, however strained at times, was important in maintaining the School's reputation as a center of professional programs.

Thus, the seminar leader's visibility as Director of Field Instruction mandated a careful approach in the leader's responses to the participants, including an alertness for self-bias and non-judgmental comments. It became increasingly more important for

they, in fact, agree to participate so readily because they felt that they had more mastery of the material due to their minority status, and therefore would have an upper hand? To be on top is an experience that many minority professionals do not have in their work.

The role of the seminar leader as the Director of Field Instruction for the School was important for access to the field instructor population. Yet one of the leader's first log entries referred to whether the program would have differed had all of the seminar participants been minority group members. This entry was directly related to the leader's frustration in getting an adequate sample of non-minority field instructors to participate. It had been anticipated during the design period that there would be pressure on the seminar leader--pressure to move the process with sufficient speed so that work could progress, yet to allow for the necessary process in establishing group trust and cohesiveness. What was unanticipated, or not fully appreciated, were the intense racially connected emotions which needed to be harnessed. Since the program was conducted under the auspices of the School, proper seminar relations, however strained at times, was important in maintaining the School's reputation as a center of professional programs.

Thus, the seminar leader's visibility as Director of Field Instruction mandated a careful approach in the leader's responses to the participants, including an alertness for self-bias and non-judgmental comments. It became increasingly more important for

the seminar leader not to favor one participant over another because of a likeness in thinking and to permit open--sometimes hostile--interaction, while restricting that interaction so the group could work effectively. In addition the process of leader modeling had to be very deliberate and the leader's log and recollections of the seminar together with the tape-recordings of the seminar sessions indicated that sometimes the modeling created tensions which could not be released fully until after a seminar session. During the sessions the leader attempted to articulate the anxiety generated by the material without being overwhelmed by it. This part of the process became a very critical component which allowed the sessions to progress, if not always smoothly, then at least with civility and professionalism. Thus the leader's knowledge and training in group process proved to be extremely helpful even though it had not been regarded as a critical variable during planning: the participants commented on the usefulness and helpfulness of the leader's behavior in facilitating the learning process for them.

Following each session, the seminar leader was debriefed by several colleagues who helped in gaining insights and perspective. The leader received feedback from colleagues, perhaps one-sided at times, and gained a perspective that was of obvious benefit to the on-going sessions. These debriefings became an increasingly critical tool for the leader as the intensity of the sessions increased. Overall, the debriefings were helpful in identifying and assessing the seminar's major themes while the individual debriefings were instrumental in shifting the leader's focus toward the next session.

Significant Observations on the Method of Teaching and Seminar Content

Given the responses of the participants during the sessions and the comments in their logs, the curriculum units and content would seem to have been appropriate to the stated goals. It was openly acknowledged by the seminar leader and all participants that in an eight-week seminar only major themes could be presented and discussed. A number of points should be mentioned here.

First, the length of time required to administer the pretest was greater than originally anticipated. Fortunately, the leader had pretested the time and content on a separate group of field instructors who then were taking the required seminar in field instruction for new field instructors. Subsequently, the decision was made to reduce the number of cases for the pretest and the B. family and Mrs. T. case vignettes remained as the pretest instruments. These cases were selected because they contained the most information about the seminar content. The decision, although somewhat arbitrary, was based on the assumption that at the beginning it would be better to use more detailed and specific information. Then, the post-test could be less specific, although the post-test, in some ways, was perceived as more demanding. Therefore, the impact of the program could be more sharply defined at the post-test stage.

There generally seemed to be cohesiveness to the individual seminar sessions and the material designated for each session was covered. Attendance was excellent, so no need existed to update the participants other than with a summary of the previous week's

work. All of the sessions were tape-recorded; some were more audible than others and some were incomplete because the participants and leader forgot that the tape was being used. Consequently, these latter sessions ran longer than the cassette tapes on which they were being recorded.

The conceptualization of the three levels of cognitive activity as identified by Papell—conceptual, affective and operational—were isolated for the seminar participants. The use of these concepts was helpful to the participants in their identification of the learning styles of their students and themselves. In fact, it became clear through one participant's presentation of a social work student's case that the participant's use of the concepts enhanced supervisory skills.

It is generally agreed that social work education should involve thinking, feeling and doing in content, process, and teaching/learning interaction and should be modeled on these three modes of activity (Papell, 1978; Towle, 1954; Reynolds, 1970). In this and other ways, the teacher is an object of identification and a role model (Bruner, 1960; Towle, 1954).

In experiential teaching the use of student records and field instructor records to recapture a moment and reflect upon it is critical. The seminar project viewed experience as the core of learning and both inductive (generalizing and highlighting concepts from experience) and deductive (presenting material which illustrated concepts) teaching methods were used. Learning should be active (Scheffler, 1969), and students should be expected and asked to

engage in the process through class participation, logs and so forth. These notions as well as some principles of andragogy, as described in Chapter I (see p.20), served as underpinnings for the seminar program.

In reviewing the tape recordings, one can readily appreciate that the sessions were marked by the field instructor participants' lively and active particpation. The leader's tone seemed to encourage participation and feedback. When appropriate, humor was used while the didactic approach was minimized. An atmosphere of sharing and spontaneity seemed to characterize most of the sessions. Following is a review of the seminar sessions as expressed by the tape-recordings and logs.

Content and purpose. The seminar leader, in the first session, took considerable time to establish the contract between the participants and the leader, to talk about what was to happen. In retrospect one might conclude that the anxiety related to initiating the seminar may have caused the leader to talk too much. The leader's sharing of personal and professional experiences in relation to content seemed to inspire the participants to acknowledge their own anxieties and/or interests. Subsequently, more participants volunteered to present material than could be used.

Because so much had to be covered in the first session, including administration of the pretest, the ethnic/sensitive exercise (see Appendix C) was postponed until the second session.

Responses to the pretest were characteristically anxious: "Now, we have been tested"; "What will you think if we don't do well?"

This latter comment seemed directly related to the role of Director of Field Instruction and the evaluation component of the position. Other participants felt that they needed more time and/or more information than the case vignettes offered. One field instructor even wanted to take the vignettes back to the agency to discuss them with other supervisors and students. The overall group response to this attempt was characterized by comments like "no, you can't do that." "We answered spontaneously." "That's the point--to deal with material on the spot." All participants wanted feedback to their responses and there was discussion among them about their answers to the questions. This was a rather promising first experience in their sharing with one another.

The leader's log on the first session contained comments about assessment of motivation for learning, that is, if the group felt that they were helping the leader too much, would they then be more or less motivated for learning? One wondered, too, whether the project and its objectives had been overemphasized in the first session. The decision was to emphasize, in the second session, the overall scope of the seminar, to strengthen the contract with the field instructors, and to be guided by Bruner, who wrote that motives for learning must be kept from becoming passive: "They must be based as much as possible upon the arousal of interest in what there is to be learned, and they must be kept broad and diverse in expression" (Bruner, 1960, p. 80).

Session two. This session began with the ethnic/sensitive exercise and everybody in the group participated. The range of

responses revealed to an extent the participants' self-images racially and ethnically—an American, a Progressive Humanist, an Afro-American woman (the only one to refer to race and sex, and the one who later would refer also to racist, sexist issues). Although the seminar was not designed to scrutinize relationships between social characteristics and behavior, it was interesting to realize, in retrospect, that how participants identified themselves initially became characteristic of their performances. The further removed the participant was from having an ethnic identification, the more she or he tended to want to be colorblind. It should be emphasized that this was an impression from the experience, not a finding. This exercise provoked considerable discussion, and some beginning teaching and learning, regarding majority-minority relations.

The readings were limited but substantial. That the field instructors completed, or nearly so, their reading assignments was evident in their logs and in references to the literature during the seminar discussions. In fact it had not been anticipated by the leader that the participants would read as much as they did. Two, in particular (and in keeping with their style), were avid readers and offered suggestions for additional readings. One even suggested the use of novels as another method of increasing knowledge about minority content.

Following the ethnic/sensitive exercise, the balance of session two dealt with specified content: the historical perspective and the centrality of racism in America. The participants discussed

their work with social work students and made connections between the historical perspective, the Black client and the content.

The leader's log reflected a positive feeling, a sense of beginning the planned work with the group. The comments had to do with consistently identifying the learning tasks--the themes of both the content and the learning. As an example, the leader and participants took notes as one or another of the participants described their student cases and methods of supervision. The leader felt less anxious during the session and the tape reflected that feeling. Current practice was a major focus and the first formal presentation, for the next session, was a process recording of a supervisory session.

By this point, the conceptual framework emerged as an excellent guide to the seminar curriculum. Another unanticipated benefit was proving to be the smoothness with which the content was covered at each session, that is, it might have been expected that the planned material would not be fully covered. On the contrary, each unit was covered completely during the session. A seemingly strong contributing factor for this success was the inductive style of teaching--the generalizing and highlighting of concepts and themes that emerged from the work with students. Throughout, this thinking and doing continued to be a high motivating force which kept the leader and participants actively engaged.

Session three. The leader's log for the third session shows that the socioeconomic perspective provided an opportunity to stress assessment of Black clients that moved practitioners away from an

intrapsychic, pathological view of the client. The participants responded to this by indicating what they wanted to teach their own students. The field instructors acknowledged the "slipping back" to a pathological perspective that had occurred for them individually in the past. The session emphasized the psychosocial approach rather than the intrapsychic approach that all too often became the catch-all rationale for a client's behavior. The session also offered an opportunity to deal with balance, especially the pitfalls of blaming the victim or oppression excessively. The participants liked Sillen and Thomas's notion about not assuming that all Blacks were crippled and unable to function because of the oppression they had experienced (Thomas and Sillen, 1972).

Issues related to strengths and coping mechanisms of clients emerged, as well as the need for students to relate or "tune in" to clients, particularly the poor, minority clients. They, the field instructors, suggested enriching their orientations with students by giving them an opportunity to visit hospitals, welfare offices, courts, schools, housing developments, and so on. They approved of the question that should be raised in assessing the Black client or family: "How well has the client or family performed the adaptive tasks?"

Some role-play was used for this session with a vignette setting and scene (see Appendix E). The role-play began with the leader taking the role of the field instructor. The student role was clarified: he or she could conceivably be hostile, colorblind, liberal or overtly racist. Each dyad represented a cross-racial

dyad. Some of the questions covered included: How should participants teach? What ought to be taught in relation to the case? What do the participants know (superfically at least) about each student's learning style? The leader demonstrated and the group broke up into dyads. The leader circulated, taking discussion notes.

After fifteen minutes, the role-play was stopped and discussion began. Initial resistance to the experience emerged characterized by comments like "It's not real"; "I couldn't get into it"; "I do better when I talk about my students." This attitude remained unaltered during the sessions despite further attempts at unannounced role-playing. One might well wonder why, as the sessions progressed and the participants seemingly became a more cohesive and risk-taking group, the attitude toward role-playing didn't soften. Perhaps this was an activity where the participants felt uniformly inhibited because of inexperience and their perception of themselves as not reaching the high level here which was attained in the other seminar activities.

Surely some of the resistance related to the dyad-relations/cross-racial relationships. The issue of being sufficiently self-aware and knowledgeable about another's culture was crucial to the seminar's success. On the other hand, the leader deliberately talked about the leader's non-positive professional relationships vis-a-vis Black-on-Black encounters. Participants were able to share similar experiences, as they heard the leader suggest that sameness does not necessarily constitute sensitivity nor the best

approach to problem-solving. The value of being clear about the uniqueness of individuals, both the service provider and the client, was basic to the process of helping. If one analyzed the interaction from a psychodynamic point of view, the discussion here was symbolic of the participants' personal struggles; through the students' work, through other experiences that they had heard about, the field instructors came as close as they could to revealing their true feelings.

By the third session, too, the leader's log indicated that the participants could travel between the broader issues in social work education and the specific. Their tone continued to be serious, intense, and committed.

Session four. The leader's log entry, after the fourth session, included the comment that "I am overjoyed, hope they are feeling as good as I am...the response is great." The participants were able to focus the discussion, moving from the larger societal issues to agency systems and direct practice. This opening up continued on the movement of the group and helped them to articulate, as one participant pointed out, the difficulty in teaching students the material: that in the process of sensitizing students, the students often overreacted, wanting to deprive the client of his or her individual history, instead of understanding that history and that struggle. Students wanted to say, the participants agreed, "how awful." The experience was not perceived in a way that acknowledged the strengths. The focus on students and the field instructor's relationship with them became clearer during sessions three and four.

Again and again the participants, and the leader, stressed the need to move beyond sensitization toward helping the students understand and articulate their understanding, of the Black client as evidenced in their assessments and interventions. Despite the initial pain the interaction among the participants, marked by cautious risk-taking, improved during those sessions.

Session five. Sessions four and five covered the themes described in Chapter II. The sessions were highlighted by the presentations: the student case and the supervisory conference presented by one of the participants. Emotions ran high; their anxieties seemed to encourage the participants to skirt the central topic and discuss the extraneous issues. In addition, they began to discuss the replication of the seminar work in their individual agencies. According to their comments those agencies with minority directors encouraged the field instructors to share the content, "bringing back the material to the staff and students as quickly as possible." This was an unanticipated consequence. One of the most anxious-appearing field instructors emerged as a strong participant with an unusual willingness to become involved in risk-taking. This individual talked about non-minorities wanting to be "taken off the hook." Later, in another session, this participant became a scapegoat, referred to as "Miss Ann" who hid behind the cloak of "not knowing."

All of the emotions and content in the sessions seemed to eventually become related to the students' learning styles and the

content to be taught. Once again, the issues related to the dyads emerged. No ultimate solutions were forthcoming, but the participants seemed to concur that understanding and interaction became more complex when there was supervision of minorities by non-minorities. One participant raised the question of "inverse racism," that is, whether the Black field instructor put more work into the supervision of a white student than a non-minority field instructor would have done.

Session six. Sessions five and six included further presentations of the participants' student-supervisory work as well as discussion of their ongoing practice and struggles in their agencies. There were moments of excessively nervous laughter and giggling--presumably because the content was provocative in that the participants were unaccustomed to discussing their everyday work in relation to minority content.

The leader's log reflected a sense of agitated depression, of questioning whether the real issues were being addressed. The angry participant became angry again, stating that a sensitivity group would have been better . (This was the same field instructor, mentioned previously in this chapter and Chapter III, who evidenced no change in testing scores and whose strong emotions seemed to prevent her from using the seminar material as quickly and effectively as the other participants in her supervision of social work students.)

These two sessions also dealt with teaching methods based on the students' learning styles. The field instructors were able to make educational assessments and discuss how their students learned.

At this point, the minority field instructors were sharing more, taking leadership responsibility beyond "showing their stuff".

The seminar leader became active again in discussing the anxiety and interpreting the participants' nervous laughter. This allowed some settling down and a refocusing on the stated tasks and issues. It is noteworthy that the laughter became incredibly loud when the field instructor who was talking said, "...the anger, the rage, I wanted to kill her /the student/". The seminar leader at this point was convinced that the seminar experience was no different from supervisor-student interaction; conscious use of the modeling theory was as important to the field instructors' work with students as it was to the seminar leader's work with the participants.

The sharing of the leader's teaching and practice experience appeared to be a positive part of the process. The sharing of feelings, of pain and struggle encouraged the group to talk more about themselves and, more importantly, their work with students. Once again, the leader struggled to maintain a balance between the seminar's content and purpose and what sometimes seemed a group about to evolve into treatment process.

Sessions seven and eight. The leader's log indicates that the last two sessions, seven and eight, focused on the dual perspective, self-awareness of the student and field instructor, and learning patterns and teaching methods used to meet the identified needs regarding content. Again, we might remember that all sessions were supplemented by assigned readings. One cannot help but wonder, although it was not an objective of the study, whether attitudes

change with the acquisition of knowledge. Cognitive entities ought not to be separate from attitudes. Evidence of the integration of content and student supervision was demonstrated in the participants' discussion of their work with students.

The conclusion of session eight was marked by reassessment of the overall process, unanimous agreement on getting together and continuing in the fall term and suggestions about steps to follow especially in regard to:

a. Training of fieldwork faculty.

b. Selecting fewer themes for ongoing seminars with more intense examination of issues.

c. Development of teaching materials for the field; helping field instructors conceptualize their work with students.

There was a general request for a formal evaluation of the experience. The participants were each given a certificate signifying successful completion of the seminar (see Appendix H).

The major seminar themes. These themes were culled by the leader from the tape-recordings of the eight seminar sessions. The themes apply, of course, to what was actually discussed by the seminar leader and participants.

a. Encouragement of active participation and the demand for work. Keeping the process moving.

b. Inductive teaching, Review of previous week's work and limited use of didatic teaching.

c. Reinforcement of the seminar contract.

d. Keeping to the curriculum units. Balancing between free expression and holding to the task.

e. Consistent operationalization of the cognitive, or thinking, concepts.

f. Focus on the social work students and the field instructor participants' role with the student.

g. Teaching regarding assessment and interventions based on the content. Emphasis on the parallel minority content and social work practice principles.

h. Use of case material--canned cases and their own. Involves risking which creates anxiety.

i. Attention to the levels of understanding of the material and distinctions relaed to class and poverty issues.

j. Teaching methods that were useful based on the learning style of the social work student.

k. Connections between the content, student work and supervision. Discussion about what they, the field instructors, said that they wanted to do with the students--what cognitive concepts they wanted to teach.

l. The field instructor participants seemed to reveal themselves in their discussion of their work with students.

m. Role modeling as evidenced in:
   - leader demonstrating role play and exercise;
   - leader sharing of professional experiences, both the positive and negative, and encouraging the participants to do the same;
   - leader shared own teaching and practice dilemmas;
   - leader's role fluctuated from active to passive;
   - leader's use of the group process and raising the feelings that emerged in the process;
   - leader's use of appropriate humor.

n. Provocative nature of the content.

o. Permitting conflict, expressions of anger and other feelings to emerge.

p. Resistance to risking, particularly in role-playing.

In summary, the method of teaching appeared to rely heavily on the use of field instructor experiences as well as the leader's

very deliberate use of the leader's experiences to create an atmosphere that to an extent tolerated risk and self-disclosure. As we have seen, each session began with a review of the previous week's work followed by didactic teaching about the theme and contents to be covered. Connections were consistently made between the content, the students' work with minority clients, and the field instructors' supervision of students' work.

The ability of the participants to make connections, remember themes and to recall earlier discussions made a distinct impression upon the seminar leader. By the last session, a cohesive group had been formed and the field instructors openly talked about their newfound willingness to risk big, to confront each other, to be less cautious with one another. The cross-racial interaction and the consciousness of both minorities and non-minorities concerning the dynamics of minority content merited a separate study.

In their final log comments, the participants candidly, if briefly, opened up about their race-related feelings: "Some of the white field instructors didn't seem real"; "I was angry at the Black field instructors who didn't support what was being said by 'X' [a Black field instructor]."

On the basis of these comments, one might tentatively conclude that although the participants did have intense race-related opinions concerning other participants and, perhaps, concerning the seminar leader, they could not or would not articulate these opinions freely.

The understanding of and skill of group dynamics and process emerged as a critical aspect of the project. The project design had

not given sufficient attention to the importance of one's being able to facilitate group process in cross-cultural interactions. The nature of the content increased the need for skill in working with groups, especially so because opportunities for polarization, scapegoating and resistance were plentiful.

The stages of group development, as well as the critical role of the leader, obviously were more evident at the beginning and end of the seminar. The beginning stage was marked by fear of the unknown, of trust versus mistrust, of approach and avoidance. In the first seminar session, one participant competed for the leader's role. This individual sat next to the leader, repeated various comments made by the leader, and intermittently "clarified" the leader's statements. As the seminar progressed the intensity of this participant's action in this regard was diminished.

During the eight sessions the seating arrangements remained essentially unchanged. Specifically, the participants tended to congregate along racial lines with minimal intergroup shifting.

By the fourth session, the leader's log comments expressed the first real sense of sharing. This middle phase found the participants seeming to feel more accepted and understood, and, in turn, better able to accept and understand each other. In this phase competition for leadership was expressed--not in relation to the leader--in the participants' relationships to each other. Critical to this phase was the leader's explicit recognition of differences among the members, and between the members and the leader, while simultaneously sticking to the seminar design.

The final stage, following the unusually positive fourth session, was characterized by a quality of depression and flatness of affect. There was distancing as if the participants had grown anxious about the openness that they had experienced with one another. The focus on their case presentations seemed a form of self-assurance or reassurance for them, helping them get reconnected to the work at hand. Too, the leader's demand for work on the cases helped in facilitating this phase.

The upcoming termination of the seminar provoked discussions about the participants' wish to continue. They seemed to feel that they were, at last, a real group. They agreed that they could now work intensively and successfully with one another if the sessions continued. An atmosphere of leaving unfinished business behind prevailed until the last participant left the seminar meeting room after the final session. The discomfort that the participants felt was addressed by the leader in relation to beginnings and endings. It is noteworthy that the participants final log entries dealt with termination of the seminar (see Table C.1, Chapter III).

<u>Assumptions and Findings</u>

Chapters I and II described the assumptions, practice principles (pp. 51-53), and methodology which were the foundation of this study. The limitations of the study were listed in Chapter II and reiterated in Chapter IV.

Both the quantitative and qualitative analyses discussed in Chapter III supported the assumption that if field instructors increased their knowledge of minority, or Black, content they would

be better equipped to teach not only the newly acquired knowledge, but also their entire knowledge base concerning minority content. The weakest link in the Chapter III analyses was the overall definition of teaching ability. Here a stronger case could have been made had the "student case" (Mrs. T., "Establishing a Relationship") been used to evaluate, by a predetermined standard, the range of enhanced teaching skills. On the other hand, the measurement of the knowledge base was done with much greater clarity. The "experts" approach, employed as a standard against which the seminar participants' pre- and post-test responses were judged, might also have proved useful in analyzing what teaching skills were.

Nonetheless, the value of seminar participants being able to test their seminar-related experiences, however informally or subjectively, in an agency environment which included social work students in field placement and Black clients, should not be discounted. An assumption of androgogy suggests that "action-learning techniques are favored" (Knowles, 1972). This assumption respects people by making use of their experience as a resource of learning.

Since the seminar content and methodology were conveyed together, considerable evidence emerged to support the use of a didactic, experiential approach. Resistance toward role-playing has been discussed. However, using the live case material of the seminar participants was regarded by them and the seminar leader as critical to the learning process. As a rule the seminar content was incorporated immediately in the participants' work with social work students, agency staff members and clients.

Classroom-to-fieldwork transfer. It is important to note that the participants' quick transfer of the seminar content to their work was not part of the seminar design. In other words, this step was inspired and abetted by the seminar participants themselves. As pointed out above, this unanticipated consequence should not be underestimated. On the other hand, it is probably fair to conclude that the classroom-to-fieldwork transfer was not as effective as it might have been because the participants, in their eagerness to use the material, allowed themselves insufficient time to gain a genuine perspective. Thus, they were incapable of communicating it successfully to the triumverate of social work students, agency staff members and perhaps Black clients. One field instructor participant indicated in the seminar log that the mixture of agency director, supervisors, staff and students may have precluded a more meaningful experience. The leader remembered that the most effective use of the seminar content with agency staff members seems to have occurred when the participants were more selective, using some readings and discussing informally their experiences in the seminar. One result of the rapid transfer was that the seminar leader encouraged discussions among the participants about implementation. These discussions reflected the lack of perspective referred to earlier.

Other minority groups. The seminar content seemed to be helpful in the participants' work with other ethnic and racial minority groups. For example, comments were made by some participants about using seminar concepts related to ethnic group history

in their work with, respectively, Haitians, Puerto Ricans and Italians. Unfortunately, as with Black clients, the seminar ended before significant feedback was received.

Teaching style. The degree, if any, to which the seminar leader's teaching style influenced the seminar participants remains unclear. The participants' logs and classroom comments seemed to express approval in this regard. Reynolds states that "there is another aspect of learning which a teacher should not lose sight of--the influence of culture in which people live upon their capacity to learn and the kinds of learning they can assimilate" (Reynolds, 1970, p. 85).

Although no definitive conclusions may be drawn about the leader's teaching methodology, it is undeniable that each participant had a distinct profile in regard to personality, learning and teaching. As mentioned previously, the project neither identified the participants' learning styles nor measured educational modeling. One might tentatively conclude that the leader's deliberate encouragement of a classroom atmosphere of openness, nondefensiveness and sharing accommodated agreement, disagreement and conflict resolution.

Seminar design. Yet another tentative conclusion is that the formal seminar design was a useful tool in setting the stage for evaluation of the participants' work.

Clarity in program design would seem critical to both process and evaluation. Furthermore, the field instructor participants' readiness to learn and use the content supported Knowles's androgogical

assumption that adult learners are ready to inquire into content relevent to their professional problems.

By the conclusion of the seminar the leader perceived that, while the content was covered completely, greater intensity and depth would have been desirable. The issue of breadth and depth is assuredly one of the most interesting confronting any teacher or leader. Here, the leader assumed that breadth was preferable to depth. The assumption, of course, was made during an early stage of seminar design and was itself based on an even earlier assumption that the participants' experience would guide them in expanding what they learned in the seminar. Unfortunately, the confines of the present study did not include follow-up contacts in order to confirm or disavow the latter assumption.

Qualitative data. As indicated in Chapter III, qualitative analyses were the primary analytical focus of the study. The Wilcoxin statistical test used to evaluate the changes from pre- to post-test supported the hypothesis that knowledge increased as a result of training. Beyond the quantitative pre- and post-test data, one can only address the qualities of change. Perhaps a future study will explore the use of experts beyond the model-answers format. One might conclude, for example, that the use of experts in establishing standards for measuring teaching skills, for evaluating seminar tape recordings and the leader's role would have added another dimension.

Chapter III discussed the data generated by the participants' responses to the pre- and post-test cases. These qualitative

responses, as noted previously, were the most measurable and standardized of the three response categories, the other two being the tape-recordings and participants' logs. The tapes offered an excellent opportunity to reflect upon the teaching-learning process, but the participants' logs presented the most individual impressions of the experience.

Thinking and doing. In regard to these logs, one might conclude that thinking and doing--the cognitive and operational parts of learning--seemed to be the most relevant of the three parts discussed in Chapter III. First, a major rationale for the seminar was that the participants needed social work students so that the content would be applicable to the field instructor, other agency staff members, students and clients. Second, the overall findings seemed to indicate that combinations of cognitive and operational activity were easily the most prevalent. Thus, despite the nature of the seminar and the student/supervisory relationships--the major style of learning was clearly demonstrated. The field instructors wrote freely about their struggles in dealing with the material, referring frequently to the readings that supported the work that they were doing with the students. This fact contrasted sharply with their apparent uneasiness about writing of their race-related feelings concerning other participants. The case presentations, of course, offered additional illustrations of thinking and doing.

In regard to cognitive activity, two field instructor participants attempted to use the content on a very broad scale with the agency staff. These two participants were the same ones described

earlier as having "more distance" from their own ethnicity (see p. 126). Although not colorblind they seemed to exhibit a greater tendency to struggle with the problems of professional social work practice than the destructiveness of racial prejudice. One must be cautious when generalizing, especially when drawing upon such a small sample, but it is nonetheless an interesting impression.

The third and fourth findings from the log analysis were that all participants had individual feelings about the seminar. Overall, there were affective responses to and about learning. While the range of feelings was wide, the most notable impression was that where the affect was intense, the participants seemed to experience difficulty in thinking and practicing with their social work students. In these cases, the cognitive and operational practice activities were evident, but supressed. When learning affectually, the participants seemed to do less with the material. One participant (see Table A, Chapter I) demonstrated no change in log comments from the pretest to the post-test. One could think of no rational way to evaluate these strong feelings. One of the participants, who began with what were regarded as strong emotions, felt that the literature helped to give perspective and acknowledged that personal feelings obstructed learning. Reynolds and others write about learning containing both elements of pleasure and pain: "Desire and resistance to the effort, or the pain, or the giving up of something else wheich may be involved" (Reynolds, 1970, p. 58). That something else was surely operative for all the participants,

in particular for those with intense feelings, may be the key to understanding what the experience truly signified for them. It is recommended, on the basis of the impressions here, that the role of personality in the integration of learning be kept in mind. In summary, then, one might reasonably state that the judgments, however generalized and impressionistic, about the field instructor participants' patterns of learning enriched the qualitative analysis.

Increased knowledge. Finally, the value of the seminar was championed in the participants' verbal and written comments. Some might have preferred a different focus in regard to, for example, sensitivity training or exploration of attitudes in cross-racial contacts, but there was virtually unanimous agreement that the need for increased knowledge, and increased ability to convey that knowledge, was important and useful.

Recommendations for Future Studies

The seminar under discussion here represents but one effort in the integration of minority content into the field experience. It has been commonly accepted that practice, not theory, falls short of effective work with minority groups; that social work education has focused its attention on the classroom, not the practicum in the struggle to integrate minority content. Hopefully, this study will encourage others to make further efforts and take further steps along the lines suggested here. Certainly, the present study makes no claims of being final and, unquestionably, much remains to be accomplished.

In addition to the use of the model suggested in this study, one might suggest at least four topics of a narrower, more refined scope for which the present study could serve as a foundation:

a. Race, Ethnicity, Culture--Implications for Social Practice.

b. Worker-Client Relationships as They Pertain to Race, Ethnicity and Culture.

c. Supervision by Majorities of Minorities.

d. The Identification and Teaching of Social Work Content Relevant to the Preparation for Work in the Afro-American Community.

On the basis of the seminar experience, one can recommend more complete training not merely of field instructors at all levels of experience, but also of those who will train the field instructors. It would indeed be gratifying to learn that the material in this study had been adapted by others for use in their own seminar experiences.

Furthermore, one can recommend that if schools of social work are truly committed to the integration of minority content into the fieldwork experience, then specific resources should be made available to offer required seminars for field instructors. These resources would include--but not be limited to--classrooms, books and other printed materials, clerical assistance, tape-recording equipment, and other things which would help in making these seminars successful. Given the difficulties of recruiting, consideration should be given to making these seminars a requirement rather than an elective, voluntary activity.

Thought should be given to developing case material for use in the training of field instructors similar to the "canned" cases used for student education in the classroom. Illustrations of student/supervisor work in relation to this content can be useful to field instructors in their teaching of fieldwork students. (A first step in this direction has been to include one of the seminar presentations in the common curriculum that has been developed for the seminars in field instruction at all of the New York City metropolitan schools of social work including Rutgers University and The State University of New York at Stony Brook.)

The seminar designer is not convinced that a larger sample, particularly if self-selected as in this group, would yield appreciably different kinds of behavior. What would seem inherent in a limited sample is the ability to generalize with confidence about the accuracy of the findings. Perhaps a future study will scrutinize, for example, two groups led by, respectively, a minority and a non-minority seminar leader. Participant responses related to the race or ethnicity of the seminar leader might increase our knowledge about who should teach minority content.

Another possibility for future study might concern significant characteristics such as work experience, race, sex, age, agency setting or prior educational exposure and their affect on the study of minority content.

The major conclusions discussed above suggest a list of guidelines which might serve as practice principles, in addition to those outlined in Chapter II, for this type of program.

a. Individual meetings with the field instructors who express an interest in the advanced seminar should aid in the selection process and strengthen the commitment to the program.

b. A preparatory phase (orientation meeting) prior to implementation of the program should prepare the participants for a cross-racial interaction and enhance their ability to share and risk in a seminar concerned with this sensitive content.

c. Field instructors should represent a cross-racial group to allow for a rich and dynamic interchange.

d. An additional number of sessions will provide an opportunity for in-depth examination of the substantive content to be taught.

e. A didactic and experiential approach, making use of the participant's own material is useful and effective.

f. Focus on how one best learns the content based on field instructor and student teaching and learning patterns should be a critical component of the program.

g. The leader of the seminar should possess knowledge of group dynamics and process.

h. Participants in the program should be discouraged about a premature replication of the program prior to their completing the seminar.

i. The seminar leader should have a planned way of debriefing after each session.

j. Two seminar groups offered concurrently with different leaders should provide an opportunity for comparison regarding the process and cross-racial interaction.

k. Awareness of risk taking in a short period of time with members who are unknown to each other should be considered so that there is balance between the affective and cognitive activity.

l. The format of the program is not one to be replicated with agency staff. Relationships are obviously different where people work together on an ongoing basis. The affectual response to the content needs to be considered in planning how to present the material to agency staff. Attention should be also given to group composition.

m. The leader should take responsibility for identifying the expectations of the minority person's role in the group. Awareness of the issues regarding the role of any minority person in a group/class which focuses on the group being discussed. The question of the role of the minority person as one of leader or teacher. There is often the expectation that the minority person will be asked to take on the role of teaching others about their group.

n. The evaluation strategy should include planned follow-up with field instructors and students to determine the impact of the program. The time for follow-up should occur at a sufficient lapse of time and at a specific time following the completion of the program.

o. A predetermined standard should be established to measure the range of possible increased teaching skill of the field instructors.

This list of guidelines is not at all exhaustive but identifies some of the major considerations should the program be replicated.

Finally, while the above suggestions hopefully may point the way toward future studies and seminars, they are by no means to be considered all-inclusive. If the present study has shed light on the subject which it discusses, then the author will have been rewarded.

New York University

School of Social Work

3 Washington Square North
New York, N.Y. 10003

APPENDIX A

Letter of Invitation

February 4, 1981

Dear

First, let me say how delighted and appreciative I am that you have agreed to participate in the seminar for experienced field instructors.

As you know, and have agreed, there is a real need to integrate minority, ethnic and cultural content into the social work curriculum. This seminar will be a first attempt to address that need in field instruction, a major component of the curriculum. I have developed a broad framework for teaching minority content in field instruction using the Black example. This model will be used and discussed with you, in an effort to increase knowledge and methods of teaching this content to your students. Although the Black experience is used as as example, the model is applicable to other racial and ethnic groups. The concepts should be useful in work with various groups.

Our first meeting will be on Wednesday, February 25, 1981 from 2-4 and we will meet for 8 consecutive weeks. On Wednesdays at the same time - the Conference Room at #2 Washington Square North, Rm. 11.

I look forward to meeting with you and hope that we will have a productive and exciting seminar. Your input and feedback will be invaluable to the seminar.

Thanks again and I will see you on the 25th.

Sincerely,

Lucretia J. Phillips, ACSW
Associate Professor
Director of Field Work

LJP/bjs

APPENDIX B

ETHNICITY SENSITIVITY EXERCISE

Ethnicity - Sensitivity Exercise Used for Beginnings - "Tuning In"

This is a group discussion method that aims at sensitizing participants to Ethnic/racial material.

Leader begins with self and does exercise by illustration.

All participants are obligated to answer:

1. Name.

2. Where they grew up.

3. How they identify themselves racially or ethnically.

Then the leader asks a series of questions and participants can volunteer. The questions are not to challenge, but to offer an opportunity for exploration and discussion of issues.

4. What is the earliest you can remember recalling difference among people?

5. What were you told about the differences?

6. Was there a significant encounter where you had to deal with differences?

7. How was the significant encounter explained? (By you and others.)

8. How are race and/or ethnic differences impacting on you now, and what are your current concerns?

APPENDIX C

Log Guidelines and Pretest

You are requested to keep an on-going "log" of your work in this advanced seminar.

Please begin log with a brief description of agency, its purpose, service delivery pattern and nature of community served. You are asked to maintain a continuous commentary on your activity, seminar discussions and other experiences and ideas which are relevant to the seminar and the aspects of the seminar that seem to enhance your learning.

The purpose of this log format is to encourage you to explore lines of inquiry in the supervision of students regarding minority content and its implementation, which is uniquely yours. You will probably want to refer to specific points encountered in your readings.

Feel free to write in your style. Be free to challenge, disagree, or to express confusion or uncertainty about issues raised in the seminar or your work with students.

The log will be submitted at specified times during the seminar, a date determined by the seminar leader. The log becomes an individualized mode of communication and feedback between you and the seminar leader.

It is a confidential communication between you and the seminar leader. You may be asked by the leader if she may read an entry to

the seminar participants (without identification). Feel free to withhold permission. Your wishes will be respected.

A "good" log is one which the participant struggles with ideas and issues. The participant makes connections between self, reading and experience. It is most useful when entries are made every week.

If you encounter difficulty with this format, view it as part of the learning struggle and consult with the seminar leader.

Answer Sheet for Responses to Case Vignettes

Date________________

As evidenced in this case:

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a.

   b.

   c.

   d. Other (specify)

2. What interventions should be made?

   a.

   b.

   c.

   d. Other (specify)

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a.

   b.

   c.

   d. Other (specify)

   4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

5. Rank order on a scale from 1-5, the following factors:

RANK ORDER

1 = most important
2 = very important
3 = important
4 = moderately important
5 = unimportant

____________ a. Body of theoretical knowledge about personality development

____________ b. Knowledge of the agency setting

____________ c. Knowledge of the social worker's function within the setting

____________ d. Knowledge of the helping relationship

____________ e. Other (specify) ____________

____

THE CASE OF MRES. T.*
(Pre-Test)

Mrs. T. is a 29-year-old Black woman with nine children ranging in age from 6 months to 13 years. Mrs. T. has a ninth grade education, no employable skills and is supported by welfare.

For the past four years, Mrs. T. has had a serious drinking problem. She was referred to the local mental health center 18 months ago for this problem. After 6 or 7 months of testing personalities and relationship building, she and her worker began to get along very well. She has shown up regularly for appointments once a week for the past year. She is progressing very well on the drinking problem and has reportedly not had a drink in 5 or 6 months. Last week she failed to show up for her appointment and did not call. She has now arrived in the worker's office and appears to be withdrawn and unusually depressed.

In addition the following events have occurred in her life over the past few months:

a. Six months ago she began complaining to the landlord about the pipes leaking, the heating unit not working, rats and roaches in the apartment and gapping holes in the walls and floor. The landlord ignored her complaints leaving the apartment unrepaired. Four months ago, she had begun withholding her rent payment, and employing individuals to repair the apartment. She kept receipts for the repairs but the apartment has not changed significantly. The landlord began threatening to throw her out if she did not pay. Two weeks ago he made good on his threats and told her that he expected her to be out in one month. She is now facing eviction in two weeks, has no friends or relatives she can turn to for temporary residence and cannot afford to live anywhere else in the city.

b. Three weeks ago, Mrs. T. had to take her 3-year old to the emergency room. The child was suffering from lead poisoning resulting from having eaten the flaking paint chips near his bed. The doctor asked Mrs. T. about the living conditions and indicated that he was obligated to report this situation to the authorities. One week later, Mrs. T. was back in the emergency room with her 18 month old daughter who had been bitten by a rat. This time the hospital registered a complaint with protective services.

*Case vignette Counseling from a Cultural Perspective, Trainee/ Resource Manual, developed by William H. Wheeler, Ph.D.

c. Shortly after the last trip to the hospital, Mrs. T. received a visit from the protective service worker. The worker could not have come at a worse time. The apartment was a mess. The pipes were leaking again, the kids appeared dirty, the younger kids were crying, and the roaches roamed freely. The worker conducted a hasty investigation and told Mrs. T. she could expect to hear from her. Mrs. T. has since received notice that she is to appear in court in seven days to show cause why her children should not be taken away from her, and why she should not be deemed an unfit mother.

d. Mrs. T. had hoped that her worker from the welfare department would testify in her behalf at the hearing, but two days ago she received an unexpected visit from the worker. Unfortunately, a former boyfriend had stopped by the same day and upon seeing how depressed Mrs. T. was, went out and picked up a bottle of gin to help them forget their problems. The worker accused Mrs. T. of being too drunk to take care of her kids or her apartment.

MODEL RESPONSES TO THE CASE OF MRS. T.

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a. Environmental and situational (housing, welfare).

   b. Health problems; protection of the children.

   c. Mrs. T.'s depression, functioning, ego strengths. Identify and seek out supports available, if any, (church, community centers, neighbors, etc.).

   d. Concern re: return to drinking; role of the worker in all of the systems.

2. What interventions should be made?

   a. Advocacy and consultation with system; court order against landlord; legal consultation

   b. Help and support re: basic needs--housing, perhaps temporary shelter.

   c. Supportive counseling and crisis intervention with Mrs.T.

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a. History of Mrs. T. and previous behavior; about alcoholism and its etiology and treatment; self-awareness, i.e., what might get in the way of a social worker that prevents one from "knowing" the client.

   b. How to deal with insensitive service delivery systems. Principles of advocacy and collaborative work with the systems. Understanding of the dynamic and process of "blaming the victim."

   c. Community resources.

   d. How one identifies the strengths, coping mechanisms and adaptive behavior out of this crisis for Mrs. T.

4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

   a. Impact of poverty, unemployment and ghetto living.

   b. Use of alcohol in minority community as "poor man's couch."

   c. Situational and environmental impact on personality and behavior.

Case of Mrs. T.

4 (cont'd)

d. Strengths of Mrs. T. such as year-long treatment relationship, controlled drinking, problem-solving abilities, etc.

e. Institutional racism and impact on service delivery; and dispelling stereotypes re: Blacks on welfare, neglect of children, and being irresponsible.

THE "B" FAMILY

(Pretest)

This Black-lower-middle class family is composed of father, mother and three boys, 8, 3 and 2 years of age. The family owns a modest home in a predominantly white community where the father is employed in a factory.

The school referred the family because of the 8 year old boy's behavior problem. He was reportedly mischievious and disruptive in the classroom, fought with younger children on the way home, and had been caught stealing in school and community. The school counselor reported that four years previously, two of the parents' children ages 3 and 2 had died when the family trailer caught fire. Recently, the current 2-year-old had swallowed a caustic substance which necessitated surgical repair of his esophagus. There were also unspecified indications of marital problems, and reports that the parents had separated several times.

The parents did not acknowledge behavior problems with their son in the house. However, they were concerned about the school's complaints. The worker's encounters with the family during home visits led to some question about the accuracy of the referral reports. After observations in the school and in interviews with school personnel, the worker concluded that a good part of the son's antisocial behavior had been precipitated in the school and community. In addition, the parents admitted that they had divergent views on how their son should behave in a white community.

*Case vignette provided by Professor Robert Sharp, Associate Professor, New York University School of Social Work.

MODEL RESPONSES TO THE CASE OF THE "B" FAMILY

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a. Possible racist school attitudes in school and in the community: what in the school and community might provoke antisocial behavior?

   b. Nature of the marital conflict, and what problems the parents identify regarding the child's behavior.

   c. Inconsistency in parental handling of son; family and interpersonal relationships; issues related to raising a Black child in a white community.

   d. Meaning of symptomatic behavior of son and possible guilt of parents re: death of other children.

   e. Separating the internal from the external problems.

2. What interventions should be made?

   a. Liaison work with the school and possible referral to an integrated school.

   b. Marital and supportive counseling; clarification, problem identification, need to increase sensitivity to child's needs, and help to understand the impact of overt and covert racism on child and their well-being.

   c. Development and exploration of possible network and support systems outside or inside the community.

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a. Needs of latency age children (developmental theory); the issues related to the reaction of a white society to the Black male.

   b. Interventions in marital and family treatment; dynamics of upward-striving Black families; isolation that comes from being different or a "token" in a situation and the behavior that may flow from those feelings.

   c. Community resources; systems; family supports--what's available for the family?

   d. Expectations regarding performance of Black children; Black self-concept and self-image.

4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

   a. All of the above and that much of what is observed about minority functioning can be understood to be reactive.

   b. Impact of racism on behavior; survival techniques and adaptations.

   c. Child-rearing patterns, male/female relationships, and reactive behavior of Black families attempting to survive in a hostile environment.

APPENDIX D

Curriculum Design and Reading Assignments for the Seminar Participants

Adams, Alfred. "Biracial Psychiatry." Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry. January, 1970.

Austin, Lucille N. "Basic Principles of Supervision." Techniques of Staff and Student Supervision. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1957.

Banks, George F. "The Effects of Race on One-to-One Helping Interview." Social Service Review. June 1971.

Billingsley, Andrew. "Family Functioning in Low-Income Black Community." Social Casework. Family Service Association of America. New York, 1969.

Blake, Wilmatine. "The Influence of Race on Diagnosis." Smith College School for Social Work. Vol. 53, No. 3, 1971, pp. 185-192.

Bowles, Dorcus. "Treatment Issues in Working with Black Clients." Smith College School for Social Work Journal, Vol. 4 Winter 1977. (Mimeographed.)

Burgest, David R. "Racism in Everyday Speech and Social Work Jargon." Reprint from Social Work, Vol. 18, No. 4, July 1973.

Chestang, Leon W. "Character Development in a Hostile Environment." Occasional Paper 3, School of Social Services Administration, University of Chicago, November 1973.

Cizynski, Martha. "Self-Awareness of the Supervisor in Supervision." Clinical Social Work Journal, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1978. (Mimeographed)

Franklin, John H. "The Two Worlds of Race: A Historical View." Daedalus, issue on the Negro American, Fall, 1965.

Goodman, James A. (Ed.) Dynamics of Racism in Social Work Practice. National Association of Social Workers, 1973; see also, Cooper, Shirley. "A Look at the Effect of Racism on Clinical Work," pp.127-40; Gitterman, Alex and Schaeffer, Alice, "The White Professional and the Black Client," pp.152-70; Kolodny, Ralph L. "Ethnic Cleavages in the United States: A Historical Reminder to Social Workers," pp. 39-53; Longres, John, "The

Impact of Racism on Social Work Education," pp. 291-305; Petro, Alice, "The Black Client's View of Himself," pp. 113-126; Pettit, Lois, "Some Observations on the Negro Culture in the United States," pp. 3-11; Robertson, Mary Ellen, "Inclusion of Content on Ethnic and Racial Minorities in the Social Work Curriculum," pp.330-37; Stiles, Evelyn, et al. "Hear It Like It Is," pp. 179-90; Turner, John, "Education for Practice with Minorities," pp. 306-15; Vontress, Clemmont, "Racial Differences: Impediments to Rapport," pp. 80-89.

Jones, Darielle. "African-American Clients: Clinical Practice Issues." Social Work, National Association of Social Workers, Vol. 24, No. 2, March 1979, pp. 112-118.

Kadushin, Alfred. "The Racial Factor in the Interview." Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1972.

Kagwa, Winifred. "Utilization of Racial Content in Developing Self-Awareness." Journal of Education for Social Work, Council on Social Work Education, Vol. 12, No. 2, Spring 1976, pp. 21-27.

National Urban League. Summary of the Status of Black American-1981, New York, 1981.

Norton, Delores. The Dual Perspective. Council on Social Work Education, New York, 1978.

Staples, Robert. Towards a Sociology of the Black Family: A Theoretical and Methodological Assessment. (Mimeographed)

Speigel, John P. "Cultural Aspects of Transference and Countertransference." Journal of American Academy of Psychoanalysis. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1976. (Mimeographed).

SESSION I.

Introduction: "tuning in" to each other through use of an exercise (see Appendix B). Orientation which provides an overview of the program--its objectives, procedures, time schedules, and the administration of the pretest knowledge base test regarding minority content (see Appendix C for the pretest instruments and log guidelines). Obtain volunteers to present student recordings and student/supervisory conference recordings for future sessions. Discuss the use and their preparation of the logs.

Reading assignment:*

"The Two Worlds of Race: A Historical View," by John H. Franklin.

"Ethnic Cleavages in the United States: An Historical Reminder to Social Workers," by Ralph L. Kolodny.

"Some Observations on the Negro Culture in the United States," by Lois Petit.

Emphasis is placed on openness, field instructor input is encouraged, and the notion of their contribution is stressed.

SESSION II.

Theme: The historical perspective and social work practice with Black clients. Discussion of what needs to be known and taught in relation to the Black experience. Service delivery systems and the Black community as they relate to historical and contemporary conditions.

Questions and discussion of the reading assignments.

Discussion of their concerns; comments from the previous week.

Logs are to be submitted at Session IV.

Reading assignment:

"Family Functioning in the Low-Income Black Community," by Andrew Billingsley.

"Character Development in a Hostile Environment," by Leon W. Chestang.

"Towards a Sociology of the Black Family," by Robert Staples.

Summary of the "Status of Black America," National Urban League.

SESSION III

Theme: Perspectives on Black family patterns and life sytles--roles, language, self-concept, attitude and personality development. Distinctions between race, culture and class that need to be made. Strengths of Black families.

Discussion of issues from the field, their work with students, and our beginning work together.* Role-play a case vignette (see Appendix E).
Distribute "student case" material for Session IV discussion--the Black family case study, "Establishing a Relationship".

<u>Reading assignment</u>:

"Racial Differences: Impediments to Rapport," by Clemmont Vontrees.

"Treatment Issues in Working with Black Clients," by Dorcus Bowles.

"The Influence of Race on Diagnosis," by Wilmatine Blake.

"African-American Clients: Issues for Clinical Practice," by Darriele Jones.

"The Racial Factor in the Interview," by Alfred Kadushin.

"Biracial Psychiatry," by Paul L. Adams, M.D.

Remind the participants that the logs will be collected at the end of the next session.

SESSION IV

Theme: Race, culture, and attitudes as factors in social work practice with Black clients; the relationship between the client's culture and responsiveness to the helping relationship.

Discussion of the "student case" material in light of the theme for the day; discuss the readings and supervisory issues (see Appendix F).

Focus questions for discussion regarding social work practice from a cultural perspective.

Discussion of the beginning work with students in the use of and the integration of this material in practice.

General discussion and some feedback.

Collegt logs.

---

*The field instructor participants used case studies drawn from their own and the seminar leader's work.

Reading assignment:

"The Effects of Race on One-To-One Helping Interviews," by George F. Banks.

"Cultural Aspects of Transference and Countertransference," by John P. Speigle.

"Racism in Everyday Speech and Social Work Jargon," by David R. Burgest.

"A Look at the Effect of Racism on Clinical Work," by Shirley Cooper.

"The White Professional and the Black Client," by Alex Gitterman and Alice Schaeffer.

"The Black Client's View of Himself," by Olive Petro and Betty French.

"Here It Like It Is," by Evelyn Stiles, et al.

SESSION V

Theme: Racism and prejudice. Treatment issues--the nature of problems faced in developing treatment skills to serve Black clients; racial impediments; transracial treatment, and some issues regarding Black on Black treatment relationships.

Presentation of a student/supervisory conference.

Discussion of the material, encourage participants' thoughts and how they might handle the same or similar situations; role-play, if appropriate.

Discussion of their ongoing experience in working with students with this material.

Use "student case" material to highlight issues and to identify student learning needs, teaching content, and tasks.

Distribute student case from a participant for discussion in next session.

Comment on logs.

Reading assignment:

"The Dual Perspective," by Delores Norton;

"Education for Practice with Minorities," by John Turner;

"The Impact of Racism on Social Work Education," by John Longres;

"The Inclusion of Content on Ethnic and Racial Minorities in the Social Work Curriculum," by Mary Ella Robertson.

SESSION VI

Theme: Education for practice with Black clients; self-awareness of the student and field instructor; specific aspects of supervision as a mode of education.

Pull together previous work in sessions.

Presentation of case of students' work with a Black family. Discuss in relation to the readings and knowledge regarding field instruction, supervisory issues and the minority content that ought to be taught in relation to the case.

Feedback, critique and assessment with participants about what their learning needs are at this point.

Reading assignment:

"Utilization of Racial Content in Developing Self-Awareness," by Winifred Kagwa;

"Self Awareness of the Supervisor in Supervision," by Martha Cizynski;

"Basic Principles of Supervision," by Lucille Austin.

SESSION VII

Theme: Supervisory techniques; making an educational assessment; identifying learning patterns.

Discussion of presentation of a student case with focus on the minority content issues and the ideas that support the supervisory plan; methods used to meet identified needs regarding the content to be taught.

Discuss material from the logs, if indicated; more pulling together of themes, issues and more feedback about the content and process of the seminar.

Remind participants that the logs will be collected next week.

Begin to deal with the "ending," and the feelings regarding termination.

SESSION VIII

Theme: The ending, the pulling together of some loose ends; informal evaluation.

Administration of the post-test instruments (see Appendix E for the post-test case vignettes).

Collect logs, and allow for sufficient time for discussion about the seminar, the participants' feelings and recommendations.

APPENDIX E

Role Play Exercise

The participants role-play a student/supervisor conference. The case material is described below. Both participants are given the case material. The focus is on identifying the minority content to be taught.

The M. Family

T. was referred to the Child Development Team at Community School A by his second grade teacher, Ms. H. He was described as having no academic interest, is constantly tardy, and is disruptive and aggressive in his behavior.

T. is the last of 9 children born to Mr. and Mrs. M. in South Carolina. He is a stocky child who talks freely and easily. He has a one-inch scar over his right eye as a result of a school-related accident which required 8 stitches. Over his left eye is visible swelling, the result of a tumor operation in August, 1976.

His world is a fantasy one. He imagines himself a member of the Jackson Five group and states that T. is really his nickname and the other M. children are his cousins, not his siblings. He talks of performances out of town, costumes, and demonstrates some of the dances. He claims that he lives down South with his aunt, but is visiting his mother in New York. He's been here for 25 days. He has two fathers, he said. The real one is God, the other is his mother's boyfriend.

Mrs. M. is a 36-year-old, very attractive plump woman. Of her 11 children , 8 are with her. In addition, she adopted one of her sister's two children after her death. Her last 2 children are the result of a common-law relationship with Mac. Mrs. M. moved to New York with her 9 children after she and her husband J. separated. J. is an alcoholic and had been neglectful of his home and children. His present whereabouts are unknown, but it is believed that he is still in South Carolina.

Mrs. M. is a very proud woman and reluctant to admit that her children's problems are burdensome. Two other children have also been referred for help. Mrs. M. attends night school and is working on getting her high school diploma. She is aware of T.'s problems but feels helpless in dealing with him. However, she is eager for him to get help.

APPENDIX F

Student Case

New York University School of Social Work

CASE RECORD*

This is a confidential record. Although the names and places have been changed, it is a real record of an actual working relationship between a social worker and client within an angency system. It is to be made available on a loan basis, and is not to be reproduced.

---

*Used with the permission of Smith College School for Social Work.

CASE SUMMARY

Issue: Establishing a Relationship

Identifying Data

Name:	June T.	Marital Status:	Single
Age:	36	Children:	Mayou, 8
Race:	Black		Chukma, 2½
Occupation:	Unemployed		

Worker	
Age:	28
Race:	White
Religion:	Jewish

Presenting Problem

Ms. T. brought her daughter, Mayou, to the agency (child guidance) for treatment. She was referred to us in April, 1978 by her daughter's public school guidance counselor because of Mayou's severe emotional difficulties in second grade. Maryou would have trntrums, cry loudly and inconsolably, then hide in embarrassment, become extremely upset at mild criticism which was provoked by her difficulty following instructions or completing assignments. She required a great deal of the teacher's attention. At the end of the year, Maryou, being very bright, was transferred to a private school with an open classroom model of education. She entered the third grade on a scholarship this past September. There, she is the only Black child in her class, whose Black teacher is nevertheless unable to cope with her. Again, she has poor concentration, is erratic, impulsive and disorganized and has difficulty completing work assignments. She is preoccupied with fantasy and prone to tell her fantastic stories to teacher and classmates, provoking disbelief and ridicule. When she fails to win credence, she cries. She has no friends and appears to be ostracized within the class. She frequently withdraws in embarrassment.

Background Information

Mayou is an 8-year-old girl who lives with her mother, her natural father (not married to her mother) and her full brother. Ms. T. is a depressed, slow-moving woman who is, however, concerned, conscientious and discerning with regard to Maryou. She is quite permissive in contrast to Maryou's father, who is a stern and emotionally unavailable man. He is a groundsman for the Housing Authority and Ms. T. is supported on ADC.

Ms. T. is the youngest of 4 children. The next oldest to her is 7 years older. She feels that she was "spoiled" by her parents because she was often the only child in the home, and maybe that is why she has "spoiled" Maryou. Her mother (now 72) lives nearby in the neighborhood and she says she is very close to her mother. Father is dead. One of her sisters lives in a suburb and has problems with her children, who are also in treatment. Ms. T. says they are "angry and stubborn" and adds facetiously, "maybe it runs in the family."

Ms. T. describes her family as one with high strivings for their children. All of her siblings went to college and it was assumed she would, too. She was an art major in high school (painting) and wanted to continue in that vein in college. Her parents disagreed, saying she must be practical. In defiance, she decided not to go to college. She regrets her decision and wants Maryou to get a good education so "she'll have more options."

Ms. T.'s parents were both "domestics." Her father was a bitter man who hated all white people. He worked for whites as a cook. Ms. T. recalls as a child how she was forced to smile in their presence and then listened to her father as he vehemently spoke about them behind their backs.

Ms. T. has lived with Maryou's father off and on for about 9 years. She claims now to have little feeling for him and only seeks enough money to take her children and leave him. He left her when Maryou was born and returned 5 years later to father Chukma and then decided to stay on. With that, life changed dramatically for both Maryou and Ms. T. Suddenly there was another child and the father. Maryou and mother no longer had the other's undivided attention. Ms. T. reports she became depressed after the birth of Chukma. He is a sickly child (asthma) and often needs hospitalization. Since his birth, mother has been unable to work, gained weight, stopped caring for the home, etc. Money has become a big problem for the family, there never being enough now that mother can't work.

In sessions, Ms. T. seems quite depressed. Her speech is bland and her affect is flat with occasional flares of interest. When she describes Maryou's attention-seeking behavior at home, she does so with a denial of feeling. When asked how this makes her feel, she shrugs and says, "that's just the way it is." She is emotionally unavailable to her children. In family sessions, she ignores them. Even when they physically stand between us when we are talking, she talks as if they weren't even there. She ignores their remarks or appeals for attention. She seems incapable of setting limits. In a session where the kids were climbing on the furniture, fighting and screaming, she did not intervene. She describes incidents of them fighting at home, where she'll shut herself in her bedroom or bathroom, leaving them to work it out. She says they have to learn to fight their own battles.

She says she wants to return to work but can't because she can't leave the children. If she leaves Maryou with anyone but her mother, Maryou cries incessantly. She says she can't leave Chukma because of his asthma, which is aggravated by cold weather. The last time she began to brush up on her secretarial skills to go back to work, Chukma was hospitalized for a week. She has looked for an after-school program for Maryou, but finds them either too expensive or having not enough staff available. She says if Maryou were happier it would take the pressure off her so she could go out and get a job.

The combination of two extremely needy, active children and a depressed mother is creating problems for this family.

Course of Contact

Establishing a relationship with Ms. T. has been in a series of stages. When first seen Ms. T. was quiet and sullen. She did not volunteer much information only answering when directly asked a question. Then she spoke briefly and to the point.

The initial obstacle was an issue of confidentiality. When I contacted Ms. T. by phone she was reluctant to come in, saying that Maryou had done much better over the summer and she wanted to see how she would do in the new school. I supported her pleasure over Maryou's progress but wondered if there weren't something else stopping her from coming in. I wondered if she weren't disappointed over the long summer wait? (The evaluation was done in April and May, treatment was not offered until my call in September). She said no, but she did say the fee was too high. During the evaluation she said she did not want to use medicaid for our services. She said she was concerned about them reading our records. She used to work for the city as a typist in a clinic and knows that information is wide open. Therefore, she elected to pay the fee of $6.00.

When I saw Ms. T. to discuss the fee issue she revealed that she had decided not to use Medicaid because she had mentioned in the evaluation that Maryou's father lived in the house and was afraid welfare would terminate her money. She felt that Maryou really needed treatment because in the intervening time she had begun at the new private school and was doing poorly. As we talked, I acknowledged that she was in a difficult situation but that we would see what could be worked out to get Maryou the treatment she needed. Therefore, over about a month of telephone conversations, and legal discussions with the agency staff, I discussed with her the options. Basically, I said that I could not guarantee her that Medicaid would not at some point read our records, but that they did not inform welfare. However, we could not give her a 100% guarantee and we could not remove something from our records. I hoped that she would decide to come in with Maryou but realized the decision was up to her. She ultimately decided to begin treatment.

The second stage was an acknowledgement that her feelings were important. This lasted most of our 5 months together. I felt like our time was a good deal of redefining what she thought to be acceptable to talk about. I would ask her how she felt about something Maryou might do and she would reply that she just ignored it. She might add that she coped with things, whatever her feelings were. I replied that yes, she did what she had to, but she also had feelings about that. I wanted to hear her feelings. This evolved into my merely giving her the space to talk about herself. For instance, in one session we spoke about her hopes for Maryou educationally and that led to her talking about her family's expectations for herself. She told me about defying her family in not going to college because she wanted to continue with her art. I wondered what kind of art she enjoyed. She started to talk about her painting. I felt for one of the first times in our sessions that she and I had some kind of connection.

The third stage in our sessions was discussing Ms. T.'s feelings of being a Black woman in a white Jewish agency. This occured when Ms. T. told me she was not much of a talker. "I'm very secretive, a plotter." She told me she was plotting to leave Maryou's father. She commented that he didn't realize it, and that one day he would wake up and they would be gone. I wondered if she might do that in other relationships, for instance in our relationship? She said no. I commented that there might be many areas in our relationship that could make her angry, angry enough to leave without talking about it. I hope she would talk first. She said she would, but our eyes met and I said I thought I noticed some doubts there. I said, "For instance, I don't know how you feel about having a white worker?" She said it had crossed her mind. She spoke about telling Maryou what it is like being Black and how to stand up for herself; then she spoke about her parents' hatred for whites. I spoke about how important her heritage seemed to her, commenting on her children's African names, her sending Maryou to an African-American day camp, her celebrating the African equivalent of Christmas in her home. She then spoke about her feelings of doubt that I could understand her: her Black experience, her lifestyle (of which she mentioned living with Maryou's father and still getting welfare). I said that she was right, I might not understand her experiences, but that the only way to tell would be to talk about them. After all, if I really couldn't understand her, it would be important for both of us to know. When she seemed unsure I asked what would be the worst that could happen? She smiled, but said nothing. I questioned whether she felt she could ask for another worker if that happened. She thought she could. I said it would be important to talk about that if she ever felt that way.

The fourth stage was when Ms. T. began to feel comfortable enough to begin to express some negative feelings about our progress. She had spoken obliquely about how her negative feelings and angry feelings were not important. She generally denied these (and any) feelings.

She first spoke about being poor and how "you can't let people push you around." Things were progressing to where Maryou was being tested for special class placement. She was having psychologicals and psychiatric exam. She was quite definite about wanting to know what the tests were, how they were scored and what the results were. Throughout this process she was informed on every account. She was pleased that she was not "talked down to," not "given the run around" and not treated like she was poor. She did say that if she had money she would not be at a public agency. Also she would be able to afford a private school and not have to rely on public school special class placement.

The timing of the special class application was unfortunate, coming about the time I was leaving the agency and the case would be transferred. Ms. T. expressed disappointment that we had not begun earlier and that the process took as long as it did. I agreed with her and told her so. I also commented that at a private therapist, the therapist would not leave so she would not have to change in midstream. She agreed that she was angry about my leaving but that she would take it in stride.

The final stage in our working together was dealing with termination and transfer to a new worker. During this time and through the last session, Ms. T. pulled back into herself somewhat. She was not as open and able to express herself as she had been previously, though by comparison to the beginning of treatment, she had still come a long way. I commented on how hard it was to change to a new person in mid-stream. That it might be hard to talk about things at the end, since they would have to be gone over again soon with someone new. Ms. T. said that in hindsight she would not have begun working with me if she had realized she would have to change I reminded her that we had spoken at length about the time we would have to work together and that if treatment was not completed she would move to another worker. She remembered that but said that at the start she had believed that we would be finished by the time I left. I wondered if she felt I could have done more for her and Maryou so they might be finished now. She said no, only repeating that she wished the testing might have been done at the beginning. Maybe all children should be tested routinely, she suggested. I said I could understand her wish that everything be more settled. Maybe we'd be further along if we had tested right away, but testing was not an answer to everything and we had to understand something about Maryou first.

We talked about the transfer to the new worker and what her expectations were. She did not anticipate anything. She preferred to wait and see. Then, however, she said she might not be able to talk to the new worker. We talked about what it would be like for her. I commented that I thought the fact that she had been able to develop a relationship with me boded well for any new worker. That she was very concerned about Maryou's well-being and this came across. Aslo, that if she felt she was unable to talk to the new worker,

it would be important to tell her so. I wanted her to feel she had some control of the situation and told her so.

It is noteworthy that of all my clients, Ms. T. did not ask me where I was going. She knew I was "leaving the agency" but never asked where I was going or why. When at one point I commented on the fact that she hadn't mentioned my leaving, she merely shrugged and said "that's the way it is."

Diagnostic Statement

Depressive Neurosis. Ms. T. is an overwhelmed and depressed woman who nonetheless is concerned and conscientious about her children. She uses rationalization as her primary defense, i.e., when she withdraws from her children and closes herself in her room she says "they have to learn to fight their own battles." Another main defense mechanism is isolation of affect. She is not only dealing with situational stress (poverty) but also a severe depression. She is able to tolerate anxiety and deal with impulses by the use of her defenses and withdrawal physically. She has unstable object relations, but that appears to be a function of her depression. She was able to relate to the worker. Her depression also appears to effect her difficulties in working. Her depression also appears to effect her difficulties in working. She has expressed feelings of guilt and internal conflict over her role in Maryou's difficulties. Empathy has not been evidenced but I question it is masked by her depression.

APPENDIX G

THE CASE OF EDWARD*
(Post-Test)

Edward, a 10-year-old Black youngster, was referred to a child and family service agency. He is in the third grade and his teacher was disturbed by his deficiencies in fundamental reading and arithmetic skills, and by marked difficulties in retaining material in which he had been drilled for hours individually by his teacher. In the past, Edward's attendance at school was very erratic. At the time of the referral it had improved considerably.

Edward is cautious, yet has a cooperative attitude. He is the second youngest of 7 children. They range in age from 23 to 8 years and, except for the oldest sibling who is in law school in the South, all of the children live with the mother in a 3-room apartment.

Mrs. R., Edward's mother, is a depressed 42-year-old woman who is somewhat guarded as she talks about the family. She describes E. as causing her some concern. He was premature in weight at birth (2 lbs.) but was a full term baby and there was a normal delivery. He was in an incubator for 2 weeks and had to have a transfusion because of what she called "yellow blood." Mrs. R. was equally unclear about the cause of her son's enuresis and his needing to be hospitalized for a month (two years ago) because of the enuresis. His developmental history was described as being normal except for delayed walking and speech. He has always been slender in build, but has a good appetite. Except for the enuresis, there have been no other hospitalizations. However, Edward has been out of school a great deal.

The father is deceased. He was shot and killed some three years ago. Mrs. R. offers this information but makes it quite clear that it is not something which she or the children talk about. She says about herself that she is asthmatic and, generally, not in good health. She is troubled and isolated and struggles to carry the overwhelming burden of caring for her family. The family is supported by welfare. Except for Edward with his learning difficulties, and his 12-year-old brother who had behavior problems, the children are said to be presenting no difficulties. Although Edward is described as being "stubborn," Mrs. R. has a strong interest in getting help for him. She had no supports and one senses that there is a good deal of turmoil in her life.

*Case vignette from records of the author.

MODEL RESPONSES TO THE CASE OF EDWARD

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a. Possible health problems of E. and his mother; diagnostic assessment of E. for appropriate school placement; meaning of the attendance problem.

   b. Housing problems; marginal economic subsistence.

   c. Mrs. R.'s depression and the impact on the family as well as other problems the family may be experiencing.

   d. Need to educate mother re: child development and the differences E. may exhibit because of medical history.

   e. Behavior problem of sibling; death of father and the limited family communication; assessing strengths of family and individual members of the family.

2. What interventions should be made?

   a. Referrals for health, and medical checkup; after-school programs for E.; mother's group, if appropriate, with other parents of "developmentally different" children.

   b. Help with housing and more adequate living conditions.

   c. Supportive counseling for mother; psychiatric consultation regarding the depression.

   d. Help family regarding feelings around death of father.

   e. Close liaison with school re: E.

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a. Community resources and contact with various needed services.

   b. Knowledge of developmental disabilities/ mental retardation; principles of consultation and advocacy.

   c. Skill and knowledge in working with families with multiple problems, and family functioning in low-income minority families.

4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

   a. Different cultural patterns and minority family functioning.

b. Survival and coping mechanisms of Black families.

c. The nature of "high risk" families and the impact of environmental and societal assaults on Blacks at risk.

d. Dynamics involved with Black adolescent males at the high risk developmental stage.

e. Particular strengths of Blacks.

THE CASE OF BEN*

Ben is a 13-year-old Black, moderately retarded child, who at the time of referral was enrolled in a classroom for Trainable Mentally Retarded children. He is an attractive child, with no visible physical stigma, and were it not for his grossly abnormal speech patterns and inappropriate affect, relying on visual clues alone, the retardation would not have been suspected. His relationships with others indicate that he is a child who has enjoyed nurturing primary relationships. He came to the attention of the outreach staff when he developed what appeared to be reactive behavioral problems. He was assigned to a second year social work intern for beginning assessment.

Mother appeared as a concerned parent, who presented information with inappropriate affect even as she described what she termed her husband's "accident." He had been completely paralyzed below the waist after being shot in a robbery attempt. During his course of treatment one leg was amputated, he was frequently hospitalized and, on his visits home, required almost total nursing care; a task that was shared by all family members, including Ben. Prior to the father's injury the family had functioned well and coped well with the retardation. Although income was marginal, it was supplemented by the father's playing the numbers and other "hustles." As the parents discussed the child, it was almost as if he were not retarded. Expectations for him in terms of behavior were the same as for other siblings. The father referred to Ben as being a "little slow," yet his pride in his only son was apparent. Neither parent was a regular church attender, yet their religious faith enabled them to accept their two misfortunes. Statements were made such as "Ben is a healthy child," and "Thank God he wasn't killed."

The father remains the center of the family; a strong and independent man, with whom the child shares a close relationship. Ben was called upon to assist in the very basics of his care. Because of the retardation and his emotional response to the injury, there was much confusion as to the cause and duration of his father's incapacitated state. Because of his expressive language deficits, the level of his understanding was difficult to ascertain.

Mother had many underlying feelings associated with the loss of sexual activity. It was equally difficult for the father to acknowledge her continuing sexual needs and his own. How they viewed

*Case vignette provided by Professor Alma J. Carten, New York University School of Social Work.

sexuality was deeply rooted in their Blackness and male-female relationships. The female adolescent siblings indicated a need for genetic counseling and they were vulnerable to the many myths that are presented in the Black community about retardation.

MODEL RESPONSES TO THE CASE OF BEN

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a. B.'s need for supportive counseling re: father's impairment; related adolescent concerns.

   b. B.'s role as the "functioning" male in a family that wishes him as normal.

   c. Counseling needs for parents re: sexual needs and impact of father's disability on family; changes in economics.

   d. The need for genetic counseling for siblings.

   e. School problems, real and potential, for B. and siblings.

2. What interventions should be made?

   a. Therapy for child and parents re: B.'s condition and his reactive behavior; stress re: sexual loss; impact of father's illness.

   b. Genetic counseling for siblings.

   c. Rehabilitation counseling for father and training, if indicated.

   d. Liaison activities with school and with other agencies involved with the family.

   e. Some family sessions.

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a. Some understanding of mental retardation/developmental disabilities and cultural and class reactions to the condition.

   b. Family functioning; Black male/female relationships; and the strength of Black families.

   c. Developmental theories, particularly in relation to adolescents and retardation.

4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

   a. Characteristics of male/female relationships and sexuality as part of the relationship.

   b. Some misconceptions held by Blacks re: mental retardation.

   c. Nature of social services in the Black community.

   d. Unique coping, adaptive and survival skills of Blacks; use of religion; "hustles" as income supplement; use of language; support systems for Blacks; minorities are often the victims of crime.

THE CASE OF FRANK*

Frank, an 8-year-old Black youngster, was referred to the child development team in an inner city public school, because of his very low level of performance. He is in the first grade, is unable to use a pencil, and his knowledge of letters and numbers is nonexistent. He is awkward in his movements and, physically, he does not look well.

Frank is the third youngest of 8 children. His siblings range in age from 3 to 14 years of age. The oldest, Ruby, is retarded, and has been out of school.

Mrs. F., age 31, is separated from her husband whose whereabouts are unknown. She lives with 5 of her children in a 2-room apartment. Three of the children, H., B., and M., live with an aunt. Mrs. F.'s own history is quite tragic, with early separation from a rejecting, unloving mother. Rape at the age of 16 resulted in her first pregnancy, in addition to abuse and exploitation by the woman with whom she lived after her mother left her to come to New York. The F. family has been in New York, from the South, about two years, each having come at different times.

In regard to F., the mother reports that he was born prematurely at 7 months, weighing 3 lbs., 7 oz., and remained in an incubator for 6 weeks. Early development, except for walking at age 2 years, is described as satisfactory. F. is small for his age and poorly developed. Mrs. F. could not remember specifics regarding development except that he walked lake and talked early.

Other children in the family have experienced some difficulty in school, but apparently not as severe.

Mrs. F. is extremely depressed, feels isolated, and only has some emotional support from a brother who lives in the same apartment building. Her rage about her mother is tremendous and there is a strong sense of helplessness about her children and current life.

*Case vignette from records of the author.

MODEL RESPONSES FOR THE CASE OF FRANK

1. Problems identified by the worker should include:

   a. Overcrowded and economically marginal living conditions.

   b. Learning problems, and possible health and medical problems.

   c. Social work service needs for Ruby; assessment of needs of other children.

   d. Mrs. R.'s feelings of depression, hopelessness and isolation.

2. What interventions should be made?

   a. Referrals for diagnostic testing for Frank and Ruby; special services for the retarded for Ruby; and some preventive measures to prevent Ruby's becoming pregnant.

   b. Help with the concrete needs, particularly housing.

   c. Referral to social work agency for ongoing contact with Mrs. F. for purposes of ventilation, support, "corrective emotional experience" in order to deal with her struggles and feelings.

   d. Contact with brother (collateral) who is identified as the mother's emotional support.

   e. Contact with the school on behalf of the other children.

3. What do I (social worker) need to know?

   a. Some knowledge of mental retardation/developmental disabilities as well as knowledge about child development patterns.

   b. Services provided by the board of education; services for the retarded; principles of advocacy, consultation and collaboration with various systems.

   c. Work with families with multiple problems.

   d. Dynamics of depression and impact of early life experiences on behavior of individuals.

4. What ought to be taught to students regarding minority content in relation to the case?

   a. Minority culture of Blacks; impact of poverty and ghetto living.

b. The isolation that develops with families moving from the rural South to the urban North.

c. Some of the possible misconceptions about retardation held by some Blacks--shame, blame, etc.

d. Concept of the extended family; other support systems in the minority community; and assessment of systems and service providers when working with the minority poor.

APPENDIX H

Seminar Certificate

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Social Work

This is to certify that

Has completed an advanced seminar in Field Instruction for teaching and integration of minority content in field instruction, while serving as a field instructor for our social work student(s)

Date

Lucretia J. Phillips
Associate Professor
Director of Fieldwork

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Lucille N. "Basic Principles of Supervision." Carlton E. Munson (Ed.). Social Work Supervision: Classic Statements and Critical Issues. New York: Free Press, 1979, pp. 56-69.

Bandler, Bernard, M.D. "Ego-Centered Teaching." Smith College Studies in Social Work. Vol. XXX, No. 2. Northampton, Massachusetts: SCSSW, February, 1960, pp. 125-136.

Bandura, Albert. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Berengarten, Sidney. "Educational Issues in Field Instruction in Social Work." The Social Service Review. Vol. 35, No. 3, September, 1961, pp. 246-257.

________. "Identifying Learning Patterns of Individual Students: An Exploratory Study. Social Service Review. Vol. XXXI, No. 4, 1957, pp. 407-417.

Billingsley, Andrew. Black Families in White America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968.

Bieri, James. "Some Principles of Learning in Field Instruction." Annual Workshop for Field Instructors and Faculty, Columbia University School of Social Work, March 1963. (Mimeographed.)

Brody, Eugene B. "Symptomatic Behavior: Ego Defensive Adaptive and Sociocultural Aspects." Silvano Arieti and Eugene B. Brody (Eds.). American Handbook of Psychiatry, Vol. III. New York: Basic Books, 1974, pp. 17-35.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Burns, Richard. New Approaches to Behavioral Objective. Iowa: William C. Brown Co. Publishers, 1972.

Carmichael, Stokley and Hamilton, Charles V. Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America. New York: Random House, Vantage Books, 1967.

Caws, Peter. "On The Teaching of Ethics in a Pluralistic Society." Hastings Center Report, October 1978.

Chestang, Leon W. "Character Development in a Hostile Environment." Occasional Paper 3, School of Social Services Administration, University of Chicago, November 1973.

________. Achievement and Self-Esteem Among Black Americans: A Study of Twenty Lives. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, June 1977.

________. "Competencies and Knowledge in Clinical Social Work: A Dual Perspective. Patricia Ewalt (Ed.). Toward A Definition of Clinical Social Work. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1979, pp. 1-12.

Cohen, Jerome. "Race as a Factor in Social Work Practice." Roger Miller (Ed.). Race, Research and Reason: Social Work Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1969.

Colson, Melvin. "The Key Ingredient in Community Participation in Planning Mental Health Services for Minorities." Conference on Issues and Priorities for Improved Community Mental Health Services for Racial Minorities, June 1980. (Mimeographed.)

Comer, James, M.D. "The Black Family: An Adaptive Perspective." (Mimeographed.)

Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Policy Statement for the Master's Degree Program in Graduate Schools of Social Work. New York, 1969; 1981.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Francis, Arcelis E. (Ed.). Black Task Force Report: Suggested Guides for the Integration of Black Content into the Social Work Curriculum. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973.

Franklin, John Hope. "The Two Worlds of Race: A Historical View." Daedalus Issue on the Negro American. Vol. 94, No. 4, Fall 1965, pp. 899-220. (Mimeographed.)

Fact Sheets on Institutional Racism. Compiled by the Council on Interracial Books for Children. New York: January 1982.

Glasgow, Douglas. The Black Underclass: Poverty Unemployment and Entrapment of Ghetto Youth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Gil, Rosa Maria. "Hispanic Americans and the Community Mental Health Services." Conference on Issues and Priorities for Improved Community Mental Health Center Services for Racial Minorities, June 1980. (Mimeographed.)

Gary, Lawrence. "Social Work Education and the Black Community: A Proposal for Curriculum Revisions." Carl Scott, (Ed.). Ethnic Minorities in Social Work. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970.

Hill, Robert B. The Strengths of Black Families. New York: National Urban League, Inc., 1971.

Knowles, Malcolm S. "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based Upon Adult Learning." Journal of Education for Social Work. Spring 1972, pp. 32-39.

Leigh, James W. "Ethnic Content in Field Instruction." Black Perspectives on Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1974, pp. 51-61.

Levy, Charles. "Personal Versus Professional Values: The Practitioner's Dilemmas." Clinical Social Work Journal. Vol. 4, No. 2, 1976, pp. 110-120.

________. "The Value Base of Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work. New York: Council on Social Work Education, Winter 1973, pp. 34-42.

Meyer, Carol. Social Work Practice: A Response to the Urban Crisis. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Mizio, Emelicia. "White Worker-Minority Client." Social Work. Vol. 17, No. 3, May 1972, pp. 82-87.

Mussen, Paul Henry, et al. Child Development and Personality (5th ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1979, pp. 31-34; cited by Leon W. Chestang, "Competencies and Knowledge in Clinical Social Work: A Dual Perspective." Patricia Ewalt (Ed.). Toward a Definition of Clinical Social Work. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1979.

National Association of Social Workers. Code of Ethics. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, April 1967.

New York University School of Social Work. Self Study Report to the Commission on Accreditation to the Council on Social Work Education. June 1974.

Norton, Dolores G. The Dual Perspective. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1978.

Oswald, Ida. "Field Work Instruction: Facts and Outlook." Trends in Field Work Instruction. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1966, pp. 7-14.

Papell, Catherine P. A Study of Styles of Learning for Direct Social Work Practice. DSW dissertation, Yeshiva University, June 1978.

Reynolds, Bertha Capen. Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work. New York: Russell and Russell, 1970.

Robertson, Mary Ella. "Inclusion of Content on Ethnic and Racial Minorities in the Social Work Curriculum." J.A. Goodman (Ed.). Dynamics of Racism in Social Work Practice. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1973, pp. 330-337.

Scheffler, Israel. The Language of Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1960.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Smith College School for Social Work. A Model for the Training Supervisors. Northampton, Massachusetts, September 1978.

Solomon, Barbara B. Black Empowerment. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

The State of Black America 1981. National Urban League. New York, January 1981.

Thomas, Alexander and Sillen, Samuel. Racism and Psychiatry. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1972.

Towle, Charlotte. The Learner in Education for the Professions as Seen in Education for Social Work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Turner, John B. "Education for Practice with Minorities." J.A. Goodman (Ed.). Dynamics of Racism in Social Work Education. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Social Workers, 1973, pp. 306-315.

Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.