Order Number 8914751

Transition from practitioner to social work student: The work-study student

Goldstein, Samuel Michael, D.S.W.

City University of New York, 1988

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Transition from Practitioner to Social Work Student:

The Work-Study Student

by

Samuel M. Goldstein

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

1988

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.

9/29/88
Date

Chair of Examining Committee

1/29/88
Date

Executive Officer

Dr. Charles Guzzetta

Dr. Irving Weisman

Dr. Solomon Green
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

TRANSITION FROM PRACTITIONER TO STUDENT

by

Samuel M. Goldstein

Adviser: Dr. Charles Guzzetta

The socialization of the full time work-study student has received limited attention in graduate social work education. The "work-study" student has been defined in this project as one who carries full time employment in a social agency and simultaneously studies for a social work degree in which field instruction is in the employing agency.

Work-study students were excluded from studentship when social work education became university based. Historically, this was not always the case. Recently, decreased applications to schools of social work and demand by agencies for upgrading staff, gave rise to development of this former educational arrangement. In recognition of needs of smaller geographical communities and because of the special mission of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work, a national block plan was developed in which full time work-study students were admitted.

The faculty noted this cohort had difficulty understanding their beginning studentship and demonstrated conflict over their employee-student status. This duality of function posed severe

role strains which effected the nature and quality of their learning. Faculty recommended a special project course be developed to help beginning students in the transition from practitioner to student. The impact of that interventional strategy was the subject of this dissertation.

An exploratory design was utilized and three instruments were used to measure the outcome of the project. Instruments were administered at the beginning and end of the course. Twenty work-study students maintained a log of their educational experience and each student was interviewed once during the eight week summer program.

The findings indicated that the orientation course was effective in helping students acquire knowledge and awareness of their special circumstances; enlarged their conception of studentship and reduced role strain and conflict. The project facilitated socialization to the profession.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In my endeavor to become a student I experienced both the pain and joy that comes with the struggle to grow. Many individuals have contributed to my personal growth. The ideas which culminated in this project were sparked by the doctoral faculty at Hunter College School of Social Work who were always considerate and thoughtful.

I am especially indebted to Dr. Charles Guzzetta, my project adviser. His support, generosity, and critical questions helped me confront the intellectual challenges in this study and in myself. He carefully examined my material and his comments were always substantive. He was the model social work educator and practitioner.

I am grateful to the faculty of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work, especially the Block Faculty who in their disciplined manner captured my interest in the topic of the project and made this educational issue vital and significant. Other friends on the faculty were there when needed and gave me a shoulder to lean on.

My wife Edythe and children Michelle and Jeffrey were supportive, patient, and their kindness sustained me in this effort.

Dedicated to my wife Edythe whose faith in me never waivered, whose caring, sensitivity, warmth, and nurturance was the central ingredient that sustained this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Social Work education in the United States developed about the turn of the century, when volunteers were no longer adequate in number or preparation to deal with the social problems of a modern industrial society. The apprenticeship model was rejected in favor of the professional model. This model included academic study in an academy, college, or other post secondary institutions, along with applied practical study under the guidance and supervision of an experienced master in the field.

Over the years, students have undertaken the study of social work under a variety of arrangements. Most common have been either full time or part time in which full time usually has meant a full compliment of studies with little time for outside employment; "part-time" has meant study of a reduced number of courses in order to allow adequate time for major outside commitments, mostly commonly employment. However, the employment has been expected traditionally to be in some non-social work area or at least, not having any direct relationship to the academic study. The "work-study" student is one who carry substantial or full time employment in a social agency and simultaneously studies for a social work degree. The applied, practical study is taken in the employing social agency.

This project examines the social work student who is designated as the "work-study" student. This individual attends the school of social work and fulfills the internship responsibility in the agency in which he or she is employed.

This project assesses the impact of an interventional strategy on the socialization process of incoming beginning work-study students in the block plan of the School of Social Work at Yeshiva University. A cohort of students designated as "work-study" were part of the student body which entered the program during the period of time covered by the project.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF WORK STUDY

The history of social work education reveals an ebb and flow between the wish to have students devote themselves solely to a full-time social work education and the necessity of allowing students to earn a living while pursuing their studies. Work-study is one arrangement by which students can earn a professional degree.

Social work education at the time of Mary Richmond had work-study arrangements as the primary mode of studentship. As the profession and the schools became more university-based and professionalized, the work-study arrangement was abandoned. The economic costs of social work education were essentially regarded as a student responsibility which could not be allowed to influence the necessity for intense, full-time study. Students were expected to spend each year in graduate study in a different field setting. However, by the 1970s and 80s, the social work field experienced a drop in numbers of applicants leaving schools to experiment with various educational models, including a return to the earlier work-study mode.

The applied, practical aspect of social work education, called "field work", "field instruction", "practicum", was sometimes just "field" has been developed along several lines. This development has generally

fallen into one or two broad categories, called the "Concurrent Plan" and the "Block Plan". In the Concurrent Plan, students attend classes a certain number of days each week, alternating the classroom study with a certain number of days in the practical setting (called the "field placement"). In the Block Plan, the student takes full time study, usually of a semester's duration, in the classroom, followed by full time placement in a practical setting for a designated number of weeks - hence, a "block of time" or "block placement".

Wurzweiler School of Social Work at Yeshiva University evolved a program which provided opportunities for students to study under either the Concurrent or the Block Plan.

In the development of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work Block Plan, the faculty noted some differences among the students in the different plans.

The arenas of concern identified about the work-study student focused on the student as learner; work load and distribution of time; the field instructors; field assignments; role duality and role transition of students; and related systemic issues. Such problems as being overloaded between school and agency demands; the student being inactive in one's own behalf; emphasis on production rather than process; time constraints in field instruction; and the utilization of the methods and tools

of field instruction were examples of issues encountered. These concerns, which impacted on the social work educational process had to be addressed in order for the school to be accountable and responsible for the quality of social work professional education.

It was suggested that an orientation course be developed which would sensitize the students in the Block Plan to the standards, knowledge, and concerns of social work education. The course developed was six weeks in length and addressed the problems observed by the faculty. The course was designed specifically for the work-study student. The content of the course included the following:

School and Agency relationships, Sanctions, and Functional Roles and Purposes.

The Field Instruction Process

Assignments and Learning Potential

Policies and Procedures

Values in the Profession of Social Work

Learning Opportunities - Instrumentation

Course material would be given to the students and would include readings on field instruction, The school manual, readings on values, and other materials deemed useful to the work-study student. The format for the orientation course was to be a semi-structured seminar which would allow for the presentation of content and

facilitate opportunities for discussion between participants.

This project that utilized an exploratory design attempted to assess the impact of the course noted above. Three instruments measuring values, attitudes, and identification with the agency and school were used. They are used to measure the impact of the course. Before and after measures as well as series of vignettes, specifically developed for this study were used in the study.

The project sought to examine the following questions:

1) Can the Orientation Course help the student modify his/her perspective from that of "agency employee" to that of social work "professional learner-student"?
2) Can the Orientation help the students recognize the strains inherent in their dual status of "employee" and "students"?
3) Does the work-study student value change as a result of the special orientation course?
4) Can the orientation course strengthen the students identification with both agency and school?

Educational Control

Almost from its inception, social work has been involved and occupied with two issues: one is educational "control" and the other is "professionalism". After 100 years of social work history, these concerns have not been fully resolved, and while the tensions continue, the field of social work has grown from a small band of amateurs to a complex industry of over 100,000 professional workers.

In the early days of the 20th century, social work education was characterized by short courses of apprenticeship training for recruits in the fields of charity and philanthropy. This early practice had a marked influence on the structure of social work education today. This educational system was created out of the need to improve the quality of practice in the institutions of the day, and to increase the number of practitioners who needed some preparation for their tasks.[1]

Watson pointed out that it was not in the academic institutions that social work education had its beginning.

> The first suggestions for a professional school of social work came not from colleges or universities, but from the members of the International and National Conference of Charities, and the first professional classes were organized, not by an educational institution, but by the directors and staff of a private charitable agency.[2]

The need for professional training schools was put forward by Mary Richmond at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1887,

> Through these 20 years, our charity organization societies have stood for trained services in charity. We are thoroughly committed to that, in theory at least. But it is not enough to create a demand for trained service. Having created the demand ... we should strive to supply it.[3]

Levy suggests that in Mary Richmond's view a system of professional training was a prerequisite to the formulation of standards of professional practice. He notes that in her suggestions there was the possibility of avoiding a tendency towards artificial specialization within the work of the agency and also the possibility of laying a common professional foundation for all practitioners. Richmond also held the view that training schools should focus on practical work rather than academic requirements. She stated this often and argued against the transfer of control of the schools of social work from the field to the university.[4]

Rothman has stated that the foundations laid by Mary Richmond are the same today as they were from the beginning of the training schools. There is an inseparable interest between the social work agency and the school of social work.[5] The schools and the agencies have struggled over this educational control even while voicing a "partnership". This strain has left an impact

upon educators, administrators, practitioners, and those individuals entering into the educational process. It is perhaps especially true of those individuals designated as work-study students, who work in agencies as employees and at the same time enter the school which, to all intents and purposes, acts as the gatekeeper to their sought after profession.

The Association of Schools of Social Work struggled with the issue of educational control of field work from 1919 to 1933. In that latter year, the Association required that schools present "an approved program of field work under the educational control of the school."[6] Gordon Hamilton, by contrast, suggested: "Perhaps what all schools of social work really need for effective curriculum is educational control of the independent field facilities that they use."[7] Katherine Kendall of the Council on Social Work Education staff (successor in 1952 to the American Association of Schools of Social Work) argued for greater educational controls through structured learning experiences in the field.[8]

It was not until 1939 that the American Association of Schools of Social Work mandated that social work education be on a graduate level. It took some three decades to anchor the partnership of the school-agency in the university which then stressed its educational control.

Boehm in 1974 pointed out that social work education had not yet resolved the issue of educational control.[9] Most schools held the view in which "the agency must yield."[10] One author stated that:

> The process of collaboration must be rooted in a real acceptance by both (school and agency) that the professional school carried major responsibility for leadership in the process between the two parts. What does it (the school) ask? It asks of the agency to yield a little of its own wholeness ... in order that the school may discharge its responsibilities and obligations as educator.[11]

The same formulation was stated by Bishop when she wrote, "I have no question that the primary role in defining and providing student training belongs to the school of social work."[12]

Middleman acknowledged this tension between school and agency, and in fact welcomed the tension as a dynamic to learning. She stated:

> ... but whether symptom or disability, I say "Vive le gap." I believe it is a necessary condition to stimulate ferment and continuous change for both systems and a means for approaching more creative ways to ease social distress. I see the hectic relationship between school and agency as a dialectic process of tension and struggle between two different entities rather than two polar extremes on one continuum termed "learned professional practice." Out of the very incongruence the learner creates his own synthesis which becomes his professional behavior.[13]

She stated that she viewed these two entities as two separate systems sharing common goals and interests. For her, partnership is a myth.[14]

The fieldwork structure of social work education has remained very similar throughout its history. There have been attempts at using student units and even at schools developing and administering services. Yet, by and large, the fieldwork arrangement has not changed greatly. The strains emanating from these conflicts have obviously had an impact upon the student struggling to become a professional. It may be even more of a struggle for the student who is identified as the work-study student, given the competing demands of the educational institution and the employing agency.

The Emergence of the Profession

Hand in hand with the development of the educational structure was the development of the organizational structures of the profession. The question of social work's status as a profession has come up almost since the field began. One of the first to question social work as a profession was Abraham Flexner in 1915. He expressed the view that social work was responsible, learned, altruistic and practical, but did not possess a knowledge base of its own, which he held to be an essential test for a profession[15]. Flexner appears to have measured social work against several criteria, similar to those he utilized previously in examining the medical profession.

> Social work ... appears not so much a definitive field, as an aspect of work in many fields. The

> field employment is so vast that delimitation is impossible ... the high degree of specialized competency required for (professional) action and conditioned on limitation of area cannot possibly go with the width and scope characteristic of social work ... would it not be least suggestive therefore, to view social work as in touch with many professions rather than as a profession in
> and by itself? ... If social work fails to conform to some professional criteria, it very readily satisfied others.[16]

Social workers were shocked when Flexner declared that social work was not yet a profession.

In 1957, Greenwood defined the attributes of a profession and discussed their incorporation by social work. He stated that professions had a systematic body of theory, community sanction, authority, a relative code of ethics, and a culture. Greenwood maintained that social work was a profession because "it has too many points of congruence with the model to be classified otherwise".[17] The "points of congruence" referred to, include a professional culture sustained by formal professional associations, a code of ethics regulating relationships of professionals with clients and colleagues, the increasing broader community sanctions and authority by licensing and certification, authority recognized by clientele, and the development of a systematic body of theory.

Both Flexner and Greenwood sought to define "profession" by identifying the characteristics essential to the designation, and then applying them to social work in order to determine social work's position as a

profession. Other scholars have used different definitions.

Hughes, in examining professions, used as his base the prototypes of law and medicine. The "classical" professions had four attributes: they delivered an esteemed esoteric service; they had a knowledge base which was an amalgam of the theoretical and practical; they had a special knowledge which was acquired through apprenticeship; and, they had formal study under masters who were already members of the profession.[18]

These four attributes were reduced by William J. Goode to two core characteristics: prolonged specialized training in a body of abstract knowledge and a collectivity or service orientation. Goode defined professions as "communities within a community." He stated that the characteristics of a profession were that members were bound by a sense of identity; once in the profession, few left and thus continued to have status; members shared common values; the role definitions of members and non-members were the same for all and were defined by the members; there was a common language which was only partially understood by outsiders; the community had power over its members; limits on members were reasonably clear; and professions produced the next generation of professionals by socialization through its control over the selection and training processes. It was

Goode's view that the advantages enjoyed by the professional were made possible by the evaluation of the larger society which gave professions their special status.[19]

It has been noted that most professions have internal stresses. The proliferation of professions is a phenomenon of modern society. There are at least two sources for the movement of occupations to professional standing. New professions may arise from the development of some scientific or technological discovery. Others may arise from some change in society itself. The professional social worker is a product of social change.[20] Social work has exerted considerable effort to professionalize itself, and controversy over its success still continues. A central stress is between the need to legitimatize practice through the acquisition of knowledge and the immediate need for practical solutions. Social work practice and education have confronted the strain--the stress between school and field.

As an institutional form, social work and education for social work practice have moved toward greater unification. A study of social work education, completed in 1951, recommended a reorganization of the structure of the American Association of Schools of Social Work. That study and its recommendations culminated in the development of the Council on Social Work Education

(CSWE). Known popularly as the Hollis Taylor Report, the study raised questions as to what constituted a profession and its educational system. It subsequently became a major part of the agenda of the Council on Social Work Education to deal with these questions.[21]

A second significant change of the Council on Social Work Education was the discontinuation of specializations in social work education, and the unified accreditation standards establishing a commonality of purpose in social work education.

The merger of seven professional associations into the National Association of Social Workers in 1955 marked another major unifying step for the profession. Thus, hand in hand the schools and professional association marched towards a more common view, and met criteria for professions outlined by Parsons.[22] He listed rationality, functional specificity and universalism as features of post-industrial professions. Such features allow for diversity and expertise to co-exist.

Exploring the sociological literature, Meyers found that sociologists have looked at social work and the professions from two approaches -- a functional approach (structural) and as "communities within communities" (externals). He concluded that "a profession is not an entity, it is a process." Continuing he stated that a "profession is, thus, in a constant state of emergence and

change; it is only apparently, from time to time established and stable.[23] Utilizing the criteria of other theoreticians, he concluded:

> An academic professional degree is today the eligibility criterion for membership in the only professional association that claims to legitimate a social worker as professional .. there are no other routes than the academic one for achieving a professional status. One cannot substitute employment as a social worker, in any capacity, for any substantial part of the two-year training expected for a professional degree. No test of competence or professional commitment or a functional role are available as equivalents to academic study.[24]

Meyers correctly identified a significant difference between social work and other professions.

Since the accredited educational program is the only legitimate path of entry available today for persons wishing to become professional social workers, differences among programs, and differences in patterns of professional social work education may take on even greater significance than is the case in other fields. Today, social work education involves a process of change, growth, and increased institutionalization. The perceived differences identified by faculty in the cohort of work-study students in the Block Program at Wurzweiler were sufficient cause to develop a project which would address these differences. Assuring the same or comparable educational outcomes for this particular cohort as expected of the main body of students would be in the best interest of the students, the profession, and the

interests of fairness, equity, and uniform standards. It was with those objectives that the project was developed.

1.Charles S. Levy, Social Work Education and Practice. (New York: Wurzweiler School of Social Work, 1968) p. 1

2.Ibid., p. 8

3.Ibid., p. 16

4.Ibid., p. 16-20

5.Jack Rothman, "Development of a Profession: Field-Instruction Correlates." Social Services Review, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1977) p. 289

6.Cited in Rosa Wessel, "The Place of Practice in Education for Social work," in Professional Education Based in Practice, by R. Wessel and G.B. Faith. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1953) p. 49

7.Gordon Hamilton, in Hollis and Taylor, "Social Work Education in the United States" Report of a Study Mode for National Council on Social Work Education, 1951 - Columbia University Press 1951, p. 58

8.Katherine Kendall, Field Instruction, Selected Issues. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959) p. 6

9. Werner W. Boehm, "Trends in Higher Education and Future Directions for Education in Social Work." Paper delivered at the annual program meeting of Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, Georgia, March 12, 1974.

10.Laura B. Downes, "Collaboration Between the School and the Agency in Professional Education for Social work." Journal of Social Work Process, Vl. 10, 1957, p. 22

11.Ibid., p. 25

12.Julia Ann Bishop, "The Agency's Role in Field Supervision of Social Work Students." Journal of Social Work Process, Vol. 10, 1957, p. 30

13.Ruth Middleman, "Social Work Education: The Myth of the Agency as Partner." Social Welfare Forum of National conference of Social Work (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973) p. 201

14.Ibid., p. 196-212

15.Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Chicago, 1915, pp. 576-590

16.Ibid., pp. 585-586

17.Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession." Social Work, Vol. 2, No. 3 (July 1957) p. 54

18.Everett C. Hughes, "Professions", Daedalus, Vol. 92, No. 4 (Fall 1963) pp. 655-656

19.William J. Goode, "Community Within a Community: The Professions." American Sociological Review, XXII, 1975, pp. 194-200

20.Everett C. Hughes, "Professions". Daedalus, XCII (Fall 1963), pp 655-68

21.Donald Brieland "Historical Overview: Social Work September 1977, pp. 342-343

22.Talcott Parsons, "The Professions and Social Structure." Social Forces, Vol. 17 (May 1979) pp. 457-467

23.Henry J. Meyers, "The Effect of Social work Professionalization on Manpower." In Edward E. Schwartz, ed. Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. New York, National Association of Social Workers, 1966, p. 68

24.Ibid., p. 70

CHAPTER II

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY AND THE WURZWEILER SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Developmental History

The special mission of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work grows out of its history and early roots in the needs of the Jewish community.

Yeshiva University traces its origins to Yeshiva Eitz Chaim, founded in 1886 on New York's Lower East Side. Ten years later, the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary was founded there, and in 1915 the two schools merged under the name of the latter. Liberal arts programs began with the establishment of Yeshiva College in 1928, and the first graduate curriculum was introduced in 1935. University status was granted two years later by the New York State Board of Regents. The institution initiated programs of professional education, research and special projects to advance the well-being of many constituencies. In 1954, a college of Liberal Arts and Science for Women was founded, and in later years, graduate schools of Science, Medicine, Law and Social Work.[1]

The Wurzweiler School of Social work is relatively young, having been established in 1957.

The purpose and education objectives for the School are concerned with professional education of gradate students in the field of social work. The original

statement of objectives was stated as follows:

> Our objective is to educate students so that they may become competent social workers with the necessary knowledge, attitudes and skills for beginning practice in a variety of settings. We wish to prepare well qualified persons who will have a deep sense of social responsibility and who will possess a foundation, both in motivation and in understanding from which they can continue to pursue new knowledge in the interest of rendering more effective social services. Our graduates will be expected to combine in full measure the quality of workmanship as demonstrated through skill in the social work processes and the quality of statesmanship as demonstrated in concern for social policies.
>
> We are interested in making our contribution toward solving the perennial problem of several personnel shortages in the field of Social Work. As the only Jewish-sponsored School of Social Work in North America, we are particularly concerned with educating students who will have a special interest in, and particular competence for working in the communal services of the American Jewish community.
>
> The School is concerned with advancing the state of social work knowledge as well as with transmitting that knowledge. To that end, research mindedness on the part of both faculty and students is a significant objective. The School is especially interested in research designed to advance the state of our knowledge with respect to the cultural component in social work generally and the Jewish component specifically. Our sectarian auspice provides a unique opportunity for us to carry on such research.[2]

The above statements have been contained in all accreditation material, catalogs and field instruction manuals given to the field instruction settings, students and community.

Wurzweiler is the only graduate social work educational program under Jewish auspices in a university setting which is accredited by the Council on Social Work

Education. Thus ... the school represents the culmination of efforts which persisted over half a century to establish Jewish-sponsored social work education.

A beginning effort to address the special concerns of training for Jewish communal service was the granting of scholarships in 1890 to students for in-service training "Earn While You Learn" courses given at a number of communal agencies. It was not until 1913 that the first Jewish school of social work was formally established in Cincinnati, but was quickly abandoned because it was unable to attract students. Other aborted efforts were also made -- the 1925 National Conference of Jewish Charities sponsored the Graduate School of Jewish Social Work which also had its demise by 1940. In 1947, five Jewish agencies pooled their resources and established the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service. That, too, ended in 1951 because of lack of financial support and difficulty in recruiting students. Unlike previous efforts, the Wurzweiler School of Social work was conceived as a "national school" without special obligation to one or a combination of agencies, and under university auspices.[3]

The Training School for Jewish Social Work which was founded in 1925 and became The Graduate School for Jewish Social work in 1932 when it changed its name should be noted. That school was viewed as "an experiment in

training professional social workers for work in a specific ethnic - religious community, struggling to justify itself."[4] The organizers of the school were guided by five principles which they related to the educational preparation for social work on behalf of the Jewish people:

1. Successful work with Jewish people requires intimate knowledge and sympathetic appreciation of their background.

2. The Jewish community is but part of the general community and must be studied in relation to it.

3. There are distinctly Jewish problems which require either special methods or modifications of general methods.

4. Jewish life in America and elsewhere is undergoing important changes and must therefore, be constantly re-evaluated and analyzed.

5. The large turnover of Jewish social workers presents serious dangers and must be arrested.[5]

The school closed in 1940 because of financial problems, but its objectives persisted in the minds of leaders in the Jewish social welfare field. These views, while not directly responsible for the development of the Wurzweiler School gave impetus to the university in opening the school.

Morton Teicher, the first Dean of the School, described the history of the Jewish community in attempting to educate personnel for Jewish communal services. He wrote that the American Jewish community had made "valiant" efforts for over a period of 80 years to

develop programs whose personnel would render service to the Jewish community. It was hoped that these programs would sensitize that personnel to the special needs of this group of constituents. Yeshiva University and the School of Social Work thus represented a culmination of prior attempts and was "The Keeper of the Flame."[6]

Objectives and Culture of the School

In 1974, the faculty approved the following mission statement:

> As a school that educates for the Social Work Profession in general and for Jewish Communal Service in particular. the Wurzweiler School of Social Work is unique among schools of Social Work in its special commitment to the Jewish community.
>
> The School's mission is based on three objectives:
>
> 1) Student development of a philosophy, professional attitudes and skill toward Social Work practice;
>
> 2) Social Work Education for Jewish Communal Service;
>
> 3) The development of the student who is responsible for his own learning and growth.[7]

Guzzetta, writing about social work indicated that it has come from two traditions - scientific and philosophical. He contended that social work educators must each percepts (philosophy) and concepts (scientific) for preparation of the profession. In relation to sanction, he pointed out that moral philosophy preceded both specific practice and the profession. Thus, the

teaching of practice is not only guided by the scientific - social science theory, but by a value base which impacts on how interventive practice must take place.[8]

Although practice itself is guided by knowledge, an issue within social work education has been the identification of what knowledge should guide practice. Since its inception, the Wurzweiler School of Social Work has anchored its teaching around what it calls: "practice situation - the professional act". Teicher, a social worker and anthropologist, was apprehensive about the scientific orientations that many of the schools espoused. He viewed as a danger a school's reliance on social science theory which did not deal with the human being as a totality.

> The art of social work as a human service profession rests on all of human science and it is the foundation which provides us with an understanding of man as a bio-psycho-socio-cultural, spiritual organism. Since social work deals with man as a total organism we cannot abdicate our rightful responsibilities as social workers by thrusting upon social scientists a demand for a ready made system of understanding man in society that will solve all of our problems. Nor must we deceive ourselves into believing that social scientists possess golden keys to open locked doors beyond which lies magic knowledge.[9]

Teicher utilized the concept of culture to view man as his own creator. This philosophy of choice is the dynamic with which the social work practitioner (student) must deal in the practice act.

This viewpoint is reflected in the philosophy and rationale for Wurzweiler's orientation to social work education:

> In the social work act, there is a confluence of knowledge and value generated by the 'practical purpose in view' an organized by the particular function that is carried as an integral part of the professional self. In the ordering of knowledge is to be found the science of the professional act: in the use of knowledge is to be found the art of the professional act.[10]

Gilpin discussed this functional philosophy in writing about the relationship between "two distinct" segments of the educational structure; the service agency and the professional school. In explaining this relationship, she contended with what she stated was the "age old question of the philosophic analytic - synthetic, the psychological knowledge-experience, the professional theory-practice."[11] It was her view that these debates were not resolvable. She clearly believed however, that teaching and learning in social work education took place in two arenas which were different in function, and that Jessie Taft's idea of "Agency Function" was the guide to action.[12]

Agency is viewed as representing that sanctioned institution in society by which the helping impulse of man has been realized. It is in the agency that the interaction of the helper and the client takes place. "Agency Function: is viewed as giving focus and direction to the helping social work processes. Gilpin writes that the

original statement of functional principle was agency function. She stated:

> The caseworker was never again to be alone. Facing the client he could now have the agency's function to give life as well as limits to his activity and his clients. As the functional creators saw it, agency function as represented by the caseworker was the given, external to the client within the helping situation and against or towards which he could move with the given that was his internally.[13]

It is in the agency with its specific purpose and limit which sets the structure of helping and gives direction to the worker. The agency holds both the client and the worker accountable.

The school's curriculum is designed to integrate social science knowledge-liberal arts in the core curriculum. The curriculum is broader than the social sciences since it also includes values, philosophy and ethics, as well as practice. Even in the practice content area, the focus is not merely on mastering a specific field of practice or specialized agency task, but on generic issues common to all practice.

The school's approach is to demonstrate that the apparent tension between social science theory and practice can be utilized by students to acquire a larger generic professional point of view. It is that the social sciences and the value issues enrich students' potential as professionals and employees rather than diminishing them. This is translated into their growing sensitivity to good professional practice as it is exhibited in their

own work and the work of their fellow students. They are expected to develop this internalization of quality that they use to assess what they and other students are doing.

From the beginning the school rejected the notion that human events in the field could be ordered so as to correlate with classroom knowledge.

The Block Education Plan

With the view of a national school in mind and requests from national Jewish organizations to expand educational opportunities to meet the demands for Jewish manpower, the conception of the Block Plan developed.

Yeshiva University and the Wurzweiler School of Social Work, from its inception, have given high priority to providing educated social workers with the skills to meet the manpower needs of American Jewish communal services. It is the one educational institution of higher education which has assigned the highest priority to this objective. The School is in agreement with Pins that

> ... the future effectiveness of Jewish Communal Services and the survival of Jewish life in America are at stake. The achievement and assurance of an adequate supply of properly educated Jewish Communal workers will require special priority, ongoing development and attention, staff time, more money, and constant evaluation.[14]

A problem identified early was that of educating social workers who, after graduation, would accept positions with Jewish communal agencies located in small

and intermediate-sized cities in the United States remains constant. It became apparent quickly that Jewish social workers were no different from others in their preference for working in large cities. Numerous authors studying manpower needs in Jewish communal services identified the special need of the small and intermediate community.[15] Experience indicated that persons from small communities tended to return to work in their own or in similar communities after graduation. Such persons experienced a sense of community, and were apt to appreciate the importance of cohesion to such communities.

The task for the program was complicated by the fact that the school was located in the center of the nation's largest metropolis, so that even a successful recruitment of students from small towns and intermediate cities could not be assured of the kinds of experiences which would prepare them to return to similar communities to practice. Jewish Communal Agencies in the metropolitan areas surrounding the school are widely acknowledged for the scope, competence, and sensitivity of their services, but they clearly do not represent small town agencies. The determination to provide proper and appropriate field experiences led to the decision that the program had a responsibility to modifying its opportunities in order to reach agencies outside its immediate catchment area of the school itself. Since this required taking aspects of the

programs to the agencies, it was determined that the field placement had to allow for a block structure.

Further examination of the problem revealed that the preparation of social work for Jewish agencies in small communities was only one aspect of social work educational needs. Major cities with large Jewish populations and Jewish social agencies also had difficulty in finding practitioners with appropriate professional preparations. Since Wurzweiler is the only program with a unique mission from Jewish Communal Services, the Block Program was conceived as an approach which, appropriately modified, could deal with the needs of large urban centers as well.

This development of the Block Plan was an educational response to the need that had been identified by the Jewish community in the United States and Canada. As the only school of Social Work to offer a graduate education program under Jewish auspices, the Block Plan represented an outreach by the Wurzweiler School of Social work to Jewish communities, nationally and internationally, in response to requests from numerous agencies within the Jewish community.

The project director, Dean and Associate Dean met with Jewish Federations and agency executive directors throughout the United States and Canada over a period of more than a year to discern the educational social work needs of the Jewish community. Places visited for on-site

discussions included Chicago, Miami, Toledo, and Toronto. Approximately forty executives participated in the meetings. These discussions clearly affirmed that the field needed social workers who possessed a cultural knowledge base and a strong identification with Jewish cultural forces affecting social welfare within the general and Jewish community.

In addition, these representatives held a view that a social work program had to afford educational opportunities for staff already employed and carrying social work responsibility. The social work graduate program in their geographic areas did not allow for the education of these individuals. The agency representatives also declared that local recruiting efforts would allow educated social workers to remain in their own community and increase the professional care available to less staffed and served geographical areas.

The meetings between national organizations and community leaders in various parts of the United States and Canada with the Wurzweiler School of Social Work representatives ascertained and validated the scope of the need for the Block Plan. Social agencies pledged support and offered to serve as field instruction placements and as recruitment centers. The University administration sanctioned the development of the Block Education Plan.

The Block Plan used as its prototype a program developed at Smith College School for Social Work. The Smith College School for Social work was founded in 1918. It was developed from an emergency training course to prepare psychiatric social workers to deal with problems emanating from the First World War. The School organized itself on the Block Plan model, offering academic courses during the summer sessions and field internships during the remainder of the year.[16] This approach was different from the model of social work education adopted up to that time, in which students attended courses and simultaneously did their field work: the concurrent plan. Wurzweiler School of Social Work is the only accredited school of social work to have both programs in their entirety.

Initially, many social work educators had a deep "distrust" for the Block Plan. It was viewed by some educators as "impossible" because it was believed that there was no direct correlation between field and class.[17] The idea that an educational approach could be successful when class and field instruction were alternated by blocks of time and agency and school widely separated by geography was intolerable to some. It was thirty years after the initiation of the Smith College Program before the American Association of Schools of Social Work

affirmed the educational potential of the Block Program in 1948.[18]

The Block Education Plan was designed to offer an academic course of study during the summer with students in a social agency placement for field instruction during the fall and spring semesters. The sequence of the Plan was structured for three summer sessions of academic instruction and two years of field instruction scheduled for four days per week in the field during the rest of the year. The fifth day of each week in the field setting was planned for the student to fulfill various ongoing academic requirements of the School.

By design, the educational objectives and course content of the Block Plan are the same as for the Concurrent Plan. The admissions requirements for both plans are the same. Recruitment efforts are especially focused on applicants residing outside the New York City area who are interested in working in or near their home communities; on applicants from the New York City area who are interested in social work practice and placement in other parts of the United States and Canada; and for all persons employed in Jewish and general communal agencies desiring gradate professional training.

Block Plan Time Frame

In the beginning, the plan for the Block Education Plan provided six weeks of academic study the first summer, twelve weeks the second summer and six weeks the third and final summer, with two academic years of field instruction in between. This plan fulfilled the time requirements of the University, the Council on Social Work Education and the State of New York. This time frame also allowed for the utilization of full-time faculty for teaching purposes, availability of special resources with the School, and for release time for work-study students from agencies. It also limited the living cost to students.

A change in the time frame of the Block Education Plan was made to provide for three eight-week summers of academic study and two academic years of field instruction. This was a result of careful and continuous discussions of the consequences of the time frame for students' progress as well as the School's ongoing relationship with field placement agencies. The total hourly academic requirements remained the same, therefore, continuing to fulfill both state and curriculum requirements.

The change was designed to strengthen the academic class base by affording greater preparation for practice for beginning students. It allowed agencies to plan in a

more systematic way for the release of work-study students. It also permitted students to relate more effectively to one another since the total student body was together at the School at the same time. Thus, provision was made for the transition from the 6-12-6 weeks to 8-8-8 weeks time structure.

Field instruction under a block structure facilitates the student's identity with the agency and guarantees full participation in overall agency programs. Field instruction is viewed as an opportunity for the mastery of professional skills and for the professional development. This is facilitated by total participation in staff meetings, in interdisciplinary conferences and in the community. The student in the small community obtains a different and perhaps more inclusive view of the professional function and of the agency's role in the community from that of the student in the large urban center.

The majority of students are assigned over their two years to two different agencies for their field instruction under responsible supervision. Each student is provided the opportunity to develop special competence in one social work method, with opportunity to experience and learn from other methods. In relation to the work-study student, the school has an arrangement with the agency calling for the agency to serve as the field

setting for two years and to provide diversified learning opportunities and experiences.

The Faculty Advisor

From the inception of the Block Education Plan, it was obvious that the faculty advisor's function was different from faculty advisor requirements under the Concurrent plan. The major difference was that the Block Advisor more comprehensively represented, "the school" to geographically distant institutions, that time and role had a special dynamic quality in the more complex situation. The school advisor would have to "fly in" and in each visit play all the "roles and functions" of the faculty advisor, as well as recruiter for the school. The advisor in the Block Plan became a literal extension of the program in another location. As always, the student is paramount in the social work education process. The faculty advisor is central in the social work structure of the School in facilitating the student's learning process. The School views the advisement structure and process with great significance because of the important contribution it makes to the whole educational enterprise.

The advisor's role is carried by a full-time faculty member of the school. The advisor links the agency, student, and school by means of systematic contacts during the academic year. The advisor is conscious of agency

services and practices; the school's educational objectives; and the student's educational and developmental needs. The advisor uses himself/herself to assist all participants in heightening their level of involvement to enhance the student's educational development. The advisor is a catalyst in the process. Advisement is given high priority since the educational process is seen as intensely individual, each student and each agency having different styles and needs.

Levy has written:

> Of the many participants in social work education, the faculty advisor has the 'least sharply' defined role. However, he plays a strategic role insofar as it affects the student's professional identification and development, and as it affects the productiveness of the student's classroom and field experience.[19]

The faculty advisor meets with the field instructor and student during the field instruction year. Because of the geographical distances of placements from the school and the possible sense of isolation for both students and field instructors, telephone communication is systematically planned and utilized. When students are in their field placements, they communicate with their faculty advisors through a monthly report. This report, statistical and narrative in form, focuses on what has occurred in the process of the student's professional experience. The student considers the accessibility and use of experience and opportunities; the use of

supervision and literature; and educational opportunities afforded with the setting. These reports also alert the advisor to concerns reflected in process recording and statements offered by the student for discussion immediately or during the next visit. Between visits, the faculty advisor communicates in writing with the student on the basis of the content of the monthly reports.

When planning and arrangements were complete, fifty-one students were admitted to the Block Plan of the program and initiated their social work professional education. Of this group, fourteen were work-study students. These work-study students were employed by their own agencies and continued to draw salaries while attending the School of Social Work. The agencies served as their field instructional settings. The work-study students were divided among the three methods of Casework, Group Work and Community Organization. All work-study students successfully completed the required academic work and returned to their agencies to commence fieldwork.

After analysis of the performance of this cohort during the year of the special program, a second group of 60 students entered the program. Twenty were work-study students and became the population involved in the project.

Alternative Approaches: Work-Study

Schools of social work have traditionally required two years of academic courses and field placements. Applicants already employed and carrying social service responsibility have often been unable to meet this requirement and have thus been denied access to graduate social work education. Until recently, this population was minimally represented in graduate schools of social work.

Recently as stipends became scare, and student finances for educational training programs were severely limited. This population was disproportionately disadvantaged. Agencies and institutions in which these individuals are employed have been denied the benefits of services provided by graduates of programs of professional social work education.

In recent years, the financial difficulties faced by schools, social service institutions, and potential social work students has resulted in an interest in various types of work-study programs. Many social work schools created both part-time and full-time programs that permitted students to engage in social work education and to utilize their agencies as field assignments.

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) authorized a study of the problems and alternative approaches for addressing them. In 1976 the CSWE Task

Force on Structure and Quality submitted its report, which was discussed in the organization's House of Delegates[20]. At the annual program meeting (APM), several papers were directed towards questions and issues respecting part time programs and off campus plans.[21] Their analyses were noted by the faculty at the Wurzweiler School and compared with conclusions reached about its full time Block Plan program.

It was from these analyses and faculty discussions that the idea grew for a special orientation course for the work-study students. Because of the nature of social work education as a combination of academic, practice, and socialization, faculty concern centered on providing comparable education to work-study students. They saw the students as being at risk of finding their education peripheral rather than central to their lives. As the number of applicants desiring work-study status increased, the issue became more pressing. Some of this pressure was reflected in the CSWE statistics on applicants.

In 1977 22% of applicants to schools of social work wished to attend on a part-time bases a slight rise from the percentage for the previous decade. There were 38,842 applications to the graduate schools of social work and 17,533 students attended full-time. There were some 3,912 students in attendance on a part-time basis.[22]

Although the overall number of applications steadily declined for a number of years, a phenomenon of possibly greater significance was the change in the balance of students engaged in full-time versus part-time study. In the six years between 1978 and 1984, the proportion shifted from 17,672 full-time and 4,333 part-time students, to 14,275 full-time students and 7,294 part-time students, thus, while the total number of students in the graduate programs remained relatively stable, declining by fewer than 500 students (only about 2%), the proportion of part-time students comprising the total number of graduate students rose sharply from about 20% to more than one third.[23]

The possibility that this shift was the result, at least partly, of competition for students must be noted. During this period of 6 years, five new programs of social work education were admitted to CSWE membership, but the number of applications declined by about 50% - to 19,880 in 1984. A large number of the applicants for part time study reported the need for some sort of work-study arrangement.[24]

As early as 1972, the Council on Social Work Education published a report of a committee which studied social work education in relation to the two-year, full-time accreditation requirement of schools. This report recommended that credit be given for previous work

experience and raised an issue "about the consequences for employed social workers by a school's insistence on two years of full-time graduate study.[25]

A special sub-committee of CSWE Commission on Accreditation was appointed to examine standards in need of revision. A separate commission on Educational Standards worked simultaneously to produce a revised Curriculum Policy Statement. After extensive public hearing and discussions by the House of Delegates, a revised Manual of Accrediting Standards was adopted, providing for experimentation in alternative and innovative programs, under certain conditions. This new standard was followed by a proliferation of new models of education, and changes in existing models.

In 1982, the National Committee on Part-time Social Work Education was organized. This group was formed to study and lobby for such programs, develop proposed educational standards, and "with the intent of bringing order to what appeared ... to be, at a minimum, educational confusion."[26] Frumkin pointed out that:

> Faced with a significant decline in full-time enrollments schools began experimenting with educational models that they had been unwilling to try in the "fat years" of excess students and government stipends. Many social work educators became concerned that these new models were something less than their traditional counterparts. Task forces were formed by the council to investigate the status of such programs and develop accrediation guidelines.

> What was quite evident is that positions were being taken, and policies developed, based more on educational belief than on empirical evidence. Were there significant differences between extended and non-extended programs? Was the educational experience different for students who attended classes on or off campus? Was work/study an educationally sound field work strategy? Was the year in residence mandated by the Council critical in the socialization of students into the profession?[27]

The Committee immediately received widespread attention from the field. The relevance of its objectives was reflected in a letter sent to the National Committee by Bradford Sheafor, President elect of the Council on Social Work Education. He wrote:

> In my judgement, it is very important that we find ways to offer high quality part-time programs in order to serve students we have not traditionally reached in social work education. More importantly, it is a matter of getting well qualified social workers available to clients who need their service - A second group that I see is particularly important is the population of people holding social work positions, but lacking professional social work education. Many of these people cannot leave their salaried positions and/or families to reach campus based programs. If we do not find way to make high quality education available to them, most will continue to provide lesser quality service to their clients, and we will have failed in our basic purpose.[28]

The Wurzweiler School developed its Block Education Plan in an attempt to address the need for professional manpower in the field of Jewish communal service. This plan emanated from the school's historical commitment to help develop professional social workers for the general and Jewish community. Several unexpected consequences emerged. One was the need to identify the impact of the

"work-study component" in the professional social work education process.

Exploration with colleagues and social work faculties in the New York area as well as with schools over the nation suggested that little thought had been given to this issue, even though it was widely thought to warrant educational concern. Other schools indicated that they had not examined the "work-study" component. Negative opinions were voiced about such arrangements. Statements were made that the schools with a "work-study" component were "giving away cheap degrees." It was suggested that this work-study cohort were different from other students and that a program should be arranged to "orient this special group to social work studentship."

A search of the literature in relation to work-study revealed that little had been written about this arrangement. A research team in social policy at Columbia University School of Social Work compared students who were employed by the Department of Social Services and had chosen a work-study arrangement to those who had chosen the "traditional studentship". Although the conclusion of this paper indicated that learning took place for all students involved, it was suggested that the work-study student needed "viable structural and content changes involving more input from the students involved and the school."[29]

The CSWE manual in examining work-study concluded that there appeared to be different views regarding the means for minimizing "potential difficulties for the student in his student and employee role."[30] They recommended that this arrangement needed further study and research. Material on this original survey were destroyed when the Council moved to new headquarters.

The most recent CSWE manual of Accrediting Standards and Procedures does not mention work-study programs as such. This aspect of social work education has been included in the section on "alternative programs." Work-study has become part of the rapid development of part-time programs.[31]

The acceptance of a work-study aspect of social work education has been an attempt to resolve certain problems which have developed as a result of changes in the field, in the circumstances of applicants, and in the design of educational programs. However, the emergence of work-study as a major alternative has brought with it certain problems as well. One of these is the difficulty students may face in seeking to be responsive to sometimes competing demands. An illustration of a student perception of the struggle related to what is called "serving two masters" can be seen in the following excerpt from a student writing:

> ... some of my dissatisfaction with the program stemmed from my need to be connected with a student

> network and an academic environment. Both of these components would have allowed me to be more process vs. product oriented. The Work-Study Arrangement was the obvious cause of the conflict between those two divergent orientations. The agency demands production, the student desires process, and the result is a split in expectations. I am both process and product oriented; trying to ascertain when and where and how to do both has been, and is, a most growth producing of lessons.

In summary, there has been development and expansion of educational programs in social work which permit students to engage in education while remaining employed, with the assumption that these students are different from students in the traditional social work programs. Educators have a view that this sub-group requires special conditions which must be managed so that the programs facilitate education and the students have an opportunity to become real social work students and professionals. The literature shows little in regard to an examination of the work-study student and the work-study arrangement. Issues of educational control and social work professionalism may have mitigated against the work-study students' becoming involved in the graduate educational process. The strains in the relationship between university and agency may have placed additional stress upon this work-study student in maximizing his educational opportunities.

At the Wurzweiler School of Social Work at Yeshiva University, the project was developed to orient incoming "block work-study students" to their special condition

which endeavored to insure their success. The project sought to influence the orientation of this cohort of students to the field of social work.

1.The Wurzweiler School of Social Work Catalog, 1972-1974, p. 16

2.The Wurzweiler School of Social Work, A Self-Study Report Prepared for the Council on Social Work Education 1959 (October 1958) pp. 1-2

3.Morton Teicher, "Keeper of the Flame." Yeshiva University News. Vol. XIV, No. 3 (Spring 1959) pp. 5-6

4.Leslie B. Alexander, and Milton D. Speizman, "The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, 1924-40: Training for Social Work in An Ethnic Community: Journal of Education for Social Work, Spring 1983 vol. 19 #2 p. 6

5.Charles S. Levy, Op. Cit. - p. 41

6.Morton Teicher, Op. Cit., p. 5-6

7.The Wurzweiler School of Social Work Search Committee letter, November 13, 1974

8.Charles Guzzetta, "Concepts and Precepts in Social Work Education" Journal of Education for Social Work, Fall 1966, Vol. 30 p. 40-47

9.Morton Teicher, "The Concept of Culture", Social Casework, October 1958, p. 1 Family Service Association of America

10.Wurzweiler School of Social Work - Self Study, 1979, p. 75-76

11.Ruth Gilpin, Theory and Practice As a Single Reality, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1963, p. 5

12.Ibid., p. 19

13.Ibid., p. 20

14.Arnulf Pins, Block Plan Proposal, Wurzweiler School of Social work, 1975

15.Judah J. Shapiro, "The Current Manpower Crisis in Jewish Communal Services." Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 45, No. 1, Fall 1968, pp. 38-51. Arnulf

Pins, "What Kind of Jewish Communal Worker Do We Need?" Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 42, 1965. Armand Lauffer, "The future of Social Work in the Jewish Community Center: The Case of the Disinclined Student." Presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, New York, May 30, 1969. Irwin Golden, "The Utilization of Social Work Manpower in Jewish Community Centers: Alternative Models." Presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, New York, May 30, 1969. William Kahn, "Jewish Communal Service and the Professional Today and Tomorrow", Journal of Communal Service. Vol. 62, No. 2, Winter, 1985

16.Smith College School for Social Work Catalog, 1979 p. 5

17.Ruth Gilpin, op. cit. p. 13

18.Ibid., p. 25

19.Charles S. Levy, "The Art of Social Work Advising." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, 1967.

20.Council on Social Work Education. The Policy Statements on Social Work Practice and Education and Structure and Quality adopted by the House of Delegates (march 1976), p. 5.

21.Martin Schwartz and Florence Siegel, "A Case Study of the Establishment of an Off Campus Part-Time Program in Social work." Rodger Nooe and Ronald Green, "Total Part-Time Graduate Education: Evaluation of an Experimental Program." Betty York, "The Off-Campus Alternative for Social Work Education." George Plutchok, "The Part-Time MSW Program: A Way In or a Way Out?" Papers presented at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Diego, California, 1977

22.Allen Rubin and G. Robert Whitcomb, Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1977. Council on Social Work Education, p. 37

23.Allen Rubin, Statistics on Social work Education in the United States. 1984 Council on Social Work Education, p. 50

24.Ibid., p. 46

25.Frank Loewenberg, Time and Quality in Graudate Social Work Education: Report of the Special Committee to Study the Length of Graduate Social work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972. As reported in Robert Salmon and Joel Walker. "The One-Year Residency Program: An alternative Path to the Masters Degree in Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Winter 1981), p. 23

26.Michael Frumkin, "From New York to Miami: Five Years of Progress." Topics, Vol. 3, no. 1 (March 1986) p. 1

27.Ibid., p. 1

28.Bradford Sheafor, A letter sent to the National Committee on Part-Time Social Work Education - Part-Time Topics, Vol. 1, no. 2, March 1984

29.Shirley Jenkins, "Social Policy Research." A paper prepared at Columbia University, 1972, p. 16

30.Council on Social Work Education, Manual for Accreditation Standards. Revised April 1971, pp. 67-72, Appendix 4

31.Council on Social Work Education, Handbook of Accreditation Standards and Procedures. Revised July 1984, New York

CHAPTER III

SOCIALIZATION IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Socialization as a process, has been given much attention by social scientists since the turn of the century. Socialization has been viewed as a life-long process by which individuals acquire knowledge and take their appropriate roles within the general society and the specific work place. The process itself is regarded as developmental and lasts from birth to death.

Attention regarding socialization has been given to the child and to the idea that the family is the principle socializing agent of society. This important idea has been expanded recently to regard socialization as an interactive process where individuals socialize "others" to new roles, values, and skills and as such are socialized and reinforced in these areas.[1]

Freud believed that the socialization process consisted of individuals repressing their primitive drives to accept the socially approved goals of the society.[2] Erikson added social elements such as trust to the socialization process. His major concern was the individual's perception of himself in relationship to his inner drives and outer world. He described eight stages of human development that consists of the crises brought on by physiological changes and the new social environment to which an individual has to adapt.[3]

Mead viewed the notion of self as being made up of two parts: the spontaneous self--the "I"--and the social self which he designated as the "me". For Mead, the "me" develops as a result of a socializing process whereby the child learns to take on the role of an "other". It was his view that children develop a generalized impression of what is expected from society, and thereby discover where they fit into the scheme of things. Mead called this scheme "the generalized other".[4]

Piaget contributed to the knowledge of the socialization process by focusing upon cognitive development both as psychological and social phenomena. He suggested that values and moral development resulted from this process.[5]

All these theoreticians gave primary attention to childhood development, but suggested that the process went on throughout the stages of life development and was a continuing process. It was suggested that the individual who arrived at adulthood had already mastered primary socialization and had a self-view in relation to the generalized society. It has been concluded that adults thus have a commitment to the values and norms of the society; and have a willingness to subordinate some personal desires to the rules of society. It has been maintained that most adults have learned the ways of the society and are able to live within the rules.

Adult socialization had been largely ignored by social scientists who assumed that the process appeared to end when a person became an adult. Attention has lately been given to this later stage in the life cycle. Levinson described the passing of adulthood through differential stages of development.[6] Brim, in an examination of adult socialization, stated "the acquisition of roles is not viewed as the entire content of socialization, but role learning is the segment of socialization...and role acquisition is probably the most important aspect of adult socialization".[7] Brim affirmed the idea that socialization is continuous in nature and is a vital process during adult life. He stated that the individual must learn specific content to perform his roles and thus he must know what is expected of him. In this regard, a formal relationship such as school is significant in clarifying for the learner what is to be expected of him and how he can fulfill the role or roles. In comparing socialization at various stages of development, Brim stated that:

> "the most striking stage is that much of adult socialization takes place in formal organizations without a clearly specified role for the learner, while the child, in sharp contrast, is socialized by informal groups in which he has a well-defined learner's role. Much adult socialization thus is allowed to proceed through trial and error learning." [8]

The school of social work is a formal organization which should represent clear and specific goals and should facilitate the socialization process.

Much of adult socialization occurs in the context of voluntary association. The adult makes independent choices as to which group he or she will join. Numerous examples can be cited as to the reference groups which are chosen: work, friendship, religion, and political affiliations. The choices made by adults in socialization may be viewed as the reconstitution of primary groups with values and sentiments.

The basic purpose of the school of social work is to socialize the student. Wheeler stated that "schools and universities...might be called <u>developmental socialization systems</u>, where the formal purpose is the training, education, or more generally the further socialization of the individual passing through". [9] He explained that formal organizations can be defined as systems for the achievement of explicit goals. Citing Bidwell, he distinguished between role socialization and status socialization. To him, role socialization suggested training and preparation for specific tasks, and status socialization referred to a broader pattern of education which allows the recruit to "occupy a generalized status in life". [10] In social work education, socialization may be referred to as agency functioning for a specific practitioner task, while status socialization can be viewed as a generalized orientation to the profession of social work.

The graduate school of social work is a social system, and as such, is viewed as an influence system upon

the beginning student. The structure of social work education allows numerous participants to have influence upon the new recruit. These significant others can be identified as the faculty of the school, the staff of the field agency, student peers, and the administrators of the institutions. Each of these forces is an "influence system" and as such, each has a bearing on the socialization of the student.

In writing on the sociology of knowledge, Berger and Luckmann addressed the learning process and the concomitant socialization which emanates from it. Their theoretical formulation was based on what is "real" for members of society. They stated that the concern of people is what they "'know as reality' in their everyday now--or pre-theoretical lives...the commonsense 'knowledge' rather than ideas." [11] They state that there is no human nature in a biological sense and that humanness is determined socio-culturally. In this regard, they differ sharply with Freud. They state that "while it is possible to say that man has a nature, it is more significant to say that man constructs his own nature, or more simply, that man produces himself". [12]

Thus, man is a social and human product and society is an objective reality. The method posited for this to come about is knowledge fostered by communication and language. They built on these ideas to describe how roles and institutions come into being, declaring that "institutions are embodied in individual experience by means of role". [13]

Berger and Luckmann make a distinction between what they termed primary and secondary socialization. [14] Primary socialization represents the child's progression of consciousness from roles and attitudes of specific "other", to roles and attitudes in general. This process is never fully completed. "Language constitutes both the most important content and the most important instrument of socialization." [15] Secondary socialization is the internalization of institutions and begins when the child can generalize the "other".

> ...secondary socialization is the acquisition of role-specific knowledge, the roles being directly or indirectly rooted in the division of labor... Secondary socialization requires the acquisition of role-specific vocabularies, which means, for one thing, the internalization of semantic fields structuring routine interpretations and conduct within an institutional area. [16]

Berger and Luckmann pointed out that man is constantly socialized to more complex and specialized "agencies". They stated that to bring about change and to be socialized, emotion (affect) must be expended. Learning must be active.

> The techniques applied in such cases are designed to intensify the affective charge of the socialization process. Typically, they involve the institutionalization of an elaborate initiation process, a novitiate, in the course of which the individual comes to commit himself fully to the reality that is being internalized. When the process requires an actual transformation of the individual's "home" reality it comes to replicate as closely as possible the character of primary socialization.[17]

The work-study student is involved in this secondary socialization process.

It has been suggested that the graduate school of social work is charged by the profession with carrying the responsibility for the selection of prospective members of the profession, and for providing educational experiences designed to prepare these recruits for responsible entry into the profession. [18] Krause, in his description of "near professions", suggested that socialization into the profession "involves the recruit into an ongoing group. Here entry into any formal training process makes one a member of a vanguard".[19] Salmon and Walker agreed with numerous researchers that socialization is an important function of the social work education process in which norms and values are internalized. They suggested that this process takes time. [20]

The function and purpose of the agency is to render a specific service. Most work in modern society takes place in some form of bureaucratic organization. Numerous authors have examined the work setting as a socializer. Krause stated that occupations and professions do not exist in a vacuum; work is always carried out in a setting. Thus, the relationship of setting (agency) to occupation (social work profession) poses issues of strain and marginality. [21] He

summed up the issue of potential conflict in the following manner:

> The power struggles between occupational groups and organizational settings over the loyalties and commitments of the workers, the adaption and conflicts which result, and the formal and informal cultures which are created to cope with these issues color the experience of the individual in the setting in a way that is only in part due to his own membership in a specific occupational group. The setting is a factor of its own. [22]

The agency is where the student acquires his skill and learns to appreciate the complex nature of the agency as an entity. It is the arena for the mastering of the need for inter-disciplinary collaboration and for the testing of the "professional self".

Bucher and Strauss, in reflecting upon the socialization of the recruit into the professional process, challenged, the professions. They stated:

> An investigator should not focus solely upon how conceptions and techniques are imparted in the study of socialization; he should be equally interested in the class of opinions among the socializers, where students are among the prizes. Segments are in competition for the allegiance of students...During the professional training, students pick their way through a maze of conflicting models and make momentous commitments thereby. [23]

These authors thus acknowledged the potential conflicts and strains which may result from work location, ideologies and frames of reference.

Adult socialization involves acculturation during graduate education. It involves readjustments in motivation, behavior, and goals for the work-study student. "A

comprehensive understanding of the acculturation process, therefore, demands an approach that is psychologically as well as culturally oriented." [24] Judah suggested that if there were not personal readjustments, there would be no change. In her research on the significant others in relation to the baccalaureate social worker, Judah concluded that most instrumental forces in the student acculturation process were: 1) the practice teacher; 2) the field instructor; 3) the teacher of the first introductory social work course; and 4) the advisor. [25] It is clear that both school and agency have impact upon the student. One might assume that the same results would apply to graduate social work education although the order of significance might be different.

We know from theories on growth and change [26] and from organizational theory specifically that once created, organizations tend to take on an institutional identity of their own, develop their own needs as well as their own vested interests to maintain them.

In studying the movement of the social work student over two years in a graduate concurrent program, Bloom stated that "the students' achievement of a sense of professional identity is viewed as the central purpose and organizing principle of the educational program". It was her contention that the responsibility for one's own learning was central to this development of a professional self.[27] Her research

stated that in the first year of social work education, the student developed "awareness" of the profession.

Middleman has written that the social work student creates his own synthesis which becomes his professional behavior. [28] She stated that students move from self-centeredness to compassion for others. To Middleman, the social work student is not only an applier of theories and practice, but is a creator.[29]

Cassidy defined the "experienced student' as one having substantial work experience in a social work agency prior to undertaking professional education. She suggested that this individual came to the educational process with concerns and misgivings. These concerns were related to the vulnerability of exposure in the process, and the holding on to old patterns of thinking and adaptation. It was her view that such students saw themselves in a "precarious situation", because "having already achieved and succeeded, the experienced worker is more fearful of failure". She concluded that these old adaptive patterns were problematic, and it was her suggestion that the school provide "active help" in assisting the experienced student to become a professional. [30]

Towle similarly wrote about the learning patterns and needs of experienced workers. She stated that "his high hope of having less to learn than other students crashes aground as he must unlearn much that he took for granted as

useful accomplishments". [31] It was her contention that the experienced student had to give up previous learning patterns in order to take on the educational demands of social work.

Both of these educators had a stance which set one framework and orientation for this project. The literature indicates that the experienced student has to unlearn in order to be able to be open to new learning. The work-study student is an experienced worker. Although Cassidy and Towle did not specify a definition of work-study; studying and utilizing one's own agency for field practicum, a similarity can be drawn to the individual coming with social work experience. The work-study student has been successful in job performance and has been allowed or "sponsored" by the agency in which he/she is employed. Such a student must shed certain old patterns and take on new learning.

A current view of the adult learning and socialization process is the work of Knowles. Writing on "androgogy" he stated that adults are not as dependent as children and therefore, have a different self concept; are capable of making decisions; have had experiences which service as a rich resource for learning; are ready and desireous of learning; and have a time perspective and orientation which is futuristic as opposed to concrete. It is his view that learning for the adult is on a continuous. Learning is viewed as reflective. He contends that learning is a refinement process rather than an unlearning one.[32] The

work-study student fits this description of rich practice experience, motivation to learn and engage in the process of professional education.

It is useful to have an impressionistic comparison of the typical concurrent student and the Block work-study student in relation to socialization. The traditional student comes to school with a single allegiance to the school. The relationship and contract is between the educational institution and the student. The field agency is viewed as a service arena and is a "laboratory", wherein the student can develop practice knowledge and wisdom. Although the student may become very identified with the agency, there is recognition that the student will go to a second agency and another supervisor in the second year. The second agency represents the possibility of diversity of clients, field instruction methodology, service programs, and perhaps even interventive ideology and methodology. There is a broadening of the learning opportunities within the structured objectives of the school of social work. Thus, built into the traditional program structure is a sequence of steps which the student knows about and which is in the control of the school.

The student views himself as "a student and learner" and "trusts" the school to guide the educational process. The school is valued and trusted, and is seen as the idealized image of the profession, since it is the gatekeeper

to professional certification. The expectations are that the student will achieve a professional degree through demonstration of mastery of content in the school and field, and of skill as a practitioner.

In comparison, the work-study student in the block plan has been carrying professional responsibility for a period of time, and is identified with the organization in which that service is being rendered. The work-study student is aligned with the agency which has allowed him to use it as a field placement and has facilitated the pursuit of professional studies. In addition, the agency continues to provide employment and pay. Employment, utilization of the employment setting for the practicum, and developing a relationship with the school each carries significant dynamics in the learning process. The work-study student may view the agency as nurturing, supportive, helpful, and desirous of the success of the student. The agency has a vested interest in that success; that is more professional service. Although the student anticipates status passage to the profession of social work from the moment of entering school, the self-image is also one of an employee who brings practice experience to the education. The work-study student is likely to have the self-perception of a successful practitioner who will return to familiar surroundings at the completion of the educational

experience.

It has been suggested that socialization to the profession is now taking place in agencies and not in the schools of social work. Alternative programs, away from campus,and the work-study programs in the Block Program in which the students spend most of their time, have become the socializing agents for the profession. As has been indicated earlier, adult socialization takes place in the work arena. Thus, schools of social work must find vehicles to assist the student in making a connection to the school, not as an institutional structure, but as the idealized image of the profession of social work. The orientation course project endeavored to address that function.

1. Howard Robboy, Sidney Greenblatt and Candace Clark, Social Interaction. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979, p. 1.

2.Donald A. Light, Jr. and Suzanne Keller, Sociology. 2nd edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1979, pp. 115-116

3.Ibid., pp. 117-119.

4.Ibid., p. 113.

5.Ibid., pp. 119-122.

6.Daniel Levinson, The Season Of A Man's Life. (New York: Alerton), 1978, pp. 317-340.

7.Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler, Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 3rd edition. August 1967. p. 5.

8.Ibid., p. 35.

9.Wheeler, Op. Cit. p. 68.

10.Wheeler, Op.Cit. p. 70.

11.Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, (Garden City: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., 1967), p. 15.

12.Ibid.

13.Ibid., p. 66.

14.Ibid., p. 135.

15.Ibid., p. 137.

16.Ibid., p. 139.

17.Ibid., pp. 145-146.

18.Majorie W. Main, "Orientation to the Student Role: The Role of the Student in a Professional School." Social Work Education Reporter, 16 (December 1968), p. 51.

19.Elliott A. Krause, The Sociology of Occupations (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1971). p. 54.

20.Robert Salmon and Joel Walker, "The One Year Residency Program: An Alternative Path to the Master's Degree in Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Winter 1981).

21.Krause, Op.Cit. p. 37.

22.Kraus, Op.Cit. p. 49.

23.Rue Bucher and Anselm Strauss, "Professions in Process." The American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, 1961, pp. 3-5.

24.Eleanor Hannon Judah, "Acculturation to the Social Work Profession in Baccalaureate Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Fall 1976), p. 66.

25.Ibid., p. 69.

26.Ruth Smalley, Theory for Social Work Practice, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 62-87.

27.Tybel Bloom, "Achieving Professional Identity: A Conception of Social Work Education". Journal of Social Work Process.

28.Ruth Middleman, Op.Cit., p. 201.

29.Ibid., p. 201.

30.Helen Cassidy "Meeting the Needs of Work-Experienced Students", Public Welfare, January 1967 Vol. 25 No. 1 pp. 32.

31.Charlotte Towle, The Learner In Education For the Professions. Chicago, Illinois, University of Chicago Press, 1954, pp. 35.

32.Malcolm S. Knowles, "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based upon Adult Learning." Journal of Education for Social Work, (Sprin 1972), pp. 32-38

CHAPTER IV

PROJECT DESIGN

During the first year of the program, Block Plan faculty advisors observed a number of educational issues which indicated that the original intention of the plan was not being fully fulfilled. It was the faculty's view that these problems were related to the work-study context as well as the work-study students.

Sacks has proposed a process model in relation to students' reactions to the graduate masters degree program. He suggests four areas that must be accounted for:[1] expectations, encounter, dis-equilibrium, and restoration of balance. In this model, Sacks outlines stages of student adaptation to the demands of social work study overall; however, the model may be applied to segments of the program as well. The model is shown in Chart I.

During the academic study in the first year of the Block Plan, the issue of role conflict for students was not apparent to faculty, faculty advisors, students, nor administration. It was assumed that the Block work-study student was somewhat more experienced than other students, but similar to them in all other ways. It was in the field practicum that the faculty advisors, students, and field instructors became aware of the strain in the work-study situation. The experience of faculty advisors in trying to

PROCESS MODEL

EXPECTATIONS

A. Students are not quite ready for experience

B. It is unlike anything they have yet encountered.

ENCOUNTER

A. The negative features of the program.
B. Negative feedback.
C. Uncertainty: the profession does not equal control of the helping process by students?
D. Emotional drain.
E. Overloading.

DIS-EQUILIBRIUM

A. Doubts
   1. Self
   2. Profession
B. Panic
   1. Uncertain future
   2. Uncertain standards
C. Pressure

RESTORATION OF BALANCE

A. New balance
B. Redefinition
C. New perspective
   1. A sense of time
   2. A sense of possible

help students and agencies adhere to the educational expectations and demands of the school indicated constraints both through policy conflicts and what might be called a lack of sensitivity to educational expectations. Two factors that might have been relevant to the perceived strain were the dual status of worker-student and inexperience with the Block Plan structure. Some school representatives at first viewed the students and agencies as subordinating the educational policy of the school to the service goals of the agencies. Some anger was expressed over the assumed loss of control by the school. From the agency, there was also mixed responses. Some felt that the school was making inordinate demands on the agency which were not practical and which placed constraints upon both policy and service. Faculty concern shifted from anger to finding a solution which was educationally sound.

It was a recommendation of the faculty that a course be designed which would identify for the work-study student some of these educational difficulties so that the student would be sensitive to possible issues which might serve as impediments and obstacles.

At the time the project was proposed, most schools of social work would not accept employed students or permit the agency of employment to be used for the student's field placement. Most schools used the concurrent plan of field practicum.

It has been suggested that in the traditional mode of social work education, the two year concurrent program, control over the educational process rests with the school. Partnership between agency and school is not equal. Control by the school is demonstrated by the school accepting an agency for field placement, assigning of students to agencies, and the demands made upon agencies as a condition for affiliation with the program. These demands include: setting amount of time the student will spend in the service institution; requiring adherence to the academic calendar; acceptance and certification of the field work instructors; determination of manner in which recordings are made and used; and both the type and amount of the assignment with which the student will be involved. The "contract" for social work eduction is between the individual student and the school. The agency in its partnership with the school provides the practicum, which develops student skills through supervised practical experience in extending service to the client.

In the Block Program at Yeshiva, it was initially assumed that this control could be maintained. Only distance from the school was felt to be different.

A work-study field placement creates for the student ambiguous position, as both a learner in the school and employee in the agency. Haffey and Starr indicated that this arrangement gives the agency significant control over the

educational experience.[2] The Wurzweiler school was not as sensitive of the distinctions between the work-study student and the traditional independent student. In addition, the school's assumption about similarity between agencies was not supported by experience.

Typical Problems Observed

Obstacles presented by Existing Relationship

The work-study students had prior agency relationships - both formal and informal, with agency executives, peers, staff members, supervisors and field instructors. Therefore, they brought their perceptions into the situation and often did not feel free to analyze or be critical of their learning process. The significant "others" in the agency also felt a lack of freedom to assist the student. There were students who viewed themselves as "locked in" with a field instructor they did not like. Some students could not contend with co-workers who appeared to resent their attending school. Others did not contest decisions when assignments were changed with little preparation. Similarly, some field instructors perceived the student as "great". The student had little to learn; the instructors had little to teach. In one situation, a student was asked to write his own evaluation.

Agency's Commitment to Social Work Education

A number of agencies had little conception or will to follow through and make educational demands on the student. Assignments were related to the same functional responsibilities as the student had been previously held. Little thought or reflection was given to new assignments. Agency supervision was task oriented, rather than educationally oriented. There appeared to be a personal rather than professional investment in the student. Released time for academic work was an issue, as was the utilization of educational tools, such as process recording. In one situation, a student was excluded from agency staff meetings and found himself involved in collusion with field instructors because of constraints placed on them by the agency. Students did not share their concerns with the school and in some cases were unaware that problems even existed.

Background and Ideology

Faculty noted that for a number of students' personal values and religious convictions came into conflict in relation to time utilization, agency assignment and the educational process. Conflicts were noted abut time spent at the agency in relation to the school calendar, and the methodology of service delivery to clients. A job action by workers left students in a quandary. The students seemed unaware that the school had a point of view on these issues.

Student Field Instructor Relationships

The responsibilities and expectations on students and field instructors in the field instruction process often were not mutual. Evaluative criteria sometimes were not utilized. Supervisory sessions were held inconsistently and were not structures. Agendas sometimes were not developed or used. Process recording was not valued as a learning tool or used on a required basis. Some students did not assume responsibility for their participation in the educational process. Some were not prepared in relationship to their educational assignments. Personal rather than professional values and behavior were often explored in supervision. Occasionally, a task supervisor rather than the assigned educational field instructor assumed major field instruction responsibility.

These observations are illustrative of some of the problems noted in the work-study program. Student's agency status was a variable, and some students reported on the difficulty of returning to an agency and becoming a student. The geographic distance of the school from the field placement and the school's lack of awareness of student problems in the agency placed the student at a disadvantage. The work-study student found himself at times unable to

question the appropriateness of a situation. The student found shortcomings in the quality of some agency assignments, the number of agency assignments, and the processes which mitigated against a positive agency experience.

All students engaged in social work education were found to be under stress. Pachtner compared stress in the traditional student with stress in students in alternative programs, including many work-study students. Pachtner's findings indicated that social work education was more stressful for the latter group.[3] One reason for this is the strain of being both employee and student simultaneously.

In designing the project course, selected concepts were taken from role theory and exchange theory. Biddle and Thomas claimed that there is no "grand theory" in the "field of role", however, a number of concepts have been developed.[4] The concept of role is found frequently in social work literature. "Role", can be defined as a set of attitudes and behaviors within a social system that is directed by the expectations of the one who performs the role and those who assign the role. Gross noted that roles can be defined in a social psychological context. The individual's definition of his own situation is significant. Similarly, institutions have expectations for the attitudes and values as well as the behaviors which fulfill a role.

Gross stated that "role conflict" occurs when a person occupies two or more positions simultaneously, and

when the role expectations of one are incompatible with the roles expectations of the other.[5] In contrast, role congruency is a situation in which the participant of one or more positions perceives that the same or similar expectations are held for each position. School and agency hold the same conception of social work education; that is why the agency supports the student in moving toward professional status. It is however, in the operationalizing of these expectations that conflict or congruence may emerge.

Horton and Hunt indicated that role strain can be caused by any of four factors: 1) inadequate preparation for a new role; 2) difficulty in taking on or relinquising a role; 3) failure to carry out the obligations of a role; 4) conflict.[6]

Some authors on conflict resolution have suggested that conflict is not all negative and that it is dynamic in the natural course of life. It has been their contention that conflict can be a motivating force for growth. Gross identifies a number of methods of conflict resolution. Citing his research, he suggested that individuals resolve their conflict dilemma by avoidance, adaptation, compromise, negotiation, and invoking the higher authority. The selection of which strategy to use was based on the individual's view of the situation.[7] Conflict resolution can then come about by being prepared for the role and having a perspective on the role disparities. The school, in its

relationship with the agency endeavors to develop the clarity so that students may be able to fulfill both role expectations simultaneously. The project course endeavors to clarify the functional aspect of the role, and to give a clear perspective so that the student is not caught in a box and can be an advocate for effective learning. Preparing the student for potential conflicts and coaching was a method of conflict resolution.

Historically, there exist organizational strains between school and agency. Each organization has its own functional needs to fulfill. The school's primary goal is the provision of service to its clients. A conflict which has existed in the past has been the issue of educational control and educational purpose. The agency may be viewed as "local", concerned with its specific clientele for service and the school can be viewed as "cosmopolitan" concerned with the overall profession of social work. In spite of the strains, the school needs the contributions of agencies to provide education for practice and the agencies need schools for both staff development and personnel. Guzzetta summarized the issue when he stated "in addition to recognition of the essential unity of class and field and that both require substantive rather than casual content and activities, must come agreement that social work as a profession is institution-oriented and agency-based."[8]

Writing an organizational theory, Scott identified

four areas of conflict experienced by individuals in bureaucracies. He cited resistance to rules, rejection of standards, resistance to supervision and conditional loyalty to bureaucracy. It was his view that professionals participated in two systems - the profession and the organization.[9] for the work-study student, the two systems are the agency and the school. In a line of reasoning similar to Scott's, Linzer[10] stated that social work students encounter three major authority structures in their socialization to the profession: 1) the bureaucracy; 2) supervision; 3) the profession.

In addition to the ideas taken from role theory, there is a second set of theoretical concepts, drawing on the work of Homans in exchange theory. This author focuses on the process of social interaction. Homans' specific framework applies to the small group.

Homans' theory uses the small social system - the small group in which participants are interactive.[11] This group structure is one system within larger systems. The larger systems are called "environments". Central to Homans' work is that group activities lead to interaction and sentiment among participants in the group. The outcome of this interaction is that the more people do together, the more they are drawn together, the greater the group cohesion and the greater the impact of the group on the individual. The group exists in an environment and is always in

interaction with that environment. The external environment impinges on the group and the group both impinges and responds to the environment. A by-product of this interactional process is the strengthening or weakening of the cohesion of the group. Homans used the concept of spiral feedback in referring to the process affecting all members of the group. A norm is an idea that specifies what participants in a group are expected to do and think. A norm in this case is similar to role expectations in role theory. Norms come from the environment - the group specifically or the outside environment. The group is an influence system and norms are the ideas that change perceptions. Norms are ideas and not behaviors, but lead to action and behavior.

In Homans' schema, the group is in interaction with the immediate environment, and beyond that with the larger environment. The work-study student cohort was viewed as the group. The individuals in the group did not view themselves as group members, but as individual students. Categorizing all the students as work-study and calling them together began a process of group formation. The immediate environment of the work-study students was the school; at the completion of the summer, their immediate environment would be the agency in which they were employed. The orientation course represented a socialization process in which activity would lead to interaction and sentiment, and a consequence of this group process would be an impact on norms, values, and

expectations. The consequence it was hoped would be an impact on the students expectation on themselves, and on the educational institutions with which they were involved. It was envisioned that the cohort would have changed their orientation from role socialization (task) to status socialization (the profession).

The role concept of "coaching" was also utilized in the project design. Strauss suggested that the process of coaching flows from the learners need for guidance. He pointed out that the coach (the instructor) worked with the "immediate desires" of the student, but had a larger objective, creating new aims and objectives and thus "a new identity for the student."[12]

The concepts that have been included in the definition of role theory are: role; social context or system; expectations by all the actors in the educational venture; role conflict; norms; and sanction. It is the mix of the agency, student and school, in which role strain may or may not develop. In the design of the project these theoretical ideas gave direction and understanding.

Thirty years ago, Cassidy identified the need for the schools to assume responsibility in assisting the work-study student. Haffey and Starr urged the use of "a supplemental orientation course to broaden work-study students' scope and awareness of the profession as a whole".[13]

The project course was focused upon helping the students acquire a body of knowledge which would have an impact upon attitudes and guide future behavior. For its six-week duration, the course was not only knowledge oriented in the sense of providing data and information, but attempted to provide knowledge about the process of learning and thereby to equip the student with understanding of how to acquire knowledge.

Focus of the Study

When recruits become students of a school of social work (socializing organizations), they become involved in a dynamic process. They are confronted with a dynamic tension in their field settings as well as the school arena. As a result of this dual experience, they develop new understandings of the profession, the agency and themselves. This project was designed to assess certain cognitive aspects of the adult change process as they relate to the socialization of graduate students designated as work study into the social work school. It was assumed that cognitive and behavioral change could take place through the student's attainment of "new meanings for situations without changing the situation themselves".

The design of the course was intended to apply concepts from role theory. This process of engagement was

directed by the following ideas:

1) individuals who participate have a better understanding of their situation;
2) course content helps define the relevant issues and the arenas of concern;
3) areas of possible conflict could be identified in advance;
4) functional differences between agency and school can be validated and students assisted in conflict management;
5) students would recognize role strain and be active in their learning.

The method of teaching was didactic instruction, role playing, discussion of the literature and case studies.

1.Joel Sacks "Process Model." Yeshiva University, 1972 (mimeographed)

2.Martha Haffey & Rose Starr, "A View from the Other Side: An Empirical Study of the Contribution of Agency Participation in Work-Study MSW Degree Programs", paper presented at APM CSWE Washington, D.C. February 1985, p. 3

3.Michael Pachtner, "The Practitioner Becomes a Student: The Stresses of Transition" Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, Vol. 2, #2, 1983, pp. 21-31

4.Bruce Biddle and Edwin Thomas, Eds., Role Theory: Concepts in Research, John Wiley and Sons, (New York, 1966), p. 18

5.Neal Gross, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York, J. Wiley, 1958) pp. 17

6.Paul Horton & Chester Hunt, Sociology 4th ed. (New York; McGraw Hill, 1976), p 107

7.Neal Gross, Alexander McEachern, and Ward Mason, "Role Conflict and its resolution" in Role Theory; Concepts and Research (New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966) pp287-296

8.Allen Rubin and G. Robert Whitcomb, Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1977. Council on Social Work Education, p. 37

9.Richard Scott, "Professionals and Bureaucracies - Areas of Conflict", Professionalization Vollmer and Mills eds. Prentice-Hall, 1956

10.Norman Linzer, "A Study Report on the Self Image of Student and Professional Social workers", Wurzweiler School of Social Work, 1974 (Mimeographed)

11.George Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950

12.Anselm Strauss, "Coaching", Biddle and Thomas, Eds., Role Theory: concepts and Research, John Wiley and Son, (New York, 1966), pp. 350-353

13.Rose Starr and Martha Haffey, "Teaching Work-Study Students: Curriculum Delivery and Design Issues", Mimeographed Paper-Hunter College School Social Work, 1985, p. 8

CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

The development of the work-study students in graduate professional schools is a relatively uncharted area of social work inquiry. The intention of this project therefore, was exploration or hypothesis-finding rather than hypothesis-testing. Riley stated that "the researcher who works with an exploratory objective tries to find clues to what is going on in the system or tries to gain insights that suggest hypothesis ..."[1]

The design of this project was exploratory-formulative. Its objective was to identify the characteristics of the situation - the work-study student's perception of his role as he begins and ends his studentship. The method suggested was "exploratory", falling within a classification designed by Kahn. In his explication of research method, Kahn suggested that in the exploratory-formulative study, the control of variables "is not involved."[2]

Each work-study student has some knowledge about social work education and his status when he arrives at school. This knowledge is gained through the interview process, the informal system, and written materials sent to the student. This knowledge is different for each student. The work-study students knew that as a condition of admission

to the school, they would have to be involved in a work-study course.

The project was knowledge-based and premised in part on the idea that the knowledge engaged was for use and would be helpful to the student in fulfilling and expanding his studentship.

The relevant proposition was: There will be a positive change in the pre- and post- orientation knowledge base of work-study students. Through a formal course of study it should be possible to increase the specific knowledge base of the Block Plan Work-Study student. The orientation content areas examined included: a) formal course material, b) perception of role which is operationalized according to specific action response.

Two key variables were: knowledge and role perception. These variables were identified as problematic for work-study students by faculty advisors, field instructors, and students. The educational course was developed to address these issues. The data used for measurement were responses to a set of vignettes and scales which operationalized the content and objectives of the course.

Sacks built upon the work of Piaget and suggested that adult learning is cognitive in nature and depends upon a feedback system which becomes the building block for the learner to make connections and expand knowledge

under varying conditions. He stated:

> Thus what we learn from experience creates the very conditions for additional learning. In fact, it sets the parameters of that learning --- what can be acquired at any moment is limited by what has already been acquired so there must be an experimental and cognitive readiness for the new experience.[3]

Sacks applied this to the educational process for social work students and suggested that there is a movement from "cognitive disequilibrium" to "cognitive conscious raising."[4] Sacks pointed out that in the work of Piaget, knowledge is inherently practice and action oriented. Its special function (the mind) is to process information "from the environment and to organize and coordinate appropriate goal directed responses. Thus, all action or behavior is mediated by cognitive structure."[5] He pointed out that Piaget regarded a simulation as the chief dynamic of cognitive development. In essence, what we learn from experience creates the very condition for learning.

This project addressed itself to a program which not only allows the student to be the recipient of an education service, but to assist the student to be effective in his own education.

Studentship always represents a strain. Students are always under a strain to engage in an educational process - the will to learn while resisting the very process. Why is this so? It is generally true that

anyone moving into a new experience comes with a sense of anticipation, and defenses become heightened. The student is confronted with having to learn new knowledge, structures, skill, vocabulary and an examination of self. This is a dynamic interplay of the experiential and cognitive capacity of the student.

In the Block Plan the work-study student is confronted with role confusion. In addition to the fact that the student is geographically distant from the school, and does not have immediate peer or faculty support, he is anchored in two institutions; the agency which pays his salary, and the school in which he must assume a new role as student. These conditions suggest the need to help the work study student to fully and productively use the opportunities inherent in graduate social work education. The project was based on the recognition of the dynamic tension between the school and the agency. It focused on helping the student acquire knowledge which can minimize the school-agency-student tensions, and help the student to fully utilize the program.

The overall objectives in assisting the transition from "practitioner" to graduate social work student were:

1. To clarify for students the roles, mutual responsibilities, and functions played by participants in the educational process.

2. To stimulate and provoke student awareness of the external and internal influences on the various parties in the educational venture.
3. To help students identify some common social work values.

The population in this project comprised all the work-study students in the Wurzweiler School's Block Plan for one summer - twenty students or one-third of the entire Block Plan. All twenty students were involved in the program orientation course and completed the instruments devised.

A number of instruments were used in measuring outcomes. They were the Kelley Scale of Attitudes Towards An Institution, the Meyer Social Values Test and vignettes. In addition, each work-study student was interviewed once during the course of the semester, and each student was asked to keep a weekly log. The log and interview were unstructured.

The Kelley "Attitudes Towards Any Institution."[6] This is a Thurston-type scale and has equivalent type forms A and B. This scale provides a value-laden judgement on the part of the student respecting his perception of the value he places upon an institution. This scale was administered twice during the project, once before beginning the orientation course and again after

its completion. It sought to identify student attitudes toward the educational institution and toward the field work agency from which the student came and to which the student returned. The course was intended to promote a more positive attitude towards both the school and the agency.

The Meyers Social Value Test is a 40 item inventory which measures adherence to "official" social work value positions along ten dimensions. The official value positions were determined by reference to the social work literature. The test has been administered to social workers, social work students, and untrained workers. Meyers and McLeod reported that the test can distinguish among these groups.[7] The Meyers scale tapped a theme that was pervasive throughout all the course sessions, namely identification with commonly accepted social work values. These include the notion of societal responsibility; the welfare of the individual; personal freedom in terms of making choices; and group and societal goals as opposed to personal goals.[8] The Meyers Scale was also administered twice before and after the orientation course.

Meyer cautioned that although the scale had been standard for both reliability and validity it could measure only gross movements. He noted that because

social workers generally started with a more "liberal bent" then others, the direction of the movement, if any, could be signficant. He also indicated he felt this was true for students intending to become social workers.

A series of vignettes was created based on actual situational problems previously observed. Each vignette was based on an issue which presented each student with a dilemma. The students response to the dilemma could be analyzed along 3 spearate dimensions, action, role and awareness of the issue.

The vignettes served as a projective technique. Different responses to the before and after segments of the project were expected to reveal whether students had been able to apply the concepts in the orientation course to hypothetical situations. The vignettes were matched to the orientation course content, with the intention of providing students an opportunity to demonstrate concept application beyond the so-called "feeling" state. This application requires that students not only identify knowledge that has been learned, but demonstrate the relationship between the vignette situation and the student's way of thinking as graduate social work students applying that knowledge to the practical situation.[9]

The vignettes called for the students to be able to specify what it is that they had to take into account and

what actions they would take in response to critical situations.

1. Behavior Questions (Action): How would you respond if you if you were the student?
2. Analytic Question (Role): If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?
3. Negative or Positive Judgement (Awareness): What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

The exercise required the student to relate understanding to action, based on the recognition that the social worker was an actor. The vignette placed the student in the position of modeling and having to assume responsibility for his own act. This should help identify the student's ability to be attentive to and concerned with the intricate tripartite relationships among school, agency, and student. This was believed to indicate awareness of "professional self" among work-study students.

Analysis of the vignettes proceeded along two lines. The first was to determine whether the relevant questions have been perceived and addressed by the student.

Categories of response were prepared in advance according to the desired course objectives to provide a basis for comparison. The second line, based on content analysis, examined the different ways students perceived the same material, and how they might be expected to use this content in their own agency experiences.

Each participant was interviewed one time during the six week course. The interview was intended to allow the evaluator to determine some of the dynamic elements in the course relative to the students' engagement with the course. Students were asked to keep logs on a weekly basis. The intent of the log was for student recall and an understanding of what the students were experiencing in the work-study course. There was no endeavor to utilize the interview or logs formally for content analysis.

Rosenblatt described the selection of measurement materials in designing a study:

> A researcher cannot solve all the problems that arise in conducting an evaluation study to everyone's satisfaction. The problem of measurement is particularly nettlesome. All that a researcher can hope to do is to select an instrument from the limited stock of those currently available that is either "better" or "less bad". Even the best instruments available for evaluating social work education are far from perfect. This should be openly acknowledged.[10]

A number of problems influenced the approach to the project, including precedents, time constraints, and generalizations. Since the work-study in a Block Program represented a unique case in social work education, there

were no precedents for guidance in developing the orientation course. No empirical data could be found to direct the selection of content, or even the duration of the project. Moreover, the question of duration was constrained by the practical considerations of the length of time period available. The portion of the total program available for the project was an 8 week segment. Moreover, students were hard pressed during this segment, attending classes from 8:30 a.m. until 5 p.m. The instruction was continuous and intense. Not only did this act as a time constraint, but also required consideration of fatigue.

Overcoming these problems was not sufficient. The question of generalized ability had to be attended that is, would the results of this orientation project be applicable to other cohorts of students.

To deal with this question, it was necessary to determine if there was problem continuity. The difficulties observed by the faculty among the work-study students in the first year of the program were found to be repeated in the second year, the year used in the project. While the pre-orientation identification of problems helped note greater detail, it was found that the patterns of problems were the same, and the issues facing students were familiar. That is, the examination of difficulties identified the same things as had been identified in the

informal faculty observations. The identification process was pursued in an individual, interview with each work-study student.

In summary, as the work-study arrangement is relatively unchartered an exploratory formulative design was chosen. This design would allow for hypothesis finding. An orientation course was offered focusing on role perception of the work-study student and acquisition of knowledge. A number of scales were selected to gather information and to test for the effectiveness and impact of the course directed to the work-study student. Two scales, the Kelly Scale and the Meyers Scale have been used previously in research. A specially constructed series of vignettes were developed for this project. The vignettes posed dilemmas for the work-study student and were issues observed in student practice previously. All tests were used on a pre- and post- basis.

1.Matilda Riley, Sociological Research: A Case Approach. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963), p. 14

2.Alfred Kahn, "The Design of Research" in Normal A. Polansky, ed. Social Work Research, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 58

3.Joel Sacks, "The Cognitive Development of a Professional Social Worker - A Piagetion Sketch." Wurzweiler School of Social Work (May 1977) (mimeo)

4.Ibid., p. 6

5.Ibid., p. 1

6.Ida B. Kelley, "The Construction and Evaluation of a Scale to Measure Attitude Toward Any Institution." Bulletin of Purdue University, vol. XXXV, Lafayette Ind. 1934, pp. 13-36

7.Donna L. McLeod and Henry J. Meyer, "A Study of the Values of Social workers" Behavioral Science for Social Workers, ed. by Edwin J. Thomas (New York: The Free Press, 1967) pp. 401-16

8.Henry J. Meyer, "Social Values Test", (Revision of the Social Values Test, 1961), University of Michigan, September 1962 p. 3 (Mimeographed)

9.Lewis Chartock, How Teen Workers View Their Practice (New York, Florence Heller, Jewish Welfare Board Research Center, 1976) p. 6

10.Aaron Rosenblatt, Marianne Welter and Sophie Wojciechowski, The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education, (New York Council on Social Work Education 1976) p. 12

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS

The primary objective of the project orientation course was to promote the work-study student's transition from "layman practitioner" to a "social work student". The following four factors relevant to work-study students were examined.

a) Identifying characteristics

b) Action, role and awareness perception

c) Attitude towards the agency and the school

c) Adherence to social work values

A. Characteristics

The following identifying characteristics of the work-study student were considered: age, sex, marital status, social work experience, motivation for pursuing the MSW degree; religious affiliations; practice method selected for study; and education degrees beyond the baccalaureate. These data are presented in Table 1.

1. The typical work-study student (i.e., lay practitioner) in the project was 30 years old; married (or had been married);

2. Has been employed in his/her current position for 2 years; and working in the general field for 5 years;

3. Students chose the Wurzweiler program because it allowed them to continue their full-time employment and involved an eight week residency during the summer;

4. A large group of students 60% came from geographic areas distant from the school to attend this program. They came from small as well as large communities;

5. Forty percent of the students had advanced degrees Quam, Applebaum, and Seidl found the "non-traditional learners" are generally older, homebound, fully employed and perceived themselves as "being responsible, autonomous, and self directing" than "traditional learners".[1] The authors also suggest that such learners are "strongly characterized as discovery learners and significantly different from the traditional learner."[2] This description seemed to apply to the work-study group. Based on my impressions as a social work educators for twenty-five years, this work-study student is older and more mature than the typical student and may fit the description cited by Quam.

6. The students were primarily Jewish, and;

7. Were affiliated in their jobs with a variety of service organizations.

TABLE 1

IDENTIFYING CHARACTERISTICS OF WORK-STUDY STUDENTS

Age (in years)
Range: 26-55
Median: 30
Average: 35

Sex
Male: 8
Female: 12

Marital Status
Married: 10
Single (never married): 5
Divorced: 4
Widowed: 1

Advanced Degrees
Yes: 8
No: 12

Religious Affiliation
Jewish: 17
Catholic: 2
Protestant: 1

Geographic Area
Local: 8
Distant: 12

Social Work Experience (in years)

	Current Position	Total Experience
Range	0 - 11	2 - 21
Median	2	5
Average	3	7

Practice Method Chosen
Casework: 10
Group Work: 6
Community Work: 4

Reasons for Pursuing MSW Degree
Ability to continue to work full time: 20
Structure of program (8 weeks in summer): 20
Fulfill field work in current agency: 12
Need degree for career: 10
Jewish component of WSSW: 9
Reputation of WSSW: 3

CURRENT AGENCY
Jewish Federation: 4
Family Service: 3
Comm. Mental Health: 3
Jewish Sr. Citizen: 2
Jewish Center (J.C.C.): 4
Schools: 2 facility
Drug Related: 1
Psychiatric Hospital: 1

Vignettes

B. Action - Role and Awareness Perception

Twenty-four vignettes were designed to identify students' ability to apply knowledge to selected practical situations. Each vignette was based on an issue which presented each student with a dilemma. The students' response to the dilemma can be analyzed along three separate dimensions: action, role, and awareness of the issue. These vignettes were examined by a panel of two faculty members at the Wurzweiler School of Social Work, two work-study students from the previous year, and the project director. From the total of 24 vignettes, twelve were selected by the panel for use with the project students.

Student responses to the dilemmas posed by the vignettes were analyzed in terms of the following possibilities:

The Action Dimension:

1. The student ignores the dilemma and complies with an unreasonable request; 2. The student tries to negotiate and not merely comply; 3. The student invokes his/her student status and/or has the school address the issue. These levels were viewed as a scale indicating the student's degree of identification with the school, with three representing the closest identification.

The Role Dimenion:

1. The student responds on a personalized individual basis; 2. The student responds as a worker; 3. The student responds as a student. These levels were viewed in a scale indicating the degree of student identification, with three representing the closest identification.

The awareness dimension is binary and the student response is either yes or no. This was viewed as a two point scale indicating student sensitivity to practice issues. A yes response - represented awareness of the issue. This was scored on a higher basis in the two point scale.

Eleven vignettes were used statistically as to category fit. The original vignette number six was discarded as it was viewed by respondents as a clinical issue rather than an educational concern. The sequence of eleven vignettes excludes vignette number six.

The eleven vignettes were analyzed in two ways. First, one faculty member and the project director judged the responses of students separately and independently on the three dimensions outlined above. Three scales were formed by combining the individual items to produce measures of the three identified dimensions. These scales

showed moderate reliability levels* as follows:

Action - r = .33

Role - r = .27

Awareness of Issue - r = .56

Second, each vignette was reviewed separately and analyzed the changes from time 1 to time 2 with the non-parametric Wilcoxin test (SPSSX p. 850). the Wilcoxin sign test is paired in that each individual is compared against himself. The null hypothesis of this test suggests that changes from time 1 to time 2 will <u>not</u> be in any consistent direction while the working hypothesis of this study is that there will be consistent movement in the direction of greater identification with the School and with the newly acquired student status.

* Coefficient alpha, SPSSX p. 857

<u>Scale Analysis</u>

Table 2 summarizes the student responses to the vignettes before taking the course (Time 1) and after completion of the course (Time 2). As noted in methodology, these types of responses were required-behavioral - action; analytic - role; and positive or negative judgement awareness. Table II contains the means and standard deviation for each scale on the pre-test (time 1) and post-test (time 2) and reveals that there was considerable positive movement in each area (all

differences were statistically significant at the .001 level.) On a three point scale, action started at an average of nearly two suggesting that students were primarily interested in reaching an accommodation to the situation when faced with the practice dilemma. On the post-test students shifted to an average score of 2.57 leaning towards involving the School as the response of choice.

In terms of role, the students initially average 1.72 on a three point scale, which is in the clear direction of acting as a lay practitioner rather than merely as an individual. In contrast, following their six week summer course, the work-study students average 2.43 which is between taking the role of a worker and moving towards identifying with their role as a student.

Finally, on the pre-test most students were unable to clearly identify the practice issues involved as evidenced by an average score of 1.4, on a two point scale. On the post-test, the majority of students were aware of the issue as demonstrated by a shift to 1.74. These data strongly confirm the movement of these work-study students from their position of lay practitioners towards their new status as MSW students.

TABLE 2

VIGNETTE ANALYSIS

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND t-TEST VALUES for the VIGNETTE DIMENSIONS of ACTION, ROLE and AWARENESS of ISSUES

	Time 1		Time 2		
DIMENSION	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	t-Test Val.
Action	1.97	0.36	2.57	0.19	6.89*
Role	1.72	0.31	2.43	0.1	7.99*
Awareness of Issues	1.41	0.18	1.74	0.15	7.48*

*p .001

A second analysis considers each vignette separately in documenting the types of issues involved and the changes that occurred. In each case the data are presented for those students who completed both the pre-test and post-test on each of the three dimensions.

Each vignette requires responses as to the student's perception of the issue and calls for action based on this awareness. The reaction can be viewed as what one might reasonable expect from a student. Did the student perceive the educational issues involved? The vignette calls for action appropriate to the ideal solution.

perceive the educational issues involved? The vignette calls for action appropriate to the ideal solution. Inherent in the act is the role represented and carried by the student. The student can respond and act based upon his understanding of the situation from a personal point of view, as an agent of the agency, or as a student socialized to the student role. Each vignette dilemma is cited followed by the organizing ideal desired by the school. Each table lists the responses of the twenty (20) work-study students in the project course.

VIGNETTE 1 - PROCESS RECORDING

Previous to your coming to school, you employed summary recording and memorandum as communication documents. Upon returning to the agency, your field instructor tells you to record as you always did, in summary form.

In Vignette #1, the student must deal with educational issues involving instrumentation. The school prefers and demands process recording as the vehicle for documentation and use in the supervisory conference. The organizing principles concern the function and purpose of recording, the meaning and value of writing in this form, the specific mode of recording observations, the agency's use of documentation and the use for monthly reports and classes at school. The vignette focuses the student attention on the dilemma posed by the field instructor's request.

V1 - Initially (Time 1) students are unaware of the issue (13 said "No") and were generally willing to comply (N=12). They responded on an individual basis and as workers ("I record this way for my job, it must be good enough for the school"). Following the project course (Time 2), there was a marked change - a large majority became aware of the issue, only two students would comply with the agency while 11 would cite the school requirements. The majority now adopted the role of

student ("It is important for me to use process recording in order to maximize my education potential").

VIGNETTE 1 - PROCESS RECORDING

SUMMARY: Field instructor tells the student to use agency summary recording.

TABLE 3 - PROCESS RECORDING

Response to situation in terms of action, role and awareness of issue.

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	12	2	INDIVIDUAL	8	3	NO	13	4
NEGOTIATE	6	7	WORKER	10	2	YES	7	16
INVOKE SCHOOL	2	11	STUDENT	2	15			
TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20
	p= .001			p= .003			p= .014	

The response to question #1 at Time 1 indicates limited awareness of the educational issue, acting on one's own behalf and an accommodation to the agency demands.

For example, one student commented at Time 1, "I would have no objection to recording in the manner requested." Whereas a second said, "If necessary I would make two sets of recordings: process for supervision and summary for the case folder."

One sees a dramatic shift in understanding and action in Time 2. At that time students have a sense of the schools' expectations and were able to call the school

into action. For example, one typical response was "This would be an inadequate means of communication in my role as student." Whereas another said, "I would discuss with my field instructor my understanding of the agency obligations towards my Wurzweiler training and remind him of the schools requirement for process recording. If necessary, I would request a three way conference with my instructor and advisor."

VIGNETTE 2 - TERMINATION OF SERVICE

You are in the midst of your field work year when a new executive director is hired. In examining work assignments, he determines that you should terminate what you are doing as he has other agency needs which he wishes to assign to you.

In Vignette #2, the student must contend with educational issues regarding continuity of client service inherent in the assignment, responsibility to clients and agency and preparation and process in termination. The school prefers a continuous assignment over time. Termination of services should be orderly and part of a planned process. The decision to terminate should be reasoned, responsible and should include student-worker and administration. The decision should not be made arbitrary and on the basis of power, bias, authority without the process involving the student.

V2 - Many students were initially (Time 1) aware of the issue involved and less than 1/3 were willing to comply. Fully half the students reacted to this request on an individual basis. Significant changes were observed (Time 2) as a majority saw this as an educational issue by invoking the school and taking on the student role following the project course.

VIGNETTE 2 - TERMINATION OF SERVICE

SUMMARY: New executive is hired and requests immediate termination of current services and movement to other needs.

TABLE 4 - TERMINATION OF SERVICE

Response to situation in terms of action, role and awareness of issue.

ACTION Response	Time 1	Time 2	ROLE Response	Time 1	Time 2	AWARENESS OF ISSUE Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	6	4	INDIVIDUAL	10	3	NO	11	5
NEGOTIATE	9	5	WORKER	4	6	YES	7	13
INVOKE SCHOOL	4	10	STUDENT	5	10			
TOTAL	19	19	TOTAL	19	19	TOTAL	18	18
	p= .030			p= .023			p= .030	

The respondents, in these examples, typically expressed in frame of reference of agency employees and reacted willingly and ambivalently to the demands of the situation.

For example, one replied: "I would respond not as a student, but as an agency employee responsible to my supervisor and lay board." While another stated: "It might upset me for the moment, but I would try to look at it with an open mind and think of it as a challenge."

Their response in Time 2 signified movement and action guided by understanding of concept and principle. There was a shift toward taking on the student role. A typical response then was: "I would point out the nature of the contract that our agency would have with the school. I would add the importance of continuity and the sense of the supervisory responsibility to the school."

OR

"I would refer him to the school advisor, and the manual."

VIGNETTE 3 - EXAMINATION OF PRACTICE

Field instructor disagrees with school's educational emphasis on learning by examining practice - feels education is better served by reading and discussing examples of good practice.

Your agency field instructor, who supported your candidacy for school, tells you that he does not agree with the school's educational emphasis on learning by examining "practice". It is his view that your education would be better served if you read examples of good practice and discussed these with him for the first part of the semester. He also tells you that your assignment should be generic rather than one based on a specific social work method.

Vignette #3 calls attention to the school's philosophy and style of the teaching learning process. The position promulgated by the school calls for an active engagement by the student in the direct rendering of agency services. The examination of this practice by student structures the form of the supervisory conference. It is expected that the student and field instruction will be active rather than passive in their examination of the students' practice. The school is a method oriented school and holds to a view that the assignments will be congruent with this held value.

V3 - There were substantial changes - initially (Time 1) half the students did not recognize the issue involved, a majority reacted on an individual basis. Only six students used the school's policy to try to get the field instructor to change his/her mind. Following the project course (Time 2), almost every student recognized the issue and took on their student role by invoking the school.

VIGNETTE 3 - EXAMINATION OF PRACTICE

SUMMARY: Field instructor disagrees with school's educational emphasis on learning by examining practice - feels education is better served by reading and discussing examples of good practice.

TABLE 5 - EXAMINATION OF PRACTICE

Response to situation in terms of action, role and awareness of issue.

ACTION Response	Time 1	Time 2	ROLE Response	Time 1	Time 2	AWARENESS OF ISSUE Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	5	0	INDIVIDUAL	13	1	NO	10	2
NEGOTIATE	9	2	WORKER	0	2	YES	10	18
INVOKE SCHOOL	6	18	STUDENT	7	17			
TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20
	p= .001			p= .003			p= .021	

The examples cited by the respondents demonstrated that substantial change took place for the student group between Time 1 and Time 2. Initially, there was limited awareness of the problem and the students were guided by personal need.

For example, one student said: "I do not feel it is his perogative to advise me as to what form of education

would be most fitting to my needs. I have the right to make that choice." Whereas another said: "I would try to work out a compromise where we could accomplish the work to his satisfaction and the schools."

As Time 2, there was a cognitive awareness of the schools expectations as well as an identification with the school. "I would explain that this neither my nor the school's philosophy towards my education; that I must be actively engaged and I would contact the school FAST." "I would disagree and explain that the agency had agreed to the school's educational system by supporting my candidacy."

VIGNETTE 4 - SELF-EVALUATION

Field instructor asks student to write his/her own evaluation. Your field instructor is preparing for your evaluation, and he asks you to write your own evaluation. He then informs you he will submit this evaluation in that form under his name.

Vignette #4 focuses on the evaluation process, the meaning of stock taking, the reciprocal functions and roles in this activity and the ethical issues of responsibility. It is the school's view that the evaluation process is an active engagement between two individuals in which assessments and judgments are made in behalf of learning and growth for the student. This process puts responsibility on both parties to prepare and to be honest in the judgements made about the learning to date. It is the expectation of the school that the field instructor plays an active role in structuring, conducting and engaging in this process. The field work instructor, as the school and agency representative in the educational situation signs the written evaluation after having shown it to the student.

V4 - Students recognized the issue both before and after the project course showing no real change. However, there was clear change in their response as a majority took on the student role and invoked the school. This issue was fairly obvious - how could the student learn

anything by writing his/her own evaluation? Initially, (time 1) the work-study students did not use their student status to address this dilemma - this changed substantially as a majority took on the student role and invoked the school by the end of the summer.

VIGNETTE 4 - SELF EVALUATION

SUMMARY: Field instructor asks student to write his/her own evaluation

TABLE 6 - SELF EVALUATION

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	3	2	INDIVIDUAL	14	6	NO	7	5
NEGOTIATE	9	2	WORKER	0	1	YES	12	14
INVOKE SCHOOL	5	23	STUDENT	6	13			
TOTAL	17	18	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	19	19
	p= .014			p= .012			p= .232	

At both times the respondents were clearly aware of the ethical issues involved. Thus:

"I would tell him that I think it is a good idea to have me evaluate myself, but I would also appreciate if he would include his own evaluation."

"I would be angry but might not show it. I would ask the field instructor not to do that."

Initially, they resorted to their behavior was discussion and negotiation, but they acted as individuals.

By time 2, however, they were responding more

forcefully as students.

"I would object. I would suggest that he include his evaluation of me. I would inform him that it was the school's policy that he do the evaluation and sign it. I would refer him to the manual and to the school advisor."

"I would explain to him that I would prefer to have him evaluate me on his own and that doing so would be a great help to me. If he insisted on using my evaluation, I would contact the school, and request advice."

Moreover, they seemed to sense the school's support for this approach.

VIGNETTE 5 - SCHOOL CALENDAR

Field Instructor asks student to work during holiday time; school has organized this break time to facilitate the learning process. An educational calendar has been developed by the School to facilitate the rhythm of education and to conform with the School's purposes and policies. As service responsibility develops during the year, your field instructor requests that the agency will need additional coverage during the holiday season. This is so because many clients who are not generally available will be accessible. He suggests that you consider this service obligation.

Vignette #5 gives attention to the school's policy on a calendar and the use of time by agency and student. The calendar is agreement to all parties and represents the academic year - beginnings and endings, religious and national holidays and winter and spring breaks. The schedule is arranged in such a manner to protect the student in regard to academic expectation.

V5 - Initially, students did not fully understand that this was an educational issue in that the break time was designed to enhance learning. Most students reacted to an individual level and were willing to comply with the request. Following the present course, a majority now saw the educational implications and were willing to take on their student role and invoke the school.

VIGNETTE 5 - SCHOOL CALENDAR

SUMMARY: Field instructor asks student to work during holiday time; school has organized this break to facilitate the learning process.

TABLE 7 - SCHOOL CALENDAR

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	13	5	INDIVIDUAL	12	4	NO	15	8
NEGOTIATE	3	2	WORKER	4	4	YES	5	12
INVOKE SCHOOL	3	12	STUDENT	3	11			
TOTAL	19	19	TOTAL	19	19	TOTAL	20	20
	p= .003			p= .009			p= .009	

At times, most responded on a personal basis, and were willing to comply and compromise in Time One. For example, one student said:

"I would ask for compensatory time. If not, I would endeavor to compromise or offer other suggestions to compensate."

The responses by Time Two saw a shift in behavior, role, and attitudes towards being students incorporating this in her response. A typical response then was:

"I would say that though I understood the problem, I could not readjust my schedule since my first responsibility at this time is to the school, myself, and the contract which we originally agreed upon."

VIGNETTE #6 - SPECIAL ATTRIBUTE

As a student, you have a special attribute (e.g. speak Russian) and have made a unique contribution to the agency so that part of service is dependent upon you. You recognize that there are other services with educational potential in your agency for you. Upon your return from school, the executive director asks you to continue with the service you were involved with exclusively.

Vignette #6 gives attention to the service component of assignments. It is expected that educational assignments would be continuous, have depth and breath and be different than the job of the employee. The view of the school is that newness in assignment offers opportunities for the student to explore "the self" in and find the common elements of practice. For the work-study student, experience with newness allows for transferability of learning.

V6 - Student found this vignette difficult - they were split on recognizing the issue on both the pre and post tests (no significant difference) and tended to react on an individual basis ("No one else speaks Russian - what can I do?"). At the same time, students were able to bring the school in when deciding how they would handle the problem.

VIGNETTE 6 - SPECIAL ATTRIBUTE

SUMMARY: Because of a special attribute (e.g. Russian fluency) the student has made a unique contribution and the agency is dependent-executive asks that student continue in this service and not move into other areas which have greater educational potential.)

TABLE 8 - SPECIAL ATTRIBUTE

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	4	4	INDIVIDUAL	9	9	NO	10	7
NEGOTIATE	14	5	WORKER	4	3	YES	10	13
INVOKE SCHOOL	2	11	STUDENT	7	8			
TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20
	p= .021			p= .430			p= .187	

In Time One the students showed some awareness and comprehension of the dilemma posed by this situation. Their responses demonstrated an orientation which was both personal and employee in nature. By Time Two there was a shift in their awareness of the issue. Their actions

involved the school. They also showed an acceptance of the agency's need to render service.

A typical response at Time 1 was:

"I would try to convince the agency that my education would not be complete without a variation of experiences. Hopefully, I could perhaps do a bit of both."

Whereas, at Time 2 the following was typical:

"I would review the manual with him and explain my obligation as a student. I would hope to combine my past service with new experiences applicable to field work."

VIGNETTE 7 - PROPRIETARY MATERIAL

The school has informed you that your process recordings will be used in your practice class when you return to school. Your agency indicates that you cannot use agency material outside of the confines of the physical location of the agency.

Vignette #7 addresses the relationship between agency - school in their reciprocal focus on professional education. The school utilizes the process record as a tool in the classroom educational structure. The student learns to assume responsibility for presentation of his real practice. The case method is the format for class participation with colleagues. This dilemma for the student is the meaning of the school - agency relationship and the use of this instrumentation for learning. The student is faced additionally with value issues of protecting the agency and client.

V7 - Students only recognized the educational issue involved here following the project course, and they saw that their student status required the agency to allow them to use the material. By the end of the project, no students were willing to comply with this agency demand.

VIGNETTE 7 - PROPRIETARY MATERIAL

SUMMARY: School expects student to use process recording in class - agency does not allow its material to be used out of the agency.

TABLE 9 - PROPRIETARY MATERIAL

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	4	0	INDIVIDUAL	12	3	NO	14	5
NEGOTIATE	9	7	WORKER	2	1	YES	6	15
INVOKE SCHOOL	4	10	STUDENT	6	16			
TOTAL	17	17	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	20	20
	p= .009			p= .005			p= .008	

In the initial test students accommodated to agency policy, but sought ways to fulfill the school's demand. The tone of their responses suggested a sense of being alone and powerless in the situation.

For example, one student said:
"This really would be a pity as my agency has so much to offer."

By Time Two, the students demonstrated awareness of their rights and had a perspective on the relationship

between agency, school, and student.

"I would ask the agency to read their manual in which this agreement is stated."

VIGNETTE 8 - SUPERVISORY CONFERENCE

When you appear for your educational supervisory conference, your field instructor declares that you and he have been given the assignment of taking care of the details for a staff board luncheon the following day. He suggests that the consideration of the record that you would have worked on be postponed until next week.

Vignette #8 calls on the student to recognize the meaning and value of supervision. The supervisory conference is viewed by the school as significant and central in the student's learning process. It is expected that the conference would be regular and consistent. The conference time is thought of as "protected time." The supervisory meeting is the structure which allows for the building of the relationship between the participants and for the fulfillment of the appropriate functional roles- as helper and administrator to learner and service provider.

V8 - Students were initially (Time 1) unaware of educational implications involved in postponing a conference - none of them invoked the school and only two reacted in their role as students. Following the project course, (Time 2), there was a marked change - a majority recognized the issue and took on the role of student. At the same time, many people continued to comply with the request while now seven students invoked the school in trying to resolve this issue.

VIGNETTE 8 - SUPERVISORY CONFERENCE

SUMMARY: Field instructor requests postponement of conference to handle separate assignment.

TABLE 10 - SUPERVISORY CONFERENCE

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	8	7	INDIVIDUAL	11	4	NO	13	4
NEGOTIATE	9	3	WORKER	6	2	YES	5	14
INVOKE SCHOOL	0	7	STUDENT	2	13			
TOTAL	17	17	TOTAL	19	19	TOTAL	18	18
	p= .039			p= .002			p= .004	

At Time One the respondents showed their flexibility and compliance to the request in this situation. There appeared to be limited awareness in relation to the dilemma.

For example, one student replied:
"I would accept the fact that in the job things do not always go by the book."

The responses to Time Two demonstrated that the students had incorporated the principles and purposes of

the supervisory process. Concepts such as continuity, and preparation guided their reaction. They were aware of their role as students and their behavior was directed toward enhancing their education.

For example, a typical response then was: "I would ask him to discuss it with me now because of the importance of our weekly conference. I would offer to help with the luncheon on my own time."

VIGNETTE 9 - STRIKE SITUATION

You are asked, as a result of a strike situation at your agency, to do an analysis of the conflictual demands and issues raised by the strike. The agency director also suggests that he views this as a special circumstance and that all agency personnel should be on call in this strike situation.

Vignette #9 addresses the policy of the school in a specific crisis, the strike situation. The student is viewed as the developing professional - the learner, and this process should not be contaminated by labor relation conflicts. The school has devised a strategy for students in the field to contend with this interruption of services, student education and trauma. The policy of the school is to withdraw the student from the agency and set up an academic program for the duration of the strike. The work-study student is confronted with a serious dilemma by his status as employee and the school's policy.

V9 - Initially, (Time 1) students did not see the issue in this strike situation and tended to react as individuals. Very few invoked the school. By the end of the project, (Time 2), a large majority now understood the educational issue and were willing to take on their student role in dealing with it. Note the difficulty this posed for students - seven people did not supply codeable action alternatives.

VIGNETTE 9 - STRIKE SITUATION

SUMMARY: Strike at agency, director expects student to be available for service.

TABLE 11 - STRIKE SITUATION

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	7	0	INDIVIDUAL	10	5	NO	14	2
NEGOTIATE	3	2	WORKER	7	1	YES	5	17
INVOKE SCHOOL	3	11	STUDENT	3	14			
TOTAL	13	13	TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	19	19
	p= .004			p= .013			p= .001	

This situation was a most difficult one for respondents, as it focused attention on their role as workers and co-employees. The students felt isolated and were guided in their behavior by ideology and their agency position.

Thus at time 1:

"I would find out the facts from the strikers, and all parties involved, and decide where my sympathies lay and act accordingly."

VIGNETTE 10 - CONFIDENTIALITY

As part of your workload, you are assigned to work with a "task supervisor" by your field instructor. This task supervisor is out of your "immediate department of service." He asks you to speak to a relative of a client without the client's permission. He suggests that since he is supervising you on this part of your work that you go ahead with it.

Vignette #10 poses a question of dual authority in a complex setting. Students working collaboratively with other professionals and "task supervisor" are confronted with demands and expectations. This dilemma places the student in the midst of an ethical practice situation in relation to service, method, agency obligations and client. This situation raises issues regarding collaboration, communication, authority, agency structure and the student's obligation as worker and student.

V10 - This situation engendered very little changes in students - their initial reaction was to invoke the school which was again repeated on the post-test. People tended to act as either individuals or students on both the pre and post tests. Only half the students saw this to be an issue in their education.

VIGNETTE 10 - CONFIDENTIALITY

SUMMARY: "Task Supervisor" asks student to speak to a client's relatives without client's permission.

TABLE 12 - CONFIDENTIALITY

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	1	1	INDIVIDUAL	8	6	NO	8	6
NEGOTIATE	1	0	WORKER	1	1	YES	10	12
INVOKE SCHOOL	15	16	STUDENT	9	11			
TOTAL	17	17	TOTAL	18	18	TOTAL	19	18
	p= .328			p= .329			p= .288	

The responses in Time One students had a clear view about the issue.

In Time One, a student remarked:

"Whether or not I would go along with it, would depend upon the situation. In some cases not seeking the client's permission would not destroy confidentiality."

In Time Two, most students stated:

"I would consult my field instructor about this request since I feel it is an inappropriate request."

VIGNETTE 11 - STAFF MEETING

The agency has a policy of staff meetings being "closed to students". Upon your return to the agency, your field instructor informs you that this policy will apply to you because of your changed status. You know of the School's preference that students be part of the staff meetings wherever possible.

Vignette #11 calls attention to the change or different status of worker-students as perceived by some agencies. The issue faced by the student is the meaning and purpose of the staff meeting and the learning opportunities inherent in this agency structure. The student's identification, relation to peers and role surface as issues in this situation.

V11 - Students initially (Time 1) reacted to this situation as individuals - only half recognized the educational issue involved. By its nature, this vignette pushes the student to invoke the school since the issue is created by the student status. The post test showed no significant changes in either action or awareness. However, many more people took on the student role following the project course.

VIGNETTE 11 - STAFF MEETINGS

SUMMARY: Upon return to agency, student is told that staff meetings are closed to "students".

TABLE 13 - STAFF MEETINGS

Response to Situation in Terms of Action, Role and Awareness of Issue

ACTION			ROLE			AWARENESS OF ISSUE		
Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2	Response	Time 1	Time 2
COMPLY	1	0	INDIVIDUAL	9	4	NO	9	4
NEGOTIATE	9	6	WORKER	4	2	YES	9	14
INVOKE SCHOOL	10	14	STUDENT	5	12			
TOTAL	20	20	TOTAL	18	18	TOTAL	18	18
	p= .058			p= .021			p= .070	

The respondents in their examples appear to react as employees, and contended with the agency policy. They were surprised and disappointed that their status could be called into question.

Thus, one student said:

"I would explain that my 'changed' status does not make me a 'changed' person in that I would not be able to participate on the same level as before. In fact, I would be even more of an asset. I would encourage the agency to reverse its decision."

By Time Two, they appeared to have taken on a self image which was more congruent with the student role. They were aware of the learning opportunities and the meaning of staff meetings for the client, the worker, the agency, and for them as students. There was recognition that there existed a tripart relationship between agency, student and school.

At Time Two, a student said:

"I cannot perform my function as a staff person or student under those circumstances."

COURSE, INTERVIEWS AND LOGS: BY WEEK

The work-study course met six weeks in the summer. An unstructured interview was held with each student during the course of the six weeks. The purpose of the interview was to gather data about the process the student was engaged in and receive feedback about the meaning of the course to the participants. The students were asked to maintain logs which were also unstructured, on a weekly basis. The intention of the logs was for student recall and the selection of important issues to the student. The purpose of these communications was to provide information from the respective students, their assessment or thinking about the program and to develop a clinical sense regarding the work-study student. The material was to be used impressionistically and there was no structured content analysis intended.

The weekly sessions, interviews, and logs serve as the basis for the following description of process.

FIRST WEEK: The first day of the Block Program was used for orientation to the program, registration, and abbreviate classes. The twenty work-study students were part of the incoming class, and did not know each other. They were directed to meet the following afternoon without an explanation. When they gathered, they were told that the school was interested in them as a work-study group

member. The students were reminded that in the admissions interview to school their status had been discussed, and that this topic would be explored when they arrived at school. They were not mindful however, of the framework of the course or its contents. They were asked to complete the three research instruments. Their request for information in this regard was given an evasive answer.

During that week, each student received a request to meet as a group with the project director. The work-study class met in the late afternoon of the following day. This was the first formal session in the first week of the program.

The project director shared with the group that the school was interested in helping them make the most of their education by discussing experiences from the past that had imposed on the work-study cohort. He also informed them that this previous group of work-study students were in attendance in their second year. The students recognized some potential difficulties. There was discussion about some of the issues which former students had to address. The project director sought, with limited success, to minimize the anxiety in student reactions.

In discussions of the orientation course, the students expressed concern about the meaning of the course

and the perceived threat in the work-study relationship. Some expressed anger as they perceived it would take time away from other studies. On individual did not see an issue.

Using a diagram which the director wrote on the blackboard to show relationship between agency, school, and student, the concept of sanction and roles was discussed. There was some discussion of the demands of role performances by each functional party. The project director distributed a publication on the planning and evaluating of social work education. Following this, a number of students raised questions about a requirement to take a course for which they had not registered. They said that they feared being overwhelmed with the amount of work in other courses. This was acknowledged by the project director.

Interviews were conducted early the following week with students. The focus of the interview was understanding the experience of the interviewee in relation to what had been experienced the previous week. Each student indicated their motivation for coming to graduate school. The students viewed themselves as "successful practitioners", but felt they needed to know more "theory". They saw the school as a repository of theory and knowledge. Although they had been employed as social workers, they did not see themselves as

professionals. There was a drive on their part to "know more".

Other reasons included job security and professional status. The school program afforded them an opportunity to fulfill their educational and practical needs. A number of students indicated their interest in the school because of its concern for the Jewish Community. All students reported that a major attraction was the ability to undertake professional studies while continuing to be employed. Although they recognized their dual status as workers and students and knew that they would discuss this during the summer, they were surprised it would take the form of a course.

The logs indicate anxiety on the part of most participants. This stress was expressed openly. For others there seemed to be a denial of any problem. The ambivilence was in part related to getting started in school which raised anxiety in its own right, and this course only added to what they experienced as a burden. Although there had been awareness that some learning experience regarding work-study would be offered, it was not concrete, operationalized, and an expectation for them to fulfill. There was not as yet an understanding of the meaning of this course to the larger educational process. As a class they were beginning to have an identification as a group. Their designation as work-study students was

imposed from the outside. They did not as yet have a sense of their own collective need.

Typical Log Comments

One student stated the education and the desire that agency and school would help. The logs demonstrated:

> "What do I want? Do I know my real needs? Just how vulnverable am I? I know what I want! I am going to get it. I WILL no matter what - want to fight? I trust you, Wurzweiler and the agency. I know there will be problems, but I want to learn, grown, and change."

Another typical thought was:

> "One fantasy that I had was can I bet the agency to make some allowances for me as a student i.e. releive me of some of my responsibilities on my job so I could concentrate better on fewer cases. I say, however, that it is fantasy inasmuch as essentially I feel that there just isn't anyone else to do my job, and if I don't do it, it won't get done and if it won't get done, I could lose my job."

The anxiety of beginning was evident:

> "I began to feel panic for the first time; I think it was contagious and it had been coming on for a few days. I was becoming aware of all my conflicting responsibilities. It was like a trap door swinging shut and I felt that I was in space with nobody to back me up."

Another student was able to connect to the tri-part relationship of agency, school and self:

> "As we began to discuss the mutual responsibilities and interactions of agency, student and school I began to feel less threatened and certainly more hopeful and confident that whatever risk was involved it was a calculated one, fully conscious and in view of the probable outcome worth it. As I said at the beginning of the session to be fore-warned is to be fore armed."

Another student began to discuss the educational process and affirm the agency:

> "I was interested in your explanation of the role and responsibilities between the student, school, and agency. I had no idea other than superficially how we three were connected. It also makes me feel secure knowing the agency has a responsibility to me, the student, as well as visa versa."

SECOND WEEK

The students came to class cautiously, but with less anxiety. They were aware of the rationale for the class although they were not yet aware of the content. There seemed to be a "wait and see" attitude as well as "show me". The class as a group seemed to move toward greater cohesion and during the week contacts undoubtedly were made with class members in other classes as well as withinthe project cohort.

The project director reviewed the functional obligations and relationships discussed in the Levy material. He also reviewed a Rhombus diagram developed by Ekstein which locates the roles of individuals within an agency setting, and that agency within the larger community. Much discussion by students ensued regarding the role of supervisor. Class members shared their experience in supervision. they shared in a spirited way and were surprised by the variety of experiences and forms supervision took. A distinction was made between supervision and field instruction. The teacher described

the criteria for field instructors which the school requires. Much of the material was tied to the issue oftheir role in becoming a professional social worker, rather than a knowledgeable practitioner. Some degree of anxiety was expressed over the expectation that the student was expected to be an active participant in his own learning, rather than a passive recipient of information. Readings by Kadushin and Rosenblatt were distributed.

The interviews conducted during the second week once again focused upon the motivation of the student in coming to school as well as the meaning of the course process. A number of interviewees complained about the time the class was held. The class was scheduled for late in the day at the completion of their other acadmic work. These students felt that the sessions took away from library time and that they were already tired when they came to the project course. They requested a change in schedule.

A number of interviewees admitted being concerned and fearful of the educational demands made on them by the school. They had little idea about the intense demands in supervision and if the agency could fulfill the expectations. Although successful in their jobs, returning to school created some stress for them. In addition, they made comparisons between themselves as work-study students, and the other students in the Block

Program. Two different lines of thought came out of the interview. Some students were fearful, and others wanted to know why they were not in advance classes.

In development of a group process in the class, some began to show trust while others were more cautious. The interviewees talked about others in the class acknowledging their contribution and experience. At the same time, other interviewees objected to the "complaining" of other class members.

There appeared to be less anxiety in the class and a beginning understanding of the content being presented by the instructor. The content had been selected for functional relevance to the work-study student's situations. The students were beginning to understand the agency as a complex institution.

There was evidence of a beginning trust between class members and the instructor. The students stated that they were not feeling as alone and vulnerable as they had in the first week, and were now able to share more than they had. They were able to admit that there was some unlearning to be done before they might move on.

From the logs there were some typical responses.

One student identified her surprise at the supervisory process:

> "The discussion about supervision was fascinating, since our experiences really ran the gamut. What did become clear is that nobody in the entire group gets supervision in the manner, frequency, etc.

which we will be getting as students."

Another student recognized the purpose of school expectations:

> "Your distinction between "training" and "education", though a small part of the class yesterday, was especially relevent to me - and your comment about "active participation" was understood by me and I do understand the school's position on this."

The agency as a complex institution was observed by one student who wrote:

> "I really hadn't given much thought to the underpinnings of my agency. I began to see that there are infinitely more complications that I had thought, and I realize that I have only been concerned about "my little puddle" as one of the bigger "frogs". I am only one of the little frogs in the "big pond". I had better begin to take seriously the ramifiactions of this situation if I am going to stay afloat as a professional."

THIRD WEEK

The students came to class more willingly than previously. The readings on supervision seemed to have been exciting to them. There was much discussion regarding the student role in supervision as well as the field instructor's competency. There appeared to be much more awareness about the school's expectation of students as active participants in their own learning. The class expressed less anxiety and hostility and there appeared to be more socialization among students. Questions were still self-oriented but more functional to the general group. A number of students admitted openly that they were fearful of looking at themselves in the supervisory

relationship, and these students found support from the class. In discussing supervision, the students were concerned about risk taking and sharing their feelings with their field instructor. They understood and viewed this relationship as educationally important. Yet there was concern as to how this would impact on their job. One individual wondered about the impact of risking given the fact that she was well known in a small community. Although there was acknowledgement that open communication was needed to enrich supervision, there was much trepidation expressed. Some students wanted to know what the school could do in a conflict situation. The role of the faculty advisor was discussed. What was evident was the critical powerful role of the field instructor and the students concern because of their employee status.

The topic of assignments created some friction for some class members. They viewed the change in assignment was impacting on their jobs, and as impossible. They pointed out that they were the only ones competent in some areas of agency service. It was their contention that agency structure mitigated against modifications. For some students, this as not an issue at all. They had discussed this aspect with administration and had been guaranteed some select and modified service experiences. The school took the position that the agency was interested in facilitating the education of the student, and that it was

not the total job which was being changed but only a number of specific learning experiences. The discussion regarding the rational for new and different assignments pointed up the need to facilitate professional learning by expanding new practice demands, generalizing from different populations, and helping the students to examine their own emotional responses. Cognitively, the students understood this but struggled with the functionalrelevance of time and service modifications within their own job. The school alerted the students to the fact that the faculty advisor would also have a role in talking with agency administration about the learning needs. The tripart relationship was made clear to all participants.

In preparation for the next week the students were referred to the manual of the school which had been distributed their first day.

Although there was acknowledgement that problems existed in the duality of employee/school roles, there appeared to be a view that the situation was manageable. There was agreement that the student had to take risks but that the student could have little impact upon the social system. However, there was a sense that the students were basically "alone" in making judgements about their own education, between agency and school. Simultanously there was also a feeling that the student was not powerless and

that the educational process was also under the student's control.

The interviews held that week seemed to involve more sharing of personal material from the interviewees. The students who had discussed their supervision in class explored this more directly in the interview. They wished to know of the nature of school's support of them and intervention in selecting another supervisor if need be. One student was thinking of the possiblity of seeking another placement. Another student discussed his relationship with other members of the group as well as what he felt was an impediment and defect in himself. Much of the interview content was generated in the work-study course; however, some of the issues dealt with other courses on the curriculum.

Students said the knowledge content of the course was reassuring to them and gave them both criteria for assessing the supervisor's performance and guidelines to expectations related to their own performances. A number of students seemed to be having a struggle becoming students in the full sense of the word. Students began to describe the course as helpful and suggested that it be extended to all students. One student was upset that the issues had not been identified earlier for agency and student. He seemed to grasp the purpose of the course.

A number of logs give a flavor of the third week's

course content and student response.

One student recognized the possibility of conflict and the purpose of the project:

> "The bottom line of job versus school is becoming more and more evident. I realize that the purpose of this class is to deal with this problem in order to aviod this conflict."

The following citation appears to demonstrate what was happening to students, the meaning of profession and their self reflection:

> "Right now, I feel that I am centering my energies more fully upon becoming a professional social worker in the full sense of the word. I also feel that I am beginning to let go of "former fragments". I realize that it is my responsibility "to open up" and provide for an ongoing communication system with my field agency supervisor. However, I do feel as if I am in suspended animation. My classmates are already considering the problems presented in relation to their agencies and their present supervisors."

This student's response:

> "Finally, I am increasingly aware of my limited ability to express thoughts as clearly as I would like to in a group. I want to narrow the gap between my "insightfulness" and my ability to express these insights to others in a group situation."

FOURTH WEEK

At the end of the third week, the instructor referred to the manual which each student received on the day of registration. The manual which contains the policies of the school, is also sent to each agency which receives a student placement. For one group of students there was great comfort in having a clear statement of

agency policy to guide their behavior. Another group of students were confronted with issues which upset them. For these students, the policies appeared to be counter to their agency practice, and put them in a direct conflict with what they considered agency expectations, or their own preferred conduct. In addition, some students found the policies restrictive. For example, a specific question was raised regarding policy around the Sabbath. There appeared to be sensitivity to beliefs and expectations of the non-Jewish students in the class, as well as restricting the personal choice of the Jewish students. A heated discussion ensued regarding the meaning of policy, its development, and how in their practice they were implementors of agency policy. Anger which appeared to have been resolved earlier or was quiescent came to the surface, directed at authority in general, and the school specifically. The class was asked to address the nature of discipline imposed by being professional and how authority as worker and as students carried.

Although there was some anger related to policy, the purpose of the work-study project course was becoming clearer to all participants. The students' language demonstrated awareness of the profession and it was evident that the participants were examing the educational process from a stance and orientation of studentship. The

fourth week seemed to be a turning point for all the students.

The manual raised much concern on the part of the students. One might surmise that this topic was reflective in a direct way with the demands made on the students directly by the school during the summer. In relation to the course, two themes seem to emerge. One group of students felt comforted by the idea of rules, procedures, and policy. A second group of students viewed policy as restrictive, limiting, and constraining. The group dynamic issue of a school under Jewish auspices and the composition of the group including non-Jews seemed to play a part in the specific policy selected for discussion. The calendar strike and Sabbath policy of the school was discussed with much emotion. The central issue, however, was focused on the understanding and meaning of policy in giving direction to agency practice and service, and the professional making the distinction between personal responses and agency service. It was difficult to assess the learning which was a result of this experience.

The interviews for the fourth week continued the prior divergence. Two students were attempting to resolve concerns regarding their work-study status. This was a surprise to the project director. It had not been intended that the course for the work-study students would

lead to participants questioning that form and arrangement with agencies. The interview process was not an administrative device, so no endeavor was made to control the student's decision making. Both students, apparently independently, had come to the conclusion that the work-study arrangement might constrain their professional edudation.

The other interviewees forcused upon their own struggles to deal with their agency and fulfilling the school's expectations of them as students. They strongly affirmed their identification with their agencies.

The question of the work-study course content was reviewed. There was a feeling that policy was important in building structure and guiding behavior of students. However, policy was still experienced as constraint. Although there was understanding about the meaning of policy intellectually, there was ambivalence in regard to its setting boundaries and limits. there were some negative observations directed at the school for not sharing the manual earlier. It was pointed out that the manual was part of the registration packet, and that the students who were not familiar with it had not taken the time to read it. One student was delighted with the manual as he felt it gave him direction under varied circumstances. Some connections were made regarding the need for policy.

The logs demonstrate a number of the themes which students were concerned abut the fourth week.

One student's feelings and understanding was evident in the following statement:

> "I am not denying a certain level of control that the school must exercise, but the use of the manual as a contract is imposing. Agency policy I guess, is similar. I don't like imposing my views on others."

Where as another student stated:

> "We talked about school policies such as strikes and students responsibility - working on Shabos, not knowing what I want to do on Friday. I dislike being told what to do and when to do what I should do."

Framing the discussion in conflict terms this student connected the issue to social work education.

> "Today's session, like some of the other classes seemed as a conscious raising instrument re potential conflict between the WSSW policies and agency practices. In other words, think about it, beware, etc., pose the questions since the questions are most important. The solutions will somehow follow."

FIFTH WEEK

There was a continued discussion by the students regarding the manual, but with less affect and more appreciation of policy and policy development. The students continued to discuss the modifications which were possible both in their agency and in the school. What seemed affirmed was the student acceptance of the necessity to assume risks in attempting to change policy in a disciplined manner. The tone of the discussions

suggested that students felt less alone, and were not as fearful to deal with difference, with authority figures. The students seemed more sure themselves as a group.

Process recording was raised and was familiar to the students. Many understood this form from their practice classes. A number of the students had utilized process recording in the past. It was clear, however, that most agencies did not use this form of communication. The students had little difficulty with understanding the need for this type of learning experience. The structure and rational for a process recording was clear. What was not clear, however, was the time which would be needed to write records while carrying other job responsibilities. What was also not clear was the manner in which supervisors would use the written material. There was much concern over the amount of time that recording might take, the number of records, an how this would be connected to the school. For some, they saw a difficulty in committing to paper issues that were troublesom to them, and posed risk for their job.

A theme that surfaced was who would be their faculty advisor. Although this role had been a question in the earlier weeks when the structure of school-agency relationship had been discussed, it was dorment until now. The idea seemed to spring forth as the students were now anticipating returning home to their agency. Familiarity

with school faculty who served in the role of faculty advisor made this discussion an important one to the students. This topic appeared to make the bridge between school and agency demonstrating the thinking of students about their future education and "going home". The project director informed the students that no decisions had been made and that the faculty advisor would be helpful to them in their role as student - employee. He acknowledged that it had been a long summer.

As a group, the class seemed quite supportive of each other, and there appeared to be positive feelings. There was recognition that conflicts would exist in the work-study arrangement, but that both the school and the agency wished to be helpful to the student in their taking on professional education. A group bond seemed to have developed in the class. Students were able to discuss their differences and talk with their classmates and the instructor in a reasonable and responsible manner.

The interviews for the fifth week seemed a recapitulation of the work-study course and the Block Plan in general. Students were at the point of completing papers, and felt that they were close to ending. They felt successful in the completion of their academic responsibilities. They were surprised that they had been able to accomplish as mush as they did in such a short period of time. A number of interviewees revealed that they had been afraid at the beginning of the program, but

were going back to their agencies with a solid grounding in their first summer and with a sense of being a student. Comments were made as to how learning had progressed. One student pointed out that resistance to learning was really engagement; another indicated that there had to be learning to unlearn, in order to be able to learn. The interviewees took the position that the manual was helpful and useful in pointing up the philosophy, policies, and orientation of the school. They had a greater appreciation of their own agencies through the discussion on policy.

A concern for some of the interviewees were process recording. They did not know whether it would be used in the agency although they recognized that it was a tool between field instructor and themselves. Another concern was whether or not it would be seen as part of their job load or as an addition which had to be done at home. Some negotiation was started with the project director in regard to the number of records one would have to submit to the supervisor or send to school. In relation to students returning to the agencies, they followed up in asking about the process of when faculty advisors would be in touch with the agency. In each of the interviews there seemed to be two parts - the specific individual needs of the student as well as a broader understanding of the nature of the course.

Student concerns and observations are evident by the selective logs noted below:

One student commenting on the process wrote:

> "My ambivilent feelings are given way. I felt that this director was being very open. Prior to this session, I felt the precariousness of our situation. This session brought a sense of relief that while our work experience presented problems, the problems could be worked out and dealt with."

In relation to the class-group experience of the project, a student stated:

> "The goal of this course may be summarized as the integration of cognition and feeling for professional (and personal) growth and utilization. I liked your statement: the social worker as therapist is an advocate for health, not for the client."

The educational and social process was summarized by a student who wrote:

> "I feel a stronger bond was established between us (the students and the school). I feel on the whole we have come to understand the "method to their madness" and have undergone a 'socialization process.'"

SIXTH WEEK

Termination was the central theme for the sixth week. Students were anxious over their final papers in other courses and brought to this class a degree of anxiety. In the previous class, material on values by Levy had been distributed to the students. There was some very limited discussion regarding the foundation of values in the social work profession. The focus of attention of

the students did not appear to be directed towards the topic of ethics and values. The class was more interested in reviewing the content of the work-study course. There was a review of the teachers' interaction with the class members and an assessment of the emotional effect expended throughout the six weeks.

There was a review of the content and purpose of the course. Consensus existed as to the importance of such a project. The class members indicated their cursory awareness of the implications of their work-study status. At the conclusion of this project they recognize the complexity of their role. The course was viewed as impactful especially as they would be geographically distant from the school.

The content of the course which most students found significant was the discussions on field instruction, school agency relations, assignments, and their role as student-learner. Although there was recognition of special strains created by their status they appeared to have a sense of control in coping with their education. The students affirmed the concept that they were important in structuring their own education. In regard to the course instructor and his style, comments suggested that he was too "forceful" at the beginning of the course and that this reinforced already existing anxiety. It was evident that a positive relationship developed as the

course and interviews continued. Structurally class members recommended that the course be given during the afternoon break in time. The evenings were viewed as a major constraint, due to fatigue and the limitation of library time.

The last class appeared to bring positive closure to the work-study course. Besides the socialization related to termination, the class members appeared to have moved from initial anger at the school to trust in the school. The work-study student had an awareness of the orientation of the school, and became sensitized to a number of problems which were of concern to the school regarding the work-study arrnagement in the Block Plan. They also had an appreciation of their own institutions and looked forward to blending their roles as worker and student. The students were eager to return home; it had been a long and involved summer for them. There was both an identification with school and agency. The students recommended that this course be made available to all Block students. They vocalized that peer group support was important and helpful especially since they would not see another student till next summer. It appeared that they left with a broader prospective about the profession of social work.

As a group, classmates were supportive and vowed to stay in touch with each other. There was also recognition

of the continuous learning that was needed. The students pledged to stay in touch with the project director and share with him their views of the work-study program during the year.

The class process showed clarity of understanding about the purpose and objectives of the work-study project course. Students seemed to be coming to grips with their own feelings about the course, and had a cognitive awareness of the issues which confronted all work-study students. The expectations of the school had become clear and the students recognized the centrality of their active engagement in the educational process. The class as a group took on a group identity and each student recognized the meaning of the work-study arrangement in relation to his or her own self. The relationship between student and school became more congruent and there was greater respect for the complex relationship. The triangular relationship of student, agency, school was reinforced and the roles recognized as functional. There was a sense of hope for a successful completion of the work-study relationship which would lead to a professional degree.

The following week, the last week of school, the students were scheduled to complete the vignettes and scales. Their response to this event was cooperative.

A class log of one of the class members served as the minutes for the class. This material is included in

the log citations.

> "Class members articulated their responses to this class and the M.S.W. Block Program in general. The problems of the work-study arrangement were threatening. Excitation was necessary to provoke us out of our complacency. Class objectives had become clearer as we moved along. Most class members expressed a positive change of attitudes towards the class in general since the first week. Most members of the class felt that they were better prepared to face the difficulties in the coming year and had a clearer idea of student responsibility. The class also expressed a view that all students in the Block Program should take such a course."

In summary, although student description of change, reported in interviews and logs, seem to indicate extensive shifts in attitudes and ideas, these shifts and changes were not supported by objective measures.

It appeared that students did not markedly move from values held at the beginning of the project, and that feelings about agencies and school did not change significantly.

C. Attitudes Toward the Agency and the School

The Kelley "Attitudes Towards Any Institution" scale was employed to examine possible changes in the work-study students' attitudes toward their agencies and toward the School. The scale was chosen because it measures shifts in attitudes between any two institutions.

This scale was utilized to demonstrate the identification with both institutions and allow for a comparison with each other. Validity and reliability have been guaranteed to make it a useful and accurate instrument for measuring attitudes.

Attitude to the Agency

There was no change in the work-study students' attitudes towards their agencies. Students began with a generally positive attitude which continued over the course. This was expected since these students had generally been employed for two years or more and the focus of the course was to support the agency as an important service provider and as an educational institution. Positive attitudes about the agency were reinforced.

Attitudes to the School

As Table 14 indicated, there was a small but significant positive shift in attitude as the students

began identifying with the School over the course of the six weeks. This was a logical result as the work-study students changed their status from that of solely a lay practitioner to a combination practitioner student as a result of starting the work-study program.

TABLE 14

AVERAGE ATTITUDES TOWARDS AGENCY AND SCHOOL

	Agency	School
Time 1	9.6	9.3
Time 2	9.6	9.7
	t=0.00	t=2.73
	N.S.	p .05

D. Adherence to Social work Attitudes

The revised version of the Meyer's Social Values Test was selected for use with the work-study students. This test was developed by Meyer specifically for social workers. This test assesses ten relatively independent dimensions of social values. The test was administered at the beginning and end of the six-week summer program. The results of the Meyer's test are reported in Tables 15 and 16.

There were generally small differences between time 1 and time 2 on any of the dimensions -- the work-study students went up on four dimensions, down on five dimensions and stayed the same on one. Only one score change showed statistical significance at the .05 percent levels (i.e., the Social Causation vs. Individual Autonomy dimensions had an average decrease of .8 points.) Generally there were no consistent changes in the professed values of the work-study students following their first semester in the Block Plan.

These data confirm the nature of the work-study student as an experienced lay practitioner whose basic social values may not be subject to major change over a relatively short time. These students had already been working for a minimum of two years; half of them had more than five years of experience. They had also shown their commitment to the field of social work by deciding to pursue the MSW degree. Under these circumstances, it is

unlikely that basic values would be changed by the six-week course, and, indeed, no real changes were observed.

Table 15

STUDENT CHANGE ON MEYER SOCIAL VALUES TEST

(MEANS STANDARD DEVIATIONS, DIFFERENCES)

DIMENSION	Time 1		Time 2		Difference
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Public aid vs. private effort	13.45	2.19	13.50	2.24	0.05
Personal freedom vs. societal control	11.85	1.98	12.30	2.18	0.45
Personal goals vs. maintenance of group	11.85	1.81	12.40	1.60	0.55
Social causation individual autonomy	12.35	1.84	11.55	1.96	-0.80
Pluralism vs. homogeneity	13.05	1.96	12.80	1.64	-0.25
Secularism vs. religiosity	12.55	2.31	12.30	1.87	-0.25
Self determinism vs. fatalism	12.20	1.01	12.05	0.83	-0.15
Positive satisfaction vs. struggle-denial	10.80	2.78	10.50	2.44	-0.30
Social protection vs. social retribution	12.05	1.85	12.05	1.91	0.00
Innovation - change vs. traditionalism	10.55	1.47	10.65	1.93	0.10

TABLE 16
STUDENT CHANGE ON MEYER SOCIAL VALUES TEST

DIMENSION	t-Test Value	Sig. Value
Public aid vs. private effort	0.18	N.S.
Personal freedom vs. societal control	1.00	N.S.
Personal goals vs maintenance of group	1.45	N.S.
Social causation vs. individual autonomy	-2.32	.05
Pluralism vs. homogenity	-0.06	N.S.
Secularism vs. religiosity	-0.57	N.S.
Self-determination vs. fatalism	-0.68	N.S.
Positive satisfaction vs. struggle-denial	-0.63	N.S.
Social protection vs. social retribution	0.00	N.S.
Innovation-change vs. traditionalism	0.21	N.S.

Similar findings were reported by Rosenblatt.3 He speculated hat there appears to be a self-selection process of students who are attracted to social work and enter school. It was his view that students had already developed values similar to those held by the profession. This may have been even more pronounced with an older student body as it is represented in the work-study cohort.

1.Jean Quam, Robert Applebaum and Frederick Seidl, "The Non-Traditional Learner: Challanges and Opportunities for Social Work Educators" Center for Research and Development at University of Wisconsin, May - Sept. 1978

2.Ibid

3.Aaron Rosenblatt, Marianne Welter and Sophie Wojciechowski, The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education, (New York Council on Social Work Education 1976) p. 12

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The starting point of this project was a very tangible problem. For about one year, it had been apparent to faculty and staff that the work study student had difficulties making the transition from agency employee to MSW student.

Numerous indications to support these impressions centered around such concrete issues as getting the agency to accept process recording, changing to new job assignments conducive to field instruction, providing ample supervision; etc. There was also evidence to suggest that the work study student had difficulty understanding and accepting his new role as MSW student.

The original conception of the problem was that it was simply a new expression of the old power struggle between agency and school regarding control of the educational process. The assumption made was that the school had a legitimate claim to be in control of the process since it traditionally served as the gate keeper to the profession and offered the formal knowledge and the credentials that certified a professionals competence. In this view, the agency was seen as an important passive ally which provided the raw experience which the school then converted into broad general professional knowledge.

Unfortunately, this point of view obscured the unique situation of the agency employed student and made it difficult to discern how the legitimate claims on the student of both agency and school could be harmonized. This orientation was adversarial and could only lead to an intensification of the conflict.

What helped to set the problem correctly, so that the real issues would become clear, were the overall orientations of role and conflict theory. The work study student was in a unique situation because he had as it were two masters and could be caught and in fact was caught, in the cross fire of conflicting loyalties.

The situation was more complex than that arising from the traditional tension between agency and school. It involved role strain and the professional resolution of conflicts. And since it was school requirements which created the problem, the school had to work out an institutional way to help the student resolve the conflict. Unaided, the work study student tended to take the "easiest" way out, a way that would not necessarily protect his educational interests.

It was observed that the student needed a special orientation course, one that would accomplish the following: a) help students understand the educational requirements of their new role; b) alert them to the way these requirements might bring them into conflict with

agency practices; c) help them to understand the reasons conflicts might emerge; d) help them see why these conflicts must be confronted; e) help them to see the role of the school in facilitating the resolution of these conflicts; f) and to understand that professional conflict resolution would involve meeting the legitimate needs of both the agency and the masters program.

Important also was for them to learn that they were not alone, that they could draw on the school for assistance and had an educational contract with their agency to fall back on.

The course format was chosen because it allowed students in the same situation to communicate to each other their emergent struggles with the issues arising from the employee-student situation. And the course instructor could feed back to the class the various forms the problem of dual roles takes based on the schools experience with this problem.

Findings suggested that after exposure to the six week orientation seminar, the work study student did undergo small but significant changes in the desired direction. The vignette "test" revealed that after the seminar, the students were more likely to use themselves or to involve the school in preserving educational opportunities than they had been before the course, and less likely to act in a conflict situation merely to

accommodate the agency: the mean action level score changed from 2.0 at time 1 to 2.57 at time 2: Vignette responses also showed that following the course, the student was more likely to take action from an understanding of his role as student and less likely to act as a lay practitioner: the before and after means were 1.72 and 2.57 respectively. And after the course, the student appeared to have slightly more appreciation of the educational issues involved in the kind of conflicts he confronted on the test than previously: a change from the earlier mean of 1.4 to the post test mean of 1.74.

There was also a small but important shift in his tendency to identify with the school as an institution while maintaining identification with the agency: a change from 9.3 to 9.7 on the Kelley Attitudes Towards Institutions scale.

The qualitative data captured in the student logs and interviews create the impression that students were deeply affected by the seminar. Many describe with feeling the way discussions about supervision, active learning, and the need to ask to help in supervision and to risk exposure had given them a new understanding of the field instruction process and their role in it.

Initially, they were upset to learn that their dual role made them a little different from other students, in time they expressed a new understanding of the reason for

this and how that understanding enabled them to handle strains and dilemmas that would arise.

Lastly, there are informal observations of an administrative nature that bear on the picture. Over time, staff has the impression that since the seminar has been instituted, there is a greater tendency for work study students to bring potential conflict areas to the attention of their faculty advisor and not attempt to resolve them on their own. Unfortunately, we did not keep a systematic count of the different methods employed by students to resolve conflicts before and after the seminar.

The methodological limitations of this study have to be confronted and explored since they do impose certain cautions on the way the data can be interpreted. There are four areas that have to be addressed: the artificial limits on the length of the orientation seminar, the absence of a control group, the small study sample and the lack of normative data for the vignette test.

Had the instructor been able to design the orientation course with a free hand, his preference would have been for a longer seminar, perhaps one running for 10 or even 15 weeks instead of the 6 week course that was utilized.

Common sense would suggest that given the exploration nature of the project and the fact that there

were no previous studies to guide the present one, it was better to risk giving too much in the way of a orienting seminar than too little. But the very real constraints of a summer block plan, consisting of eight week summer sessions, automatically set the maximum number of weeks available for such a project.

To some extent, it was then a matter of choice whether or not the desired changes could be produced in what after all was a rather arbitrary time constraint. This should be taken into account when considering the findings. Could a longer seminar have produced even more change than this one did? Now that schools do have work study students in their concurrent programs it is possible to test this idea.

Obviously, the existence of a control group would have made it possible to establish the unique contribution of the seminar in producing the desired changes and the amount of change that would take place without any intervention. Unfortunately, the number of work study students in the block plan was small (20) and it would have been unsound to divide this group into even smaller project and control groups.

It remains for future studies to deal with this problem by either combining work study students from several schools or by running the project for several years, both options not feasible at the time this project

was done. To some extent, the informal observations of faculty provide a crude baseline against which to compare the performance of the study sample. It has to be remembered that for one entire year the faculty struggled with this problem without the help of the seminar. Their consensus, which in part gave rise to the project, was that left on their own, work study students would accommodate their agencies at the expense of their learning needs, not inform the school when agencies failed to comply with the learning expectations, either out of lack of awareness or concern for their job. Although the school would ultimately learn about this, by the time it did, valuable time and learning opportunities would have been lost. Unfortunately, complete documentation of this base-line experience does not exist and instead we have to rely on informal impressions of that experience. Nevertheless, the faculty's informal impression was that since the installation of the seminar, they have an active ally in helping them maintain the educational contract with the agency and that strains are resolved while protecting the educational needs of the student.

How representative were the small sample of work study students in our project of the general population of this type of student? To answer this question with any degree of confidence requires either of two procedures not available to the project. The first consists of comparing

our sample with the known characteristics of work study students in general to see if our group was typical. The other procedure consists in estimating the degree of variability of one small sample from another. This is work which should be done in a follow-up study. If the study is replicated on a new small sample, the changes undergone by that sample and its characteristics can be compared with data from the present project. If the findings are roughly similar, it would mean that even small samples yield rather stable findings. The problem then becomes not size of sample in itself but size of sample relevant to variability of the phenomena being studied. The extent of the difference between the two would indicate how large a sample has to be to compensate for this variability.

To some extent, we have done something of the second procedure, but qualitatively and informally. The faculty as a result of its previous years experience with work study students, formulated some generalizations about the situation they were in, the problems they would encounter, the way they would handle those problems unaided, the negative consequences this leads to, and what they required to better handle their role strains. This was all based on the experience with a relatively small group of these students. If then, a small sample of work study students is unstable and highly variable, then those

generalizations based on the first year's experience should have little application to the cohort of students in this study. In other words, the problem of generalizing from the study group to future groups is similar to the problem of generalizing from the first year's group to this group. Our project seems to indicate that the inferences drawn from the first year's cohort applied quite well to the conditions of the present group.

This argument doesn't obviate the need to study larger samples of this group and perhaps even cumulate findings. But it does suggest that the findings are after all based on two years experience; one year that was used to formulated some generalizations and a second year which tested those formulations on a new group and found that they still applied in the main.

Last to be considered here are the limitations of the vignette test. The studies major instrument was developed expressly for this project. Its primary focus was on the way students are prepared to handle potential conflict situations.

As a result of the experience gained in this project, some areas for improvement have become apparent. The evidence from student logs suggests that students in the seminar not only got a better understanding of role strain management, but increased their understanding of supervision in general, field instruction and their

responsibility for active learning. These dimensions ought to be probed by an instrument measuring the full impact of the seminars.

One serious limitation of the instrument as presently constituted is that there are no norms that can help in the interpretation of the findings. How large must a change in scores be to represent a large change? How much change will this instrument identify?

Why does a reading of the students' logs and excerpts from their interviews create the impression that those in the seminar had been deeply affected by the experience, whereas the test scores reflect only small changes?

A close comparison between the themes that appear in the logs and the areas probed by the vignette test provides us with some clues. Such a comparison indicates that the test focused on only a small portion of the material covered in the seminars. The test were primarily interested in the students perception and handling of conflict situations where demands made by the agency were in opposition to the educational needs of the student. This,of course, was the major problem of concern to the project. But the seminar covered not only this area but other factors which impinged on student learning. Some of the themes discussed in class were the role of supervision, the function of agencies, the concept of

active learning, assignments, the need to risk oneself and the fear of exposure. These subjects provided the background and the context which helped students understand the particular demands of their dual role. The logs suggest that the students responded to these larger themes and gained insights about the field learning experience they participated in.

It is, therefore, possible that an instrument that covered a broader area than the one employed might reveal a greater degree of change than found by the present instrument.

At any rate, the student logs appear to be a very rich resource which has yet to be fully exploited. The experience of this project suggests that they may serve as a useful exploratory instrument that provides important insights into the way students respond to various educational experiences.

In conclusion, it appears reasonable to say that in spite of the limitations of this exploratory project, it produced findings which strongly suggest that students who occupy dual statuses are subject to conflicts and roles strains that can interfere with their professional education, especially if they are left to their own devices. An orientation course addressed to the special circumstances of this group can be effective in helping them negotiate conflicts and reduce role strains that can

interfere with their professional education, especially if they are left to their own devices. An orientation course addressed to the special circumstances of this group can be effective in helping them negotiate conflicts and reduce role strains and do so in a way that protects their educational opportunities.

The student logs, faculty observations, the test scores all indicate that the orientation course may work because it raises to consciousness the implications of holding dual roles, it sensitizes and prepares students for the conflicts that are likely to emerge, it explores responsible methods for negotiating conflicts, it provides the concepts necessary to understand the learning process inherent in the field experience, it builds group supports, it reaffirms the learning contract made among student, agency and school and it articulates the schools role in supporting that contract.

When the study was initiated, the faculty believed that it was only the agency-employed student who were in a unique position because of their dual roles and that other students were still of the traditional type. It has now become apparent that the young, recent college graduate with limited work experience who faces his first professional socialization process as an MSW student is fast disappearing. More and more, our students tend to be older, with considerable work experience and exposure to

other occupations and professions. As schools increasingly attract employed professionals, second careerists, and adults who hold membership in more than one profession, the issues this project began to explore will become increasingly important.

It has already been suggested that this project should be replicated on larger samples of work study students and that there should be experimentation with longer orientation seminars and use should be made of instruments and probe the non-conflictual areas covered in the seminars. It would also be fruitful to conduct similar projects with different student groups who also share the problems of dual roles, such groups as army or clergy social workers, second careerists who still carry with them the orientation of their first profession.

But there are wider implications of this study as well. Our experience so far, forces us to consider the value of orientation seminars for all beginning students. Without them, students on their own try to figure out the logic behind the educational program from each course and learning experience that engages them. Does this logic emerge as clearly from this experience as we would hope? Our experience suggests that the material dealing with the more generic aspects of field instruction and supervision seem to give the students the understanding of the process they needed to make the most of these experiences.

Lastly, mention should be made of the practical implications of this project and the impact it had on the school and the block plan. As a result of the project, the orientation seminar was instituted as a standard procedure and attendance in it was made a condition of admission. In the interviewing process with work study student, this was a topic of discussion. Moreover, the school instituted the procedure of setting up a formal learning contract between student, agency and school, explicitly spelling out the kinds of modifications in student assignment required to make it an enriched learning experience. This allowed for a more direct discussion with each agency regarding the specific requirements it needed to provide a suitable environment for field instruction.

The experience of the project established the feasibility of accepting work study students into the block plan if measures such as those described above were taken and led to the establishment of additional procedures to meet the needs of this group. Field instructors were invited to New York to discuss the progress of their work study students and the way in which the educational contract was being fulfilled. The school was able by this means to assist them in resolving any problems that emerged. The faculty itself became sensitized to the needs of this group as well as other

groups of atypical students.

One of the byproducts of this project and the schools' experience in working with this type of student was to make faculty aware of the rich experiences such students bring to the program and the educational process. The experience was, therefore, an enrichment for the faculty as well as the student. And finally, as a result of this project, support was given for the development of a winter program that included work study students.

APPENDIX I

WURZWEILER SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
YESHIVA UNIVERSITY
55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003

Dear:

We are pleased to send you some materials about the nature of our Block Education Program and about our working relationship with the field placement agencies.

The Block Education Program provides a program which is most advantageous for the out-of-town student, and requires enrollment for three summers of academic courses and for two years of field instruction for the Master of Social Work degree. Field instruction begins during September and ends in May, and consists of an assignment in an agency with work in one of the major sequences, as a caseworker, group worker, or as a community social worker, during four days of the week, or 28 hours. The fifth day is an important time for student reading and independent study work which the School assigns.

The student is assigned a faculty advisor by the School, who works closely with the student and with the agency field instructor. The student must receive agency supervision from an experienced worker with an M.S.W. and who has done some supervision.

The field instructor in those agencies near the Metropolitan area, is invited to our supervisor's seminar which meets bi-weekly over the year. The faculty advisor will visit the agency at least twice during the year. Within this close working relationship the nature and type of educational field instruction experience is worked out for the student's development into the profession.

The student should use at least fifty percent of assigned time for direct service. Hopefully, within the remaining time the student will become involved in other agency activities and events, apart from process recording and supervisory sessions. The agency field instructor is responsible for a mid-year and the final student evaluation at the end of the year.

-continued-

The enclosed Manual provides more specific information about requirements, standards, expectations, all of which we can consider more fully as we move into a working relationship.

If you wish to discuss any of these matters, please write or call me at (212) 790-0227.

Sincerely yours,

Samuel M. Goldstein,
Assistant Dean,
Director - Block Education Program

SMG/tc

Enc.

APPENDIX II

WORK-STUDY COURSE OUTLINE

OBJECTIVES

1. To provide orientation for the work-study student.
2. To engage the work-study student in a learning process centered on the nature of the function of field instruction, its relationship to both school and agency, and the role they carry as student.
3. To provide understanding of the learning process both in its generic aspects and its uniqueness for each student.
4. To solidify the work-study student's sense of connectedness to the School.
5. To provide a forum for the sharing of experience with other students.

WEEK NO. 1

Sanctions:

School and agency sanctions - the concept and where sanctions come from.

The hierarchy and connection to community, board, university.

The professional social work eduacational purpose of the school.

The service purpose of the agency.

The purpose of professional graduate education and the student's place in the agency.

The contract between School and agency.

The objective is to inform the students that sanctions are the foundation for the collaborative relationship between agency and School and the tripart relationship in professional social work education.

The learning experiences are an examination of the students' own experience as participants in the agency structure for indications of the relationship between agency and the school of social work. In addition, the learning experience will focus upon an examination of the students' understanding of the legitimating and sanctioning groups for both university and agency. The focus would differentiate their agency as a center of educational opportunities through the student's rendering of service as opposed to a work centered organization.

WEEK NO. 2

Supervision: Field Instruction

The School places a premium on the education supervisory process as primary in importance in all components of the field work experience.

Supervision must have consistency and preparedness by both participants in the supervisory process.

The educational purpose of supervision must be anchored in agency services. The supervisory process must be based on real agency service and have as its primary purpose the opportunity to study from a theoretical

perspective while carrying actual service responsibility.

The responsibility carried by each participant in the supervisory process is unique in its own form content and educational rationale.

The student must be prepared to engage actively, consistently, and regularly in the supervisory process. to this he must bring for supervisory consideration all elements - good and bad - that are relevant to the educational experience. The student does this by developing an agenda, and identification of problems -- also by active participation in the supervisory process.

The supervisor carries over-all responsibility and authority for the administration of the supervisory process and cannot delegate that responsibility to the student or any other party.

There is an acknowledgement that all parties relevant to the supervisory process accept the obligation of communication with each other. This includes student, agency and School.

The learning experiences are directed toward an examination of the student's experience in the supervisory process. Attention is given to understanding the purposes of supervision and the difference between the supervisory process and the field instruction process.

WEEK NO. 3

Assignments:

It is expected that assignments will be derived from the agencies' social work function. The assignments would be developed between the supervisor, student and school and the maximum educational opportunities would dictate the choice of assignments.

The School places a premium on an assignment that is new to the work-study student and allows the elements of time to be a consideration in rendering the service.

There is an expectation that once an assignment has been made, it will continue until its normal conclusion and not change due to agency imperative.

The assignment will offer educational opportunities both specific and general in relationship to agency purpose and overall School curriculum.

The assignment must be relevant to the method of study of the student, group, case and community organization.

The assignment must be timely, allowing for sufficient work and accessibility to clients. There is an expectation as to the quantity of work as the year progresses. There is also a recognition of increased complexity of assignments. Whenever possible, the assignment should be congruent to the unique Jewish aspects of the School curriculum.

The student is expected to participate actively and freely in the process of developing the assignment by sharing thoughts, feelings, or misgivings. The field instructor as educator and representative of both the school and agency has the final authority for the selection of the assignment. The school agency contract is viewed as being between institutions rather than individuals.

The learning experiences will focus on an analysis of the student's own assignment for the purpose of assessing educational potential related to the student's individual situation.

WEEK NO. 4

Policies and Procedures:

All participants in the educational venture must know the purpose of the educational involvement of the student - the purpose of the agency and its services, and the School's educational objectives.

The policies of both agency and School are guides for the conduct of the student in fulfilling service and educational obligations. The student is viewed as a representative of the agency and the School. The student is expected to view himself as a representative of both and to conduct himself accordingly.

The School Manual represents a clear expectation and explication of the educational contract between student,

agency and School. This represents a contract between institutions - expectations and obligations.

As the School's method of education is to teach from the experiential, material generated by the student in the field is available to the School. Similarly, material generated at the School is available to both agency and student.

The participants to the educational venture have a freedom to communicate with each other in relation to the educational process when it is appropriate and functional.

The learning experiences will be an examination of the School Manual which is given to all students upon entrance into the School. Discussions and an analysis of agency policies will focus upon the meaning of policy as collective wisdom over time, rather than individually oriented inclinations.

WEEK NO. 5

Instrumentation:

It is expected that the agency will provide and assist the student to carry out both the agency service and School requirements. The primary vehicle for student education is accessibility to service groups. The primary vehicle for student education is the supervisory relationship. There is a clear expectation that supervisory release time will be made available, and that this will be systematically scheduled to enhance the

educational process.

Process recording is the primary tool of the supervisory process. It is expected that the students will be facilitating, in writing, process recordings and that these records will serve as a basis for the supervisory conference.

Record material will be made available to the School in a disguised form as a safeguard for confidentiality, and for functional use in the classroom.

Opportunities to understand the agency gestalt by attendance at staff meetings and other training opportunities should be included in the educational process. The agency should make known to the student policies and procedures in order to guide the execution of work with clients and members. The agency handbook and manual should be made available to the students.

The learning experience will be an examination and evaluation of the student's staff training experience; staff training materials in current use; and a role playing of an agency staff meeting.

WEEK NO. 6

Values:

To clarify for the student the distinction between professional and personal values.

To identify and provide students with a perspective of the value orientation of social work as a profession.

To assist the student in understanding how values guide the student's intervention.

The student in an agency which is antithetical in its procedures to his personal values, has a right to dissent if he cannot function because of his convictions. Recognition is given that conflicting ideologies should be addressed by all participants actively.

It is expected that the student will recognize the profession of social work is governed by a code of ethics.

The social agency, as part of the welfare structure, is guided by social work values. The student is expected to act ethically in all situations as an agency and School representative.

The student shall not be subjected to violations of his integrity and deprivation of his principles because of educational purposes. There is acknowledgement that the student has a right to question unethical practices wherever they may appear - agency and School.

There is an acknowledgement that the institutional purposes of Jewish life and the nature of professional responsibility may not always be in accord. A distinction between sectarian agency purpose, and consistency with professional ideology is resolved by recognizing that professional responsibility takes precedent.

The learning experience will be an analysis and discussion of the code of ethics of the profession as well as discussion of case examples.

It is recognized that the objectives are not mutually exclusive to each session.

W.S.S.W.

WORK STUDY COURSE

The following materials will be used and distributed in class at appropriate times. The following should be read:

Levy, Charles. "A Framework for Planning and Evaluating Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work Vol. 8, Spring 1872, pp. 40-47.

Levy, Charles. "The Value Base of Social Work" Journal of Education for Social Work. Winter 1973, Vol. 9, pp. 34-42.

Kadushin, Alfred. "Games People Play in Supervision" Mimeographed.

Rosenblatt, Aaron. and Mayer, John. "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Students' Views" Social Work Vol. 20, May 1975, pp. 185-192.

APPENDIX III

Name:

Date:

Please write briefly about the situation you are reading. If you need additional space, please use the back of the sheet.

Previous to your coming to School you employed summary recording and memorandum as communication documents. Upon returning to the agency, your field instructor tells you to record as you always did, in summary form.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

You are in the midst of your field work year when a new executive director is hired. In examining work assignments, he determines that you should terminate what you are doing as he has other agency needs which he wishes to assign you.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

Your agency field instructor, who supported your candidacy for school, tells you that he does not agree with the School's educational emphasis on learning by examining "practice". It is his view that your education would be better served if you read examples of good practice and discussed these with him for the first part of the semester. He also tells you that your assignment should be generic rather than one based on a specific social work method.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

Your field instructor is preparing for your evaluation and he asks you to write you own evaluation. He then informs you he will submit this evaluation in that form under his name.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

An educational calender has been developed by the School to facilitate the rhythm of education and to conform with the School's purposes and policies. As service responsibility develops during the year, your field instructor requests that the agency will need additional coverage during the holiday season. this is so because many clients who are not generally available will be accessible. He suggests that you consider this service obligation.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

As a student worker in a Jewish agency you are carrying responsibility for a client who begins to berate the agency for not being "Jewish enough". He then turns to you and asks about your Jewish backgroun.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

As a student, you have a special attribute (e.g. speak Russian) and have made a unique contribution to the agency so that part of service is dependent upon you. You recognize that there are other services with educational potential in your agency for you. Upon your return from school, the executive director asks you to continue with the service you were involved with exclusively.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

The School has informed you that your process recordings will be used in your practice class when you return to School. Your agency indicates that you cannot use agency material outside of the confines of the physical location of the agency.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

When you appear for your educational supervisory conference, your field instructor declares that you and he have been given the assignment of taking care of the details for a staff board luncheon the following day. He suggests that the consideration of the record that you have have worked on be postponed till next week.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

You are asked, as a result of the strike situation at your agency, to do an analysis of the conflictual demands and issues raised by the strike. The agency director also suggests that he views this as a special circumstance and that all agency personnel should be on call in this strike situation.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

As part of your workload you are assigned to work with a "task supervisor" by your field instructor. This task supervisor is out of your "immediate department of service." He asks you to speak to a relative of a client without the client's permission. He suggests that since he is supervising you on this part of your work that you go ahead with it.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

The agency has a policy of staff meetings being "closed to students." Upon your return to the agency, your field instructor informs you that this policy will apply to you because of your changed status. You know of the School's preference that students be part of the staff meetings wherever possible.

1. How would you respond if you were this student?

2. If you were this student, what do you think are the issues relevant to your social work education?

3. What do you see as the educational opportunities and dangers in this situation?

APPENDIX IV

WURZWEILER SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Number: Agency:

Date: School:

Please not that two copies of the questionnaire are provided for each student. In responding the first time, please respond to the institution to which we are referring as the agency in which you are employed and will be utilizing for your field instruction.

The second time you fill out this form, please respond as if the institution in question is this School of Social Work.

Following is a list of statements about institutions. Please place a + sign before each statement with which you agree. The person in charge will tell you the institution(s) to write in at the head of the colums to the right of the statements.

_____ 1. The world could not exist without this institution.

_____ 2. Is an ideal institution.

_____ 3. Has done more for society than any other institution.

_____ 4. Benefits everybody.

_____ 5. Has more good points than any other institution.

_____ 6. Appeals to man's highest nature.

_____ 7. Develops good character.

_____ 8. Furthers the most satisfaction in life.

_____ 9. Has a long useful life before it.

_____ 10. Is a powerful agency for promoting individual and social efficiencies.

_____ 11. Is of real value to the civilized individual.

_____ 12. Gives real help in meeting economic problems.

_____ 13. Encourages moral improvement.

_____ 14. Is fundamentally sound.

_____ 15. Is retained in the civilized world because of its value to mankind.

_____ 16. Offers opportunity for individual initiative.

_____ 17. Is increasing in its value to society.

_____ 18. Is necessary as a means of controlling society.

_____ 19. Is improving in its service to mankind.

_____ 20. Is in the process of changing and will come out a fit instrument.

_____ 21. Is not sufficiently appreciated by the general public.

_____ 22. Its good and bad points balance each other.

_____ 23. Has not yet proved itself indispensable.

_____ 24. Is too conservative.

_____ 25. Is retained in the civilized world because of sentiment.

_____ 26. Is decreasing in its value to society.

_____ 27. Is too changeable in its policies.

_____ 28. Regulates the individual's life too minutely.

_____ 29. Grew up in frontier days and does not fit our industrial civilization.

_____ 30. Is too radical in its views and actions.

_____ 31. Is unfair to the individual.

_____ 32. Is a tool of the mercenary.

_____ 33. Is disgraced by its past.

_____ 34. Is a tool of the unscrupulous.

_____ 35. Is fundamentally unsound.

_____ 36. Is developing into a racket.

_____ 37. Is out of control of society and is running wild.

_____ 38. Appeals to man's lowest nature.

_____ 39. Is an enemy of the truth.

_____ 40. Has always cheated society.

_____ 41. Thrives on the avarice, greed, jealousy, and hatred in man.

_____ 42. Must be discarded immediately.

_____ 43. Has more bad points than any other institution.

_____ 44. Is the most despicable of institutions.

_____ 45. Is the most hateful of institutions.

APPENDIX V

No._____ Date_____

SOCIAL ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to the questionnaire, only honest differences of opinion. Please indicate with a check for each item the response that comes closest to expressing your feeling about each statement. "Probably disagree" means you disagree more than you agree with the item: "Probably agree" means you agree more than disagree with it. Some items may seem similar; actually, all items are different.

Be sure to answer every item.	Definitely disagree	Probably disagree	Probably agree	Definitely agree
1. The federal government is going too far towards creating a "welfare state"	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. No one ever has a right to commit suicide	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. When a married couple with children is having a serious problem getting along together, their first consideration should be to keep the family together at all costs	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Except when there is a depression anyone in our country can get a job if he really tries	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. It is usually better for people to live	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Everyone should believe in and practice some religion	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. People can actually do very little to change their lives	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Having to struggle for what you can get in life is the best way to develop character	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Definitely disagree	Probably disagree	Probably agree	Definitely agree
8. Having to struggle for what you can get in life is the best way to develop character	____	____	____	____
9. Any able-bodied individual who refuses to take a job should not receive assistance	____	____	____	____
10. We should spend less time trying to find new ways to handle delinquency	____	____	____	____
11. If the government does too many things for the people we may end up a country of weaklings	____	____	____	____
12. Personal freedom includes freedom to do something that is damaging to oneself	____	____	____	____
13. It is more important that families stay together than that individuals within families achieve their own personal goals	____	____	____	____
14. In normal times when people are in need it is generally due to some fault of their own	____	____	____	____
15. Trying to get different people to mix doesn't make much sense	____	____	____	____
16. There should be stricter observance of the Sabbath, the religious day of rest	____	____	____	____
17. Since most things are inevitable, people should relax and enjoy themselves	____	____	____	____

	Definitely disagree	Probably disagree	Probably agree	Definitely agree
18. People who have suffered a great deal are more likely to have a strong character than those who have not	_____	_____	_____	_____
19. People who refuse to help themselves should have to suffer the consequences	_____	_____	_____	_____
20. The solutions our parents found to the problems of living are oftentimes not very workable for today's generation	_____	_____	_____	_____
21. Government should do more than it is presently doing to see that everyone gets adequate medical care	_____	_____	_____	_____
22. Even if we were sure smoking caused lung cancer, a person should be free to decide whether he wants to smoke or not	_____	_____	_____	_____
23. If you have to make a choice, your family should be put ahead of your personal career	_____	_____	_____	_____
24. What people achieve in life is almost entirely a product of their own will and determination	_____	_____	_____	_____
25. People should live among their own kind	_____	_____	_____	_____
26. Science is a good thing even if it challenges such fundamental things as religious practice	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Definitely dis-	Probably dis-	Probably agree	Definitely agree
27. Everybody's fate is really more dependent on others than on what he himself does	____	____	____	____
28. A person is better off if he has to work and sacrifice for what he gets	____	____	____	____
29. Everyone who is in need, no matter the reason, has a right to expect to be helped	____	____	____	____
30. Ways of doing things that have grown over a long time are likely to have much wisdom in them	____	____	____	____
31. Government is a present providing many services that should be left to individual enterprise	____	____	____	____
32. As long as it doesn't hurt anyone else, a person should be allowed to do anything he wants to	____	____	____	____
33. It's almost always wrong to sacrifice the interests of the individual to those of the group	____	____	____	____
34. A person's character is pretty much what he makes it	____	____	____	____
35. It is good for people to associate with those who have interests and values very different from their own	____	____	____	____

	Definitely dis-	Probably dis-	Probably agree	Definitely agree
36. While there are conditions in the world today that may seem unjust, there is probably a divine purpose behind them	_____	_____	_____	_____
37. A person really has very little control over his destiny	_____	_____	_____	_____
38. If things come too easily for people, they won't appreciate them	_____	_____	_____	_____
39. We should try to help people who are in difficulty regardless of whether they are making an effort to help themselves	_____	_____	_____	_____
40. The ways of the past are hardly ever adequate to handle present day problems	_____	_____	_____	_____

Selected typical responses of students which yielded the flavor and perception of each dilemma in Time One and Time Two.

VIGNETTE ONE

TIME ONE	TIME TWO
If necessary, I would make two sets of recordings: process for supervision and summary for the case folder.	Discuss with my field instructor my understanding of the agency obligations towards my Wurzweiler training and remind him of the school's requirement for process recording. If necessary, I would request a three way conference with my instructor and advisor.
I would have no objection to recording in the manner requested.	This would be an inadequate means of communication in my role as student.
I would accept and respect the wishes of the field instructor and the agency. However, if I thought there was a better way, I would feel free to discuss this with my instructor.	I would share with y field instructor the advantages to the agency of process recording, plus remind him of the agency's agreement with the school and the student.
There would be no problem for me.	I would exlain to him my responsibility as a student. He would have to understand that I would be in a triangle relationship - agency/school/worker, and we would have to work out this disagreement.

VIGNETTE TWO

TIME ONE	TIME TWO
I would respond <u>not</u> as a student, but as an agency employee responsible to my supervisor and lay board.	I would point out the nature of the contract that our agency would have with the school. I would add the importance of continuity and the sense of the supervisory responsibility to the school.
It might upset me for the moment, but I would try to look at it with an open mind and think of it as a challenge.	I would refer him to the school advisor, and the manual.
Without too much resentment and a degree of curiosity I would acquiesce and adopt a wait and see attitude.	I would explain why I could not immediately terminate what I am doing. I would describe the phase at which my group presently stands. I would willingly accept the new assignment when the needs of the group had been met (as well as the school's and mine also.)
If I liked what I was doing or I thought I was doing well I would attempt to convince the director to change his mind.	It would depend on what I was doing. If I was doing "good work" I would resist the change. Iwould negotiate the "wisdom" of a new director.

VIGNETTE THREE

TIME ONE	TIME TWO
I do not feel it is his choice to advise me as to what form of education would be most fitting to my needs. I have the right to make that choice.	I would like to discuss the pros and cons of the school's point of view with my field instructor.
I would try to work out a compromise where we could accomplish the work to his satisfaction and the school's.	I would try to explain my feelings towards what I and the school see in regard to field work. If this would not accomplish my desires, I would notify the school and ask for their intervention.
I would explain that examining practice is my preference, but that I would like to read material on good practice at the same time. I would want him to discuss both with me.	I would explain that this is neither my nor the school's philosophy towards my education, that I must be actively engaged and I would contact the school <u>FAST</u>.
Ask if I can't do both or try to convince him of the school's reasonable course of action.	I would disagree and explain that the agency had agreed to the school's educational system by supporting my candidacy.

VIGNETTE FOUR

TIME ONE	TIME TWO
I would ask him if he truly agrees with my evaluation, and if so states so- submitting it by including my name and adding his recommendations.	I would request strongly he reconsider or at least read and respond to my evaluation. I would notify the school of the authorship of the evaluation.
Fine, if I and he had discussed the matter and I had the benefit of his honest evaluation. I might be a better writer than the field instructor. Also, I would be flattered that the field instructor was comfortable in putting his name under something I wrote. All this being said I would be surprised if this happened.	I would propose we each do an evaluation, submit them typewritten and ask the school to decide who wrote each one.
I would tell him that I think it is a good idea to have me evaluate myself, but I would also appreciate if he would include his own evaluation.	I would object. I would suggest that he include his evaluation of me. I would inform him that it was the school's policy that he do the evluation and sign it. I would refer him to the manual and to the school advisor.
I would be angry but might not show it. I would ask the field instructor not to do that.	I would explain to him that I would prefer to have him evaluate me on his own and that doing so would be a great help to me. If he insisted on using my evaluation, I would contact the school, and request advice.

VIGNETTE FIVE

TIME ONE

I would accept as long as they would offer compensatory time for this.

I would try to affect a compromise if possible, but probably in the final analysis would agree to go along with the school (which I am paying for).

I would ask to compensatory time. If not, I would endeavor to compromise or offer other suggestions to compensate.

If I had no previous commitments, I would be glad to be of assistance.

TIME TWO

It would depend upon what holiday. If it is on the eve of the Sabbath, on the Sabbath, or on other Jewish Holy Days, I would respond no.

I would say that though I understood the problem, I could not readjust my schedule since my first responsibility at this time is to the school, myself, and the contract which we originally agreed upon.

I would object, but consider the possibility of offering other available time.

I would discuss the school's policy and remind him of my position as student. If he insisted, I would then turn to the school.

VIGNETTE SIX

TIME ONE

I would attempt to negotiate a compromise as if in fact I had already done in running music therapy groups in my clinic, though my job was in another service.

I would try to convince the agency that my education would not be complete without a variation of experiences. Hopefully, I could perhaps do a bit of both.

I would explain about my personal enrichment is as important as the agencies, and if the original program is so dependent on me can a compromise be worked out.

I would ask for the opportunity to take on additional responsibility to deal with this problem.

TIME TWO

"That's Life." If my service met the requirements of both school and job I would accept this knowing that my education would not end with the acquisition of my M.S.W.

I would review the manual with him and explain my obligation as a student. I would hope to combine my past service with new experiences applicable to field work.

My needs educationally must take priority over those of the agency. It is important for me to have a wide scope of experiences. I would try to explain this to the director and suggest a compromise if I were indespensible to the other aspect of service.

I would accept his decision however, I would pursue the issue of becoming involved in another area. I would involve the school advisor.

VIGNETTE SEVEN

TIME ONE

I would tend to abide by the agency.

This really would be a pity as my agency has so much to offer.

I would go through the recording with the agency to see if some of the less sensitive portions of them could be used.

I would suggest summaries or abstracts be made otherwise this is unresolvable. (Perhaps special waivers or releases could be obtained.)

TIME TWO

I would help the agency understand the triangular relationship of my job as a student.

Again, I would refer the supervisor to the school's manual. The student is instructed to secure agency permission to use the material for this purpose.

I would explain the policy of the school and that the recordings will be disguised to protect the agency.

I would ask the agency to read their manual in which this agreement is stated.

VIGNETTE EIGHT

TIME ONE

I would accept the fact that in the job things do not always go by the book.

I would be flexible and go along.

I would be annoyed but I might very well comply.

I would try to convince him to go on with the conference. Perhaps I could convince him to meet with me on our own time.

TIME TWO

I would point out quietly that I hope we could meet regularly.

I would feel frustrated and disappointed; I would go along at that point (since my help was needed immediately), but would bring this incident up at the next supervisory conference. I appreciate the supervisor's position, but it does not make it right.

I would say that we could probably use the assigned time to accomplish both requirements. That we should begin and set aside "more time" based on the priorities of time and need.

I would ask him to discuss it with me now because of the importance of our weekly conference. I would offer to help with the luncheon on my own time.

VIGNETTE NINE

TIME ONE

If there would be a strike I would participate in it totally - either for or against it.

I would inform him that I have no objection to doing the analysis, but as to being on call I would not cross the picket line.

I would find out the facts from the strikers, and all parties involved, and decide where my sympathies lay and act accordingly.

I would not do anything which would put myself in the role of a scab.

TIME TWO

I would follow the manual of Wurzweiller.

I would contact the school to clarify how to handle this situation and ask the school to intervene.

I would call my advisor and explain the situation. I would be in a bind, but would follow the school policy.

I would contact the school and ask their advice and act on it.

VIGNETTE TEN

TIME ONE

Whether or not I would go along with it would depend upon the situation. In some cases, not seeking the client's permission would not destroy confidentiality.

I would try to discuss this with the field instructor. If I were sure his request was against agency policy, I do not think I would go ahead with it.

I would explain why this was not appropriate, and try to have the task supervisor change his mind on this matter.

I would attempt to discuss this situation in more detail. If I still felt that this was not the correct procedure, I would consult the field instructor.

TIME TWO

I would refuse to do this without discussion of his purposes. I would then go to my field instructor for further clarification.

I would discuss my feeling with him and explain my personal ethics and school policy. If he persisted, I would consult the school.

I would discuss with the task supervisor why I would not do so. If the task supervisor came to my understanding, fine, if not, I would speak to my supervisor.

I would consult my field instructor about this request since I feel it is an inappropriate request.

VIGNETTE ELEVEN

TIME ONE

I guess one should look upon this as a step up and my status would be changed.

I would point out the advantages for my presence at the staff meeting - if possible I would pursue beyond him in a diplomatic way.

I would explain that my "changed" status does not make me a "changed" person in that I would not be able to participate on the same level as before. In fact, I would be even more of an asset. I would encourage the agency to reverse its decision.

I would demand my rights as a representative of the agency to attend in order to fully carry out my workers' responsibility.

TIME TWO

I would refer my suerpvisor to the commitment the agency made to the school.

Try to pursuade them that it is in their best interest as well as mine. I would remind them of their contract agreement with the school.

I would discuss this with the agency and try to explain and emphasize the educational value of my being part of these meetings, school policy, etc. If still no luck, contact the school advisor.

I cannot perform my function as a staff person or student under those circumstances.

The vignettes comments of students in the work - study project demonstrate positive movement from TIME ONE to TIME TWO in relation to action, role perception, and awareness of the issues.

Typical Student Log Responses

Week One

The beginning of the session caused anger, anxiety, and disbelief. My reaction was that the message coming across said "you are all alone with your decision. The agency want service and the school will not support you".

This was unfair and very upsetting. So much thinking, soul searching and arranging had to take place before I applied to Wurzweiler and it appeared that maybe it was not the thing to do. What a let down.

During the second half, what ultimately came through was somewhat more encouraging. The triangular arrangement with school, agency, and student gave hope for support in obtaining an education.

I began to feel panic for the first time; I think it was contagious and it had been coming on for a few days. I was becoming aware of all my conflicting responsibilities. It was like a trap door swinging shut and I felt that I was in space with nobody to back me up. I was not alone because there were others in the same predicament, but equally helpless in the face of agency pressures, and school demands.

As we began to discuss the mutual responsibilities and interactions of agency, student and school I began to feel less threatened and certainly more hopeful and confident that whatever risk was involved it was a calculated one, fully conscious and in view of the probable outcome worth it. As I said at the beginning of the session to be forewarned is to be forearmed.

One fantasy that I had was can I get the agency to make some allowances for me as a student i,.e. relieve me of some of my responsibilities on my job so I could concentrate better on fewer cases. I say however that it is fantasy inasmuch as essentially I feel that there just isn't anyone else to do my job, and if I don't do it, it won't get done and if it won't get done I could lose my job.

I was interested in your explanation of the role and responsibilities between the student, school, and agency. I had no idea other than superficially how we three were connected. It also makes me feel secure knowing the agency has a responsibility to me, the student, as well as visa versa. I think I had a preconceived notion that the agency was doing me a favor.

The specific content that interested me is the question of defining social work as a profession and conceiving of myself as a professional social worker. I do not feel the level of anxiety that some of my classmates seem to be feeling. The most important aspect of our meeting, for me was participating in and observing an interesting group process. I found you as a teacher to have a very distinct style. The group, not being a "class" - no one subject to be graded allows for interaction of a different nature than my other classes at Wurzweiler so far.

Week Two

Again we seem to be back to discussing the role our agencies play in this network of social work program, but a new word popped up this time and it was sanctions. This was related to the university and the agency in their responsibility to society at large as well as to the student in particular. It seems we were to get some understanding of the differences between agencies and institutions with particular reference to those which we as work-study students are involved in.

The discussion about supervision was fascinating, since our experiences really ran the gamut. What did become clear is that nobody in the entire group gets supervision in the manner, frequency, etc. which we will be getting as students. That may not be unusual. In any case, it will be a rough adjustment for some of us and a blessing for others. I hope some of our future discussions open up the issue of the split existence that most of us will be living through i.e. our job responsibilities and accountability, combined with our student responsibilities, and often it's to the same supervisor or boss.

The sessions are really useful since the issues are very real to all of us. It gets us where we live. Our gripes had to do with time and having a sixth course. Perhaps we should meet at lunch time.

My reaction to this session was much more positive. What is coming through is the realization that accountability is requested and expected from the college, agency, supervisors, and the individual student as worker. The fact that both the supervisor and supervisee must come to a conference with an agenda is a point well taken. It is a goal to be achieved.

I really hadn't given much thought to the underpinnings of my agency. I began to see that there are infinitely more complications than I had thought, and I realized that I have only been concerned about "my little puddle" as one of the bigger "frogs". I am only one of the little frogs in the "big pond". I had better begin to take seriously the ramifications of this situation if I am going to stay afloat as a professional.

I was glad to have some criteria for selection of supervisors outlined. Knowing a little about that which is expected from agency, supervisor, and supervisee is helpful. This information helped clarify some confusion I had concerning my own agency. I feel more able to judge the value of my experiences in terms of my present agency and others at which I have worked.

Week Three

The article by Kadushin which dealt with games the student can play brought on a heated discussion. I think he is biased. The supervisor has a great deal of power within his position, and he can be very helpful in creating an educational experience for the student. It is his job to make an assessment of the students needs. What takes place between client and worker is similar to what takes place between supervisor and student. Each brings to the interaction their own individual needs. The school is accountable for the student, the student is responsible to the agency, the supervisor has the task he is to perform. Each has his own task, but the supervisor is the most essential to the educational process. For me, the problem of a worker becoming a student was the real issue raised.

The bottom line of job versus school is becoming more and more evident. I realize that the purpose of this class is to deal with this problem in order to avoid this conflict. I am bothered by the fact that these situations were not discussed with us and our agencies prior to the start of the school. It seems to me that, for better or worse, if some of these problems were confronted before the start of the course, I think this would be a much easier problem to contend with.

I find this class informative, reassuring, and helpful in allowing me to form feelings about my role as student. I agree that we as students have the responsibility to open the lines of communication if and when necessary. I think that the rest of the people in the first year could benefit from this course as I am.

Most of the group today are just now arriving at the point where they can really listen and emotionally acknowledge what you have been saying all along in the class. I feel that today you just restated that which you have already said. I was pleased that by the end of the class most students felt better about this educational process than they did at the beginning.

I could identify with the confusion that several of the students expressed. However, I realize I don't feel that way anymore. The goal of this course may be summarized as the integration of cognition and feeling for professional (and personal) growth and utilization. I liked your statement: the social worker as therapist is an advocate for health, not for the client.

Week Four

Todays session, like some of the other classes seemed as a conscious raising instrument re: potential conflict between the WSSW policies and agency practices. In other words, think about it, beware etc., pose the questions since the questions are most important. The solutions will somehow follow.

What is the process in helping to change policy? How do I begin to think about it? Know the policy, and understand how it came about. Its not cut and dry, its arbitrary based on values. What latitude for deviation and flexibility? Whose choice, and who makes the decision? There is a three way system. The student's responsibility is to communicate. The school and the agency have agreed to work together with the student.

Todays session really clarified for me what to expect from field placement. I am pleased with the schools concern for us. Frankly, I did not see the manual before I signed on the dotted line, and yes, my agency did not know what it was getting into. There were really no surprises, just clarification of procedures.

We talked about school policies such as strikes and students responsibility - working on Shabos, not knowing what I want to do on Friday. I dislike being told what to do and when to do what I should do.

I think we got a constructive concept of what supervision is and how we will be functioning as students in an agency. Since this is in essence "an unlearning" process as far as re-evaluating our expectations is concerned, I really believe all students beginning field work this fall could benefit from these sessions.

My reaction to the two articles on supervision is "right on the mark". Some sounded familiar and others I had not thought of or experienced, but could relate to, and I think I can identify with the "games" and issues on both sides (as a supervisor of students). By the way many of these games are not limited to student supervision alone (although this compounds the problem), but to other

kinds of staff supervision.

Once again the issue of our "risks" as work-study students i.e. the future possibility of having to choose between the paid job and a satisfactory placement. Aside from a major change - agency job structure, the conflict should not arise, but the implication is clear - that it comes down to the students choice.

Week Five

Finally, this seminar has been placed within the process of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work educational orientation; struggle, risk taking, and engagement. The clout of anxiety has lifted. I accept the viable nature and importance of risk taking and involvement. By understanding these forms of action, I can deal with the amorphous risks. "I" feel I can engage these problems in a beneficial manner. The initial, negative resistance in the early stages of the class were not resistance as such, but it was the early stages of honest and sincere struggle.

This was a special session. All of us spoke with sincerity about what was on our minds. Sam helped set the tone by communicating with us clearly, concisely, and softly. Often in other sessions, there was a theatrical quality about the discussions. I feel a stronger bond was established between us (the students and the school). I feel on the whole we have come to understand the "method to their madness" and have undergone a "socialization process".

The last session was the most practical helpful class for me. Aside from the fact that I may not be in the same position next year, the information was absolutely necessary. I do agree that the manual should be shown to perspective students so they know what they are "contracting" for.

My ambivalent feelings are giving way. I felt that Sam was being very open. Prior to this session, I felt the precariousness of our situation. This session brought a sense of relief that while our work experience presented problems, the problems could be worked out and dealt with.

Week Six

In todays session we discussed the philosophical values of the social work profession. You responded to our confusion in a reassuring way. I felt you really welcomed debate and were sincerely interested in helping the students realize their potential through meaningful education. I questioned inconsistencies I feel exist in the schools philosophy in relation to the work-study program. I feel satisfied that you directed your responses to the central theme in my questions.

It seems to me that todays last class has shown attitudinal changes by all the members. We all seem to appreciate the effort put out by the school. The pieces of the puzzle seem to be fitting together now. I am looking forward to my field work year.

I certainly appreciate the support Wurzweiler offers us in our work situations. It was relieving to get a sense of the schools perspective of the student-worker situation. However, I find your socratic method of exploring these issues frustrating. Though I appreciate your obvious concern, and even caring it is hard for me also to feel it is tantalizing. I think we are both experienced, intelligent, and realistic enough - as well as emotionally mature - to move a lot faster and grapple with the issues in a more direct way.

One of the most significant things that came out of the discussion, was the fact that Wurzweiler appears to be willing to back those of us who may be in precarious positions regarding our agency. I certainly feel more secure after hearing the issues which have been raised by students and which have been most disconcerting. In contra-distinction to my early resentment at the seeming irrelevance of this extra session, I was made very aware that it is one of the most vital and important classes we undertook this summer.

Class members articulated their responses to this class and the M.S.W. Block Program in general. The problems of the work-study arrangement were threatening. Excitation was necessary to provoke us out of our complacency. Class objectives had become clearer as we moved along. Most class members expressed a positive change of attitudes towards the class in general since the first week.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Leslie. and Speizman, Milton."The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, 1924-40: Training for Social Work in An Ethnic Community". Journal of Education for Social Work. 19 (Spring 1983): 27-34

Berger, Peter. and Luckmann, Thomas.The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1967.

Biddle, Bruce. and Thomas, Edwin.eds. Role Theory: Concepts in Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Bishop, Julia Ann, "The Agency's Role in Field Supervision of Social Work Students". Journal of Social Work Process. 10 (1957): 27-34.

Bloom, Tybel. "Achieving Professional Identity: A Conception of Social Work Education". Journal of Social Work Process. 22 (1969): 37-51.

Boehm, Werner. "Trends in Higher Education and Future Directions for Education in Social Work". Paper delivered at the annual program meeting of Council on Social Work Education. Atlanta, Georgia, March 12, 1974.

Brieland, Donald. "Historical Overview". Social Work. 22 (September 1977): 342-347.

Brim, Orville. and Wheeler, Stanton. Socialization after Childhood: Two Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Bucher, Rue and Strauss, Anselm. "Professions in Process". American Journal of Sociology. LXVI (1961): 3-5.

Cassidy, Helen. "Meeting the Needs of Work-Experenced Students". Public Welfare. 25 (1967): 29-36.

Chartock, Lewis. How Teen Workers View Their Practice. New York: Florence C. Heller, Jewish Welfare Board Research Center, 1976.

Council on Social Work Education. Manual for Accreditation Standards. New York: 1971.

_____ Handbook of Accreditation Standards and Procedures. New York: 1984.

_____ "Policy Statements on Social Work Practice, Education and Structure and Quality Adopted by the House of Delegates" (March 1976): 5.

Downes, Laura. "Collaboration Between the School and the Agency in Professional Education for Social Work". Journal of Social Work Process. 10 (1957): 27-34.

Flexnor, Abraham. "Is Social Work a Profession?". Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. Chicago, (1915): 576-590.

Frumkin, Michael. "From New York to Miami: Five Years of Progress". Topics. 3 (March 1986): 1-4.

Gilpin, Ruth. Theory and Practice as a Single Reality, An Essay in Social Work Education. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963.

Golden, Irwin. "Utilization of Social Work Manpower in Jewish Community Centers: Alternitive Models". Journal of Jewish Communal Service 47 (1970) 59-70.

Goode, William J. "Community Within a Community: The Professions". American Sociological Review. XXII (1975): 194-200.

Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession". Social Work. 2 (July 1957): 42-65.

Gross, Neal., Mason, Ward. and McEachern, Alexander. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1958.

_____ "Role Conflict and Its Resolution". Biddle, Bruce. and Thomas, Edwin., eds. Role Theory: Concepts in Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966. 287-296.

Guzzetta, Charles. "Concepts and Precepts in Social Work Education". Journal of Education for Social Work. 30 (Fall 1966): 40-47.

_____ "Chi" Field Instructors Conference Presentation. Wurzweiler School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, April 25, 1975.

Haffey, Martha. and Starr, Rose. "A View from the Other Side: An Empirical Study of the Contribution of Agency Participation in Work-Study MSW Degree

Programs". Paper delivered at the annual program meeting of Council on Social Work Education. Washington, D.C., February 1985.

Hollis, Ernest V. and Taylor, Alice L. Social Work Education in the United States. New York: Columbia Press, 1951.

Homans, George. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950.

Horton, Paul. and Hunt, Chester. Sociology New York: McGraw Hill 1976.

Hughes, Everett. "Professions". Daedalus. 92 (Fall 1963): 655-656.

Jenkins, Shirley. "Social Policy Research". Columbia University, 1972.

Judah, Eleanor Hannon. "Acculturation to the Social Work Profession in Baccalaureate Social Work Education". Journal of Education for Social Work. 12 (Fall 1976): 65-71.

Kadushin, Alfred. "Games People Play in Supervision" Social Work 13 (April 1968): 23-32.

Kahn, Alfred. "The Design of Research". Polansky, Norman A., ed. Social Work Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, (1960): 48-73.

Kahn, William. "Jewish Communal Service and the Professional Today and Tomorrow". Journal of Communal Service. 62 (Winter 1985): 111-125.

Kelley, Ida B. "The Construction and Evaluation of a Scale to Measure Attitude Toward Any Institution". Bulletin of Purdue University, XXXV (1934): 13-36.

Kendall, Katherine. Field Instruction, Selected Issues. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959.

Knowles, Malcolm. "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based upon Adult Learning". Journal of Education for Social Work. 8 (Spring 1972): 32-39.

Krause, Elliot. The Sociology of Occupations. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Lauffer, Armand. "The Future of Social Work in the Jewish Community Center: The Case of the Disinclined

Student" Journal of Jewish Communal Service 47 (1970): 45-58.

Levinson, Daniel., Darrow, Charlotte., Klein, Edward., Levinson, Maria. and McKee, Braxton. The Season of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

Levy, Charles. Social Work Education and Practice. New York: Wurzweiler School of Social Work, 1968.

_____ "A Framework for Planning and Evaluating Social Work Education". Journal of Education for Social Work. 8 (Spring 1972): 40-47.

_____ "The Value Base of Social Work". Journal of Education for Social Work. 9 (Winter 1973): 34-42.

_____ "The Art of Social Work Advising". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council on Social Work Education. Boston, Mass., 1967.

Light, Donald, Jr. and Keller, Suzanne. Sociology. 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.

Linzer, Norman. "A Study Report on the Self Image of Student and Professional Social Workers". Wurzweiler School of Social Work, 1974.

Loewenberg, Frank. Time and Quality in Graduate Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972.

Main, Marjorie. "Orientation to the Student Role: The Role of Student in a Professional School". Social Work Education Reporter. 16 (December 1968): 51.

McLeod, Donna L. and Meyer, Henry J. "A Study of the Values of Social Workers". Thomas, Edwin., ed. Behavioral Science for Social Workers. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Meyer, Henry J. "Social Values Test". Revision of the Social Values Test, 1961. University of Michigan, September 1962.

Middleman, Ruth. "Social Work Education: The Myth of the Agency As Partner". The Social Welfare Forum. National Conference on Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973. 196-212.

Miller, Delbert. Handbook of Research Design and Social Research Measurement. New York: Longman, 4th ed., 1983.

_____ "The Effect of Social Work Professionalization on Manpower". Schwartz, Edward E., ed. Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Nooe, Roger. and Green, Ronald. "Total Part-Time Graduate Education: Evaluation of an Experimental Program". Paper delivered at the Annual Program Meeting of Council on Social Work Education. San Diego, California, 1977.

Pachtner, Michael. "The Practitioner Becomes the Student: The Stresses of Transition". The Journal of Continuing Social Work Education. 2 (1985): 21-31

Parsons, Talcott. "The Professions and Social Structure". Social Forces. 19 (1979): 457-467.

Pins, Arnulf. "What Kind of Jewish Communal Worker Do We Need?" Journal of Jewish Communal Service. 42 (1965): 60-72.

_____ "Response to the Block Plan Proposal-A Letter". Wurzweiler School of Social Work (April 1975).

Plutchok, George. "The Part-Time M.S.W. Program: A Way In or a Way Out?" Paper delivered at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education. San Diego, California, 1977.

Polansky, Norman. ed. Social Work Research Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Riley, Matilda. Sociological Research: A Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.

Robboy, Howard., Greenblatt, Sidney. and Clark, Candace. Social Interaction. New York: St. Martin's Press 1979.

Rosenblatt, Aaron., Walter, Marianne. and Wojciechowski, Sophie. The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976.

Rosenblatt, Aaron. and Mayer, John. "Objectionable Supervisory Style: Students' views." Social Work. 20 (May 1975): 185-192.

Rothman, Jack. "Development of a Profession: Field Instruction Correlates". Social Service Review. 51 (1977) 289-310.

Rubin, Allen. and Whitcomb,Robert. Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1977. Council on Social Work Education.

Rubin, Allen. Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1984. Council on Social Work Education.

Sacks, Joel. "The Cognitive Development of a Professional Social Worker - A Piagetion Sketch." Wurzweiler School of Social Work (1977).

_____ "A Process Model". Yeshiva University (1972).

Salmon, Robert. and Walker, Joel. "The One-Year Residency Program: An Alternative Path to the Masters Degree in Social Work". Journal of Education for Social Work. 17 (1981): 21-28.

Scott, W. Richard. "Professionals in Bureaucracies-Areas of Conflict." Professionalization. Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills eds. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1966 265-75.

Schwartz, Edward. ed. Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. New York: National Association of Social Work 1966.

Schwartz, Martin. and Siegal, Florence. "A Case Study of the Establishment of an Off Campus Part-Time Program in Social Work". Paper delivered at the Annual Program Meeting of Council on Social Work Education. San Diego, California 1977.

Shapiro, Judah. "The Current Manpowr Crises in Jewish Communal Services". Journal of Jewish Communal Service 45 (Fall 1968) 38-51.

Shaefor, Bradford. "A Letter" Sent to the National Committee on Part-Time Social Work Education Part-Time Topics 1 (1984).

Smalley, Ruth. Theory for Social Work Practice. New York: Columbia University Press 1967.

Smith College. Catalog School of Social Work 1979.

Starr, Rose. and Haffey, Martha. "Teaching Work-Study Students: Curriculum Delivery and Design Issues" Hunter College School of Social Work 1985.

Strauss, Anselm. "Coaching". Biddle, Brace and Thomas, Edwin. eds. Role Theory: Concepts in Research. New York, John Wiley & Sons; 1966 350-353.

Teicher, Morton. "Keeper of the Flame". Yeshiva University News XIV (Spring 1959) 5-6.

_____ "The Concept of Culture" Social Casework 39 (October 1958) 450-455.

Thomas, Edwin. ed. Behavioral Science for Social Workers. New York: Free Press 1967.

Towle, Charlotte. The Learner in Education for the Professions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1954.

Wessel, Rose. and Faith, Basch Goldie. Professional Education Based in Practice. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work 1953.

Wheeler, Stanton. "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings". Brim, Orville. and Wheeler, Stanton Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays. New York: John Wiley & Sons 1967.

Wurzweiler School of Social Work. A Self Study Report Prepared for the Council on Social Work Education 1959.

_____ A Self Study Report Prepared for the Council on Social Work Education 1979.

_____ Catalog of the School of Social Work 1972-74.

_____ Social Work Search Committee 1974.

_____ The Block Plan Manual 1977.

York, Betty. 'The Off-Campus Alternative for Social Work Education". Paper delivered at the Annual Program Meeting of Council on Social Work Education, San Diego, California 1977.