

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9325084

**Field advising by full and part-time faculty in social work
education**

Conroy, Kathryn, D.S.W.

City University of New York, 1993

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



A

Field Advising by Full and Part Time Faculty
in Social Work Education

by

Kathryn Conroy

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.

1993

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.

4/20/93
Date

Samuel Messman
Chair of Examining Committee

4/20/93
Date

Samuel Messman
Executive Officer

Harold Weissman

Charles Guzzetta

Mildred Mailick
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Three acknowledgments are in order.

First, I want to thank Professor Harold Weissman who acted as Chair of my Committee. No one could have worked harder, been as responsive, or challenged my thinking more.

Second, I want to thank all the members of the Field Work Department at Columbia University School of Social Work. They supported this work in various ways since it began in 1990. I particularly want to thank Dr. Susan Oppenheim.

Third, I want to express my gratitude to Ellen, my partner, and Emma, my daughter. For almost ten years, they have heard me talk about completing my dissertation. For the last two years, they have lived through it. Thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
2. General Issues	3
Dearth of Literature on This Topic	
Titles Used to Identify This Function	
Need for Role Clarity	
Importance of Field Instruction	
Link Between Field and Class	
Models of Field Advising	
Field Advising Roles and Functions	
Field Advising as a Process	
3. Issues About Faculty	30
Who does Field Advising?	
Faculty Involvement in Field Advising	
Tensions of Doing Field Advising for Faculty	
Consequences of Involvement for Faculty	
Issues of Part Time Field Advisors	
4. Issues Regarding Satisfaction	42
General Satisfaction with Field Advising	
Student Satisfaction with Field Advising	

Field Instructor Satisfaction with Field
Advising

5. Current State of Field Advising46
- Overview of Field Advising at Columbia;
 1987 - 1992
- Phone Survey of MSW Programs;
 Current Models
6. Establishing the Baseline52
- Synopsis of Relevant Points in Kahn
 Dissertation of 1981
- Columbia Survey 1991; Rationale and Content
- Student Response
- Field Instructor Response
- Summary
7. Intervention75
- Interventions Made 1991-1992
- Why These Interventions Were Made
8. Measuring the Impact84
- Columbia Survey 1992, Rationale and Content
- Student Response
- Field Instructor Response
- Summary
9. Explanations89
- Focus Groups

10. Conclusion94
 Faculty Field Advising as Case Management

Appendix107

 1. Field Advising: Student Evaluation

 2. Field Instructor Questionnaire

Selected Bibliography112

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Academic Year and Percentage of Students Covered by Part-Time, Adjunct Field Advisors.....	48
2. In the Academic Year 1975-76 Kahn Surveyed.....	53
3. Efforts of the Key Actors in Social Work Education to Integrate Classroom Content with Field Experience as Rated by Students.....	54
4. Student Ratings of Field Instructor, Faculty Field Advisor, Method Teacher as Educator.....	55
5. Student Ratings of Field Instructor, Faculty Field Advisor, Method Teacher as Practitioners.....	55
6. Student Ratings of Faculty Advisors as Practitioners by School Means.....	56
7. Student Ratings of Field, Faculty and Student Influence on Social Work Education.....	56
8. Student Perceptions of the Influence of Key Actors on Social Work Education by School Means.....	57
9. Influence of Key Actors on Setting Expectation For a Field Instructor's Performance As a Student Supervisor.....	60
10. Comparisons by School of Areas Discussed Frequently with Faculty Field Advisor As Identified by Field Instructor Response.....	61
11. Influence on Student Education of Field Instructor, Method Teacher, Field Advisor and Students As Perceived by the Field Instructor Respondents.....	61

12. Comparison by School of Key Actors Judged by Field Instructors as Very Influential on Student Education.....	62
13. Field Instructors' Perceptions of the Degree of Influence of Key Actors on Expectations of Student Performance in the Field.....	63
14. Field Instructors Ratings By School of the Faculty Field Advisor As an Excellent and Above Average Educator, Practitioner and Scholar.....	63
15. Frequency of Meetings Between Field Instructors and Faculty Field Advisors Compared by Schools.....	64
16. Percent of Responding Students and Field Instructors with Full or Part Time Advisors.....	67
17. Percent of Students Having Either Full or Part Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Twelve Variables.....	69
18. Mean Scores of Student Satisfaction on Twelve Variables.....	69
19. Percent of Field Instructors Having Either Full or Part Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Two Variables.....	70
20. Mean Scores of Field Instructor Satisfaction on Two Variables by Full and Part Time Advisors.....	70
21. Mean Scores of Student and Field Instructor Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising by Full and Part Time Advisors.....	71
22. Percent of Responding Students and Field Instructors with Full or Part Time Field Advisors.....	84
23. Percent of Students Having Either Full or Part-Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Twelve Variations.....	85
24. Mean Scores of Student Satisfaction on Twelve Variables.....	85

25. Percent of Field Instructors Having Either Full or Part Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Two Variables.....	86
26. Mean Scores of Field Instructor Satisfaction on Two Variables by Full and Part Time Advisors.....	86
27. Mean Scores for Student and Field Instructor Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising by Full and Part Time Advisors.....	87
28. Mean Scores for Student Satisfaction on Twelve Variables for All Advisors, 1991 and 1992.....	88
29. Mean Scores for Field Instructor Satisfaction on Two Variables for All Advisors, 1991 and 1992.....	88

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The issue of field advising is an important one. In all of social work education it appears to be the role most consistent with the role of being a social worker. Classroom faculty have a clearly defined role. Some provide background material and instruction to prepare the students to place their work with clients and systems in both personal and social perspective. Some teach electives to round out the students' learning in specific areas. And some teach practice, the very methods the students will employ in their day to day contact with clients and organizations. The field instructor is also a teacher. She or he uses the work at hand to reinforce and expand upon what has happened in the classroom. The lessons are learned experientially and through a process. But the Field Advisor is the one charged with making it "work".

It is the Field Advisor who is constantly called upon to make judgments. It is the Field Advisor who assesses the adequacy of an agency and the field instructor. It is the Field Advisor who evaluates the progress of the student, who assures the match between the field instructor's style of teaching and the student's style of learning. It is the responsibility of the Field Advisor to determine how involved

she or he should be and how active, particularly with regard to the student/field instructor relationship.

This study was undertaken because of the enormity of the field advising role and the lack of clarity about it in practice as well as in the literature.

CHAPTER 2
GENERAL ISSUES

Dearth of Information on the Topic of Field Advising

Sentman, writing in 1949, found herself new to the role of Faculty Representative. She noted, that despite the fact "...that a wealth of experience has been gained by schools of social work using various types of field work, the literature in the field of social work training is meager regarding the function of the faculty representative."¹ Not much had changed when Nolan wrote four years later "Little has been written about the role of the faculty member who serves as consultant to students, and to agencies and supervisors offering field work opportunities."² One would think that having identified this gap in the literature social work educators would have rushed to fill it. Alas, they did not.

Writing thirty years later, Rosenblum and Raphael identified the "... dearth of systematic study of the liaison function."³ They postulated that this may have stemmed from the notion of learning by doing, a process appropriate to the apprenticeship era. They also felt that there was an assumption that the liaison role had no truly distinctive features. Their own experience led them to examine the liaison function in depth. As late as 1988,

however, Faria, Brownstein and Smith⁴ noted that many faculty in schools of social work become field liaisons as part of their academic responsibilities but that this role has received very little attention in the literature.

Titles Used to Identify this Function

Schools differ greatly in the titles they use to identify this function. Smith, Faria and Brownstein identified nine: "... field consultant, faculty consultant, educational consultant, faculty advisor, faculty Field Advisor, school practicum instructor, educational liaison, faculty-based educational director, and contact person."⁵

For the purposes of this paper I will refer to this person as the Field Advisor. This person is either a full or part time member of the faculty or a member of the administrative staff, usually the Field Work Department. She or he usually has an academic appointment, often because of this role, although they may have teaching assignments as well.

Writing again in 1991, Brownstein, Smith and Faria noted sixteen different titles to identify this position, although 59 percent of the schools used the designation "liaison".⁶ Some schools used the title "faculty advisor" which denoted academic advising as well as field advising. What was most telling in their remarks was the lack of uniformity about the role and its designation.

Need for Role Clarity

Writing in 1953, Nolan pointed out "A free flow of communication is more likely to be possible between student and consultant if there is adequate interpretation to the student on the part of faculty at the beginning of the year of the role of the consultant. Relationship, of course, can be experienced more dynamically than it can be explained, and the path to the consultant's door should be as free of obstacles as possible."⁷ Certainly a misperception of the role of the Field Advisor would be an obstacle to accessing that person. Role clarity, therefore, is crucial to the functioning of the relationship.

But how clear is the role of Field Advisor? According to Gordon, "A clear definition of the role might help but it is difficult because there are no absolute or generally accepted expectations of the field liaison. All we are sure is that it is a very sensitive role in many ways."⁸ We have, therefore, an extremely sensitive role and a murky definition of it. So how important is a clear definition of the role?

Rosenblum and Raphael point out that when the role is assigned to faculty it will be carried out more effectively if the role is clearly understood. This is probably true of any role with its assigned rights and responsibilities, but they go further. They articulate that this role, Field Advisor, "... deserves the same attention as any other teaching assignment."⁹ Implicit in their statement is that

field advising is teaching and needs to be dealt with as seriously as any other teaching in which the faculty person may be engaged.

In their survey of 88 Masters of Social Work degree granting programs (54 responded), Smith, Faria, and Brownstein determined that the role of Field Advisor was "... more complex and diverse than anticipated. The need for some form of uniform understanding and training of liaisons seems evident."¹⁰ Since Sentman had identified the same need almost forty years earlier¹¹ one wonders at their surprise.

Importance of Field Instruction

In 1976 Gartner looked at the preparation of human service professionals taking into account medicine, law, education and social work. Of social work he wrote, "Unlike our other four fields, social work education is both an American product and of recent origin. And, while issues of the interrelationship of theory and practice are important matters but not central ones in the education of doctors, lawyers, and teachers, they are at the heart of the education of social workers. No subject is more discussed in the literature of social work education and in no other human service area is field work so large a part of the professional's training."¹²

This outsider's view of our profession is important because it puts into perspective what we take so much for

granted: no other human service profession puts as much emphasis on field work as does social work. Brownstein, Smith and Faria: "About one-third of the students' credit hours are generated by the practicum..." and what they go on to say is "... yet the criteria and process by which the practicum gets monitored are not clear."¹³

Finestone¹⁴ assumed that professional field instruction was characterized by: (1) a method of teaching that stressed the learning of generalizations from specific, related experiences; (2) a range of content that reflected the total social work curriculum, not one specific social work method alone; (3) attention not only to the currently known but a preparation for changes in knowledge and practice; and (4) an opportunity to reflect not only on class content but to have material from the field to bring back to class and impact on class curriculum.

Social work education grew out of the work in the field. First came practice, then came instruction. Social work education is a partnership of class and field. Therefore, "A mutual obligation exists between the agency and the school to collaborate in the offering of the practicum... Providing expertise in the appropriate use of liaison activities to facilitate learning, identify problems, and offer consultation to field instructors are services that demonstrate the school's commitment to collaborate with agencies."¹⁵

Link of Class and Field

If field work is important, then the link between the field and the classroom is equally important. Segal and Austin talk about the increase in information and note that "... the evolution of more complex and innovative service delivery systems reveals a growing need to develop an interface between those who generate and teach knowledge and those who utilize theory and knowledge."¹⁶ Implicit in their comment is the bias that knowledge is generated by faculty and only utilized by practitioners. There is no articulation of the practitioners' capacity to generate knowledge and to refine that knowledge which comes from the classroom.

Meyer presents a more balanced picture, saying, "Social work knowledge evolves unevenly - sometimes through research, sometimes through theory development, and sometimes through practice in various stages of articulation."¹⁷ Finestone had presented much the same view of the field and class experiences as "... mutually interacting and supporting."¹⁸ Finestone articulated three ingredients necessary for this interaction to occur: (1) the activity, scholarly reflection, and research by field instructors; (2) the existence of channels of communication from field to class; (3) the interest of faculty in such communication.¹⁹

Brennan went further in positing that the practitioners are in the forefront of theory development by saying that

the university professor may have to catch up to the practicing social worker. Anderson²⁰, a year later, expanded on this, putting the responsibility on practicing social workers to "... increasingly analyze their programs and services and hopefully contribute in a more significant way to the curriculum content of social work education." It was the Field Advisor who was seen as the bridge between university and field in theory development.

Fortune²¹, citing Rosenblatt and Mayer's study, noted that students were generally unconcerned with the Field Advisor. Concerned or not, Fortune felt the field advising role was important for the agency and crucial for the integration of field and class. But is the field advising role the only way to integrate field and class, town and gown as it were?

Tropman²² articulated six activities which, in addition to agencies acting as field work sites for students, would foster field and class interrelationship: (1) faculty use of the agency as a research site; (2) faculty interaction with agency staff in writing professional articles; (3) the agency as a source of ideas for articles; (4) the agency as a location for faculty on sabbatical; (5) the agency as a source for information about and reaction to the curriculum; (6) the agency as a source for teacher recruitment.²³

Much of the social work literature points to the ongoing relationship of class and field. Some of the literature emphasizes the classroom contribution to the

field, some emphasizes the field contribution to the classroom, and a few articles articulate their true interdependence. Some of the literature on field advising puts this responsibility for integration on the Advisor.²³ But as Tropman points out, there are other ways to integrate field and class.

Models of Field Advising

The literature on field advising addresses models that are more or less active. Therefore, it seemed conceptually sound to pick those articles of the last forty years that addressed a model and to position the models on a continuum from Most Active to Least Active and see if there has been a trend in the profession's thinking about this role.

Least Active	Field Advisor Activity					Most Active
	Nolan 1953	Bogo & Vayda 1987	Gordon 1982	Garrett 1954	Danbury 1986	
1972 Latimer	1972 Yelaja	1975 Henry	1976 Arkava & Brennan	1987 Raphael & Rosenblum	1949 Sentman	

What can be seen from this continuum is that there has been no consensus on the development of thought on the issue of the level of Field Advisor activity. A chronological review of the models will show them skipping back and forth on the continuum rather than evincing a trend

in one direction or the other in an orderly, developmental progression.

Sentman²⁴ offers the most active model: The Field Advisor visits the agency field work site on a monthly basis to meet with the student and the supervisor. The student sends the Field Advisor a monthly letter which includes: (1) a concise description of cases, (2) a description of his or her social work activities in the community, (3) a description of selected developments in the field work experience that the student wishes to share, and (4) brief comments on the professional literature the student has read for at least four hours each week. (Comments must include why the article or book was chosen and how it was of value in a particular case or other aspect of social work practice.) The Field Advisor also holds monthly group meetings with the students placed in the same city and a meeting each semester with the supervisors at each agency to discuss the field work policies of the school and to explore more effective ways of working together.

Four years later Nolan²⁵ jumped to the other end of the continuum. Nolan stated that not all students will make use of a Field Advisor but one should be made available to each student whether they use that person or not. The activity of the Field Advisor, rather than determined by school policy, would be determined by the student who may or may not access the person and the activity.

At about the same time, Garrett²⁶ proposed a very active model of field advising. Garrett called this person the Faculty Supervisor who worked with both the student and the Agency Supervisor. The fact that Garrett called this person a supervisor, as opposed to advisor, gives an indication of the level of activity expected and the power with which this person was vested. Garrett's major concern was that of the "... integrating touch of a teaching member of the social work school faculty who maintains in broad perspective a close relationship with the details of each student's progress."

Latimer²⁷ took the most extreme opposing position. Latimer posited field advising as a residual activity, essential to certain situations but not central to all. Latimer went on to postulate that if field advising were necessary in a majority of situations then there might be something wrong in the rest of the educational system. Latimer felt the emphasis should be on making the educational experience better for all students rather than simply strengthening arrangements for advising for some students.

In the same year, Yelaja²⁸ took what could arguably be described as the middle position. (Unfortunately, Yelaja does not occupy the middle of the continuum pictured above because so many theorists cluster on the more active side.) Yelaja said that there is no single pattern of field advising in social work education and that the differences

could stem from the size of the school, the timing of the practicum, the various educational responsibilities of the faculty, and the values and assumptions about advising's place in professional education. Having stated the obvious and the practical, Yelaja did not make a case for a consistent pattern from school to school.

Henry²⁹ described Teaching Centers, a model with which a number of schools were experimenting at the time (1975). Teaching Centers were clusters of agencies, organized by type of work, type of population served, geography, etc., with one Coordinator from the school. Henry describes the Coordinator as being very active with all field instructors and all Field Advisors, meeting regularly with them to discuss student progress, additional student learning opportunities, teaching goals in the field and problems that field instructors may have in teaching.

Arkava and Brennan³⁰ advocated a Competency-Based Curriculum. Since the model was based on smaller groups of students working together with a larger number and variety of learning experiences, and an emphasis on self-direction, an individualized, consistent system of field advising was required.

Gordon³¹ moved slightly to the left of Arkava and Brennan six years later. Gordon thought that field advising is required to sufficiently monitor that the school's requirements are being met. Gordon saw field advising as necessary to evaluate the use of the field work site and the

field work instructor. While Gordon described the Field Advisor's duties as collegial there was a strong emphasis on the evaluative part of the role.

Danbury³² wrote of the "tutor" model of field advising as it is used in Great Britain. This is the closest model to the work of Sentman. Danbury's model is active, with the student being seen individually and in a seminar group at the school. The Field Advisor also visits the agency twice each semester and before the student is even placed there if the agency and/or field instructor is unknown to the Advisor.

Bogo and Vayda³³ employ a less active model. In this writing the responsibility is put on the student or the field instructor to approach the Field Advisor. If there is a problem with the evaluation, if a student has a problem, if the field instructor is concerned over a student who may fail, then the active involvement of the Field Advisor should be enlisted. Interestingly, in their section on the "exceptionally good student" the Field Advisor is never mentioned and therefore is assumed to have no role.

Raphael and Rosenblum³⁴ move back toward the most active side of the continuum. They propose a type of liaison activity that includes four visits, each with an articulated purpose, two each semester. They outline the highlights of each visit as it mirrors a component of the academic calendar and the expected professional development of the student. They do, however, note that they are

offering only one way to structure field Advising activities. Any school must design its own structure taking into account its calendar and faculty resources. Their bottom line is that, whatever the structure, the "... activity be supported by clear field performance objectives and a well-defined but flexible curriculum that takes the field input into account."

At the same place on the continuum (but not listed in the diagram), and also in 1987, Davidson and Livingston³⁵ proposed an active model of field advising rather than a residual model. They look to the Advisor to pro-actively work out educational plans with both first and second year students and not simply rely on problem-solving after the fact.

One thing should be clear from this forty year retrospective on field advising: there has not been a logical, consistent, consensual development of thought on the issue of field advising. As new factors arise, the models may become more diverse, thus expanding the existing continuum. The economy, the development of new forms of agency practice, the place of social work education in the university, and the development of the profession itself, have had, and will have, an impact on all aspects of the training of social workers.

Field Advising Roles and Functions

The literature on field advising emphasizes the various roles a Field Advisor fills and the functions inherent in the position. Instead, a synopsis of the various descriptions of role and function will be given, followed by an analysis indicating where there is consensus.

Sentman³⁶ presented an extremely active field advising role. Sentman describes the essence of the role as focusing "... on co-ordinating for the individual student the knowledge gained in the classroom and in the field." Nolan elaborates on this, stating that it is of the "utmost importance" that at least one member of the faculty know the student as a total person, know not just the student's class and field work, but know how the student thinks, feels, and produces in working toward professional goals. Nolan³⁷ sees the Field Advisor as both counselor and teacher. Garrett³⁸ sees the Field Advisor as caseworker - teacher - faculty supervisor in a very active model of advising. Again, the emphasis is on coordination and guidance. Emphasized is the Advisor's responsibility to note student progress at each step and carefully plan for the next.

Finestone³⁹ sees the main Advisor responsibility as fostering the exchange between field and class. Finestone notes that social work knowledge is constantly developing both in the class and in the field so that ongoing exchange is very important. Finestone also notes the turnover in teaching faculty and supervisors in the field, particularly

the latter, and sees continuity as an Advisor responsibility.

Gruwell⁴⁰ defines the main Advisor function as observer. Gruwell, interested in evaluation, notes that systems and instruments are being, and will be, developed for evaluation purposes, but that nothing takes the place of human observation and judgment.

Yelaja⁴¹ sees the system of faculty advising as the means by which theory and practice are fused. The Advisor functions as a teacher, friend, philosopher and guide for the student and this relationship is itself central to learning, particularly in the understanding of the "use of self". Yelaja sees the rationale for student advising in the very nature of social work education itself particularly where it is helpful to the student when strains emerge. It is worth quoting Yelaja at length: "In the foregoing discussion of student advising it is possible to conceptualize the following roles of the faculty advisor: Faculty advising as a medium of relationship between the student, the school and the profession; advising as mediation of conflict between the student and his total learning experience; faculty advisor as client advocate in defending students concerned with dehumanization of clients; faculty advisor as a friend, philosopher and guide; and faculty advisor as a protector of students' rights and freedom. One of the significant issues arising out of these

role configurations is that there is a conceivably built-in tension or conflict between these various roles."

In writing about student evaluation in the field, a source of concern and often tension for field instructors, Gitterman and Gitterman⁴² highlight the role of the Field Advisor. The Advisor, with final responsibility for the evaluation and the grade, and as the school liaison to the agency, is in a unique position to be helpful to the field instructor in this task.

Bogo⁴³ sees an instructional role for the Field Advisor with the field instructors. Field Advisors ran bimonthly groups with new field instructors for whom they also acted as the individual Field Advisor. (These groups appear to have been equivalent to the Seminar in Field Instruction, SIFI, given in many schools for first time field instructors. The major difference was that the instructor of the seminar/ group also acted as the Field Advisor for the group members' students.) In addition to the group meetings, the Field Advisors could be approached for individual consultation by either field instructors or students.

Wilson⁴⁴ catalogued the tasks of field advising: meets with student to review progress; visits placement whether there is a problem or not; keeps field instructor informed of school happenings; helps field instructor work with student to integrate class and field; problem-solves when communication breaks down between student and field

instructor; keeps Director of Field Work informed about the agency; reviews the grade recommended by the instructor. Like Sentman, Wilson has a strong emphasis on coordination. Unlike the other authors on the subject, Wilson presents the material in a "handbook" fashion and delineates the tasks of everyone involved in field work.

Gordon⁴⁵ sees the Field Advisor as the most continuous link between the school and the field; again an emphasis on the coordination role. But Gordon goes further. Gordon posits with the Advisor the responsibility to make the practicum "work" as long as it has been determined that the site satisfactorily meets the field work criteria. (This harkens back to Yelaja's emphasis on the use of relationship in field advising.) Gordon also emphasizes the need for the Field Advisor to meet with the agency executive; the executive should be kept informed by the Advisor and have the opportunity to give the Advisor feedback from the executive's position. In the literature, the first time the importance of meeting with the executive was highlighted was by Berkowitz.⁴⁶ The need seems to have reasserted itself fourteen years later. It is curious that in the meantime Wilson left this task off her otherwise very comprehensive list.⁴⁷

Rosenblum and Raphael⁴⁸ describe the Field Advisor role as "... building, maintaining, and traversing an imaginary bridge between..." the school of social work and the agency in which the student is placed. They cite Wilson and

highlight three of the tasks: (1) facilitating field teaching, learning and integration; (2) monitoring educational opportunities, student progress, and interchange between school and field; and (3) evaluating field instructor efforts and student achievement. They assert that looking at these tasks, the complexity of the role becomes apparent.

Fortune⁴⁹ described the role of the Field Advisor as that of facilitator, monitor, and evaluator. In addition, Fortune asserts that it is the Field Advisor's responsibility to maintain a sense of morale or reward for the agency's service to the school so that the site will continue to take students for the practicum.

As a result of their study of students, field instructors and Field Advisors, Smith, Faria and Brownstein⁵⁰ identified Field Advisor roles and functions as follows. Roles: Advisor, Monitor, Consultant, Teacher, Mediator and Advocate; Functions: Practicum Placement, Linkage, Evaluation and Administration. A core group of these roles and functions were common to all of the 54 schools in their survey. Of most importance to them was the linkage function which ensures that the practicum is an educational endeavor and not simply an apprenticeship. In the same discussion on linkage, however, they mention a function not often articulated in the literature: Gatekeeper. They see the Advisor as responsible to the public and the profession for the development and

accreditation of the students.⁵¹ It may be that in other discussions of field advising the role of Gatekeeper was implied or understood, but, it was clearly spelled out and enunciated here.

Davidson and Livingston⁵² see relationships as the essence of the Advisor's work. The Advisor focuses on the relationship between the student and the field instructor and should there be a problem in this relationship it is in the context of the student's relationship with the Advisor that it gets worked out. The primary goal of the Advisor is to get the student and the field instructor working together well, or working together toward a resolution. Tasks of the Advisor include: taking initiative in establishing expectations; making clear the role of the Advisor to both student and field instructor; and evaluation through monitoring and discussion.

Raphael and Rosenblum⁵³ see the Field Advisor's activity as the demonstration of the school's commitment to collaborate with the agency. They see the Advisor as promoting linkage, facilitating field teaching and learning, and as maintaining standards.

Urbanowski and Dwyer⁵⁴ highlight many of the Wilson tasks: meetings with student and field instructor, visits to the agency, communication with Director of Field Work. In particular they spell out the steps of the visit. They lay with the school the responsibility of bringing together the agency and the school and cite an increased need for active,

invested Advisors because the vast majority of student supervision is done by agency field instructors, not by faculty-based instructors. And finally, they point out that the responsibilities of the Field Advisor, no matter how often or in what detail they are spelled out, may not be clear to either the student or the field instructor until there is a problem or a crisis.

Koerin, Harrigan and Reeves⁵⁵ advance a very active role for the Advisor. They emphasize an individualized approach to advising which assumes most of the tasks identified by Wilson, but, also incorporate helping students clarify their long term personal and professional goals. Koerin et. al. talk about "advising out" of the profession those who are unsuitable or unable to make the commitment necessary. In describing this process they also label the Field Advisor as a "gatekeeper" to the profession.

Brownstein, Smith and Faria⁵⁶ in their 1991 chapter in Field Education in Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends reiterated the ten Advisor roles and tasks articulated in Smith, Faria and Brownstein, 1986. They added, however, that the Field Advisors surveyed most commonly cited the functions of linkage, monitoring and mediating. Interestingly, in their survey of field instructors, they cited the tasks of the Field Advisor as linkage, mediating and monitoring, in that order.

Field Advising as a Process

The last section could leave the impression that a list of roles and functions is all that is needed to explain the work of a Field Advisor. This is not true. It is not the separate tasks that are important, but the way they come together in a process. Rosenblum and Raphael point out that the field instructor is the primary educator of the student in the field. Therefore, the activities of the Field Advisor should be directed to that person and not directly at the students.⁵⁷ This implies a relationship of trust and respect between the instructor and Advisor which can only be established with time, experience and the perceived expertise of each.

Rosenblum and Raphael go on to point out that when a problem emerges, most often with student performance or the relationship between student and instructor, the Field Advisor is pressured to solve the problem, to provide immediate answers.⁵⁸ The system works best, they assert, when the Advisor resists this pressure and holds out for a process that includes all the participants and takes into account all the factors needed for resolution. The "quick fix" cannot take the place of the intense work needed for long range educational goals although it may be easier for the Advisor at the time. In essence, the role of Field Advisor is a background position.⁵⁹ The Advisor must not have an overly close relationship with either student or instructor but maintain an independent stance with the sole

interest being the educational process. As Rosenblum and Raphael point out, this can make the role of a Field Advisor a lonely one.

Livingston, Davidson and Marshack see the Field Advisor as fostering reciprocity between the student and the field instructor.⁶⁰ They highlight the use of three-way meetings to: (1) foster respect for the perspectives of both the student and the field instructor; (2) review student progress and (3) help the instructor in adapting teaching methodology. Kissman and Tran noted in their research the positive relationship between student satisfaction with field work and the autonomy they experienced in the practicum.⁶¹ One implication of this finding is that Field Advisors should use a process of advising that enhances individual student autonomy.

Most of social work practice is based on process. It should not be a surprise that the underlying role of the Field Advisor is to use a process with the student, and the field instructor, as a method for teaching. It can be in modeling this use of process that the field instructor teaches and the student is able to learn.

CHAPTER 2

1. L. Sentman, "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative in Field Work," Social Service Review, 23:3 (1949): 337
2. L.G. Nolan, "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student," Social Casework, 34 (1953): 156
3. A. Rosenblum and F. Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," Journal of Education for Social Work, 19:1 (1983): 69
4. G. Faria, C. Brownstein and H. Smith, "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role," Journal of Social Work Education, 2 (Spring/Summer 1988): 135
5. H. Smith, G. Faria and C. Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," Journal of Social Work Education, 22:3 (1986): 73
6. C. Brownstein, H. Smith and G. Faria, "The Field Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," in Field Education in Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends eds. D. Schneck, B. Grossman and U. Glassman, (Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co. Debuque, Iowa, 1991): 239
7. Nolan, "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student," 157
8. M.S. Gordon, "Responsibilities of the School, Maintenance of the Field Program," in Quality Field Instruction, eds. Shaefer and Jenkins, (New York, Longman, 1982): 118
9. A. Rosenblum and F. Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," 72
10. Smith, Faria and Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," 68
11. L. Sentman, "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative in Field Work," 337
12. A. Gartner, The Preparation of Human Service Professionals, (New York, Human Sciences Press, 1976): 123

13. Brownstein, Smith and Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," 247

14. S. Finestone, "Selected Features of Professional Field Instruction," Journal of Education for Social Work, 3:2 (1967): 14

15. Rosenblum and Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," 163

16. B. Segal and M.J. Austin, "Innovations in Field Instruction: Community College and Teaching and Staff Development," Journal of Education for Social Work, 10:1 (1974): 77

17. C. Meyer, "Integrating Practice Demands in Social Work Education," Social Casework, 49 (1968): 481

18. Finestone, "Selected Features of Professional Field Instruction," 15

19. W.C. Brennan, "The Practitioner as Theoretician," Journal of Education for Social Work, 9:2 (1973): 11

20. D. Anderson, "Practice and Education: A Commentary," Social Work, 19:6 (1974): 651

21. A.E. Fortune et. al., "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," Journal of Social Work Education, 21:3 (1985): 103

22. E.J. Tropman, "Agency Constraints Affecting Links Between Practice and Education," Journal of Education for Social Work, 13:1 (1977): 8

23. Finestone, "Selected Features of Professional Field Instruction," 15 & 24; Brennan, "The Practitioner as Theoretician," 11; Anderson, "Practice and Education: A Commentary," 651; J. Cohen, "Selected Constraints in the Relationship Between Social Work Education and Practice," Journal of Education for Social Work, 13:1 (1977): 6

24. Sentman, "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative," 337-39

25. Nolan, "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student," 158

26. A. Garrett, "Learning Through Supervision," Smith College Studies in Social Work, 24:2 (1954): 6

27. E. Latimer, "Comments on Dr. Yelaja's Paper on Student Advising," Journal of Education for Social Work, 8:1 (1972): 71-72

28. S. Yelaja, "Student Advising in Social Work Education," Journal of Education for Social Work, 8:1, (1972): 64
29. C.S.G. Henry, "An Examination of Fieldwork Models at Adelphi University School of Social Work," Journal of Education for Social Work, 11:3, (1975): 64-65
30. M.L. Arkava and E.C. Brennan, eds. Competency-Based Education for Social Work: Evaluation and Curriculum Issues, (New York, Council on Social Work Education, 1976): 37
31. Gordon, "Responsibilities of the School, Maintenance of the Field Program," 118
32. H. Danbury, Teaching Practical Social Work: A Guide for Supervisors (Great Britain, Gower Pub. Co., 1986): 20-22
33. M. Bogo and E. Vayda, The Practice of Field Instruction in Social Work: Theory and Process, (Toronto, Buffalo, University of Toronto Press, 1974): 75,76,78,108
34. F. Raphael and A. Rosenblum, "An Operational Guide to the Faculty Field Liaison Role," Social Casework, 68:3 (1987): 158-162
35. K. Davidson and D. Livingston, "A Relationship Model of Faculty Field Advising," Arete, 12:2, (1987): 46
36. Sentman, "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative in Field Work," 338
37. Nolan, "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student," 158
38. Garrett, "Learning Through Supervision," 7-9
39. Finestone, "Selected Features of Professional Field Instruction," 18
40. M.L. Gruwell, "Development of Tools for Education Research" in Field Learning & Teaching; Explorations in Graduate Social Work Education, (New York, Council on Social Work Education, 1968): 92
41. Yelaja, "Student Advising in Social Work Education," 65-70
42. A. Gitterman and N.P. Gitterman, "Social Work Student Evaluation: Format and Method," Journal of Education for Social Work, 15 (1979): 104

43. M. Bogo, "An Educationally Focused Faculty/Field Liaison Program for First-Time Field Instructors," Journal of Education for Social Work, 17:3 (1981): 64
44. S. Wilson, Field Instruction: Techniques for Supervision, (New York, The Free Press, 1981): 13-15
45. Gordon, "Responsibilities of the School, Maintenance of the Field Program," 118, 121
46. S.J. Berkowitz, "Agency-School Communications and Relationships: Redefinition of Agency-School Partnership," Social Work Education Reporter, 16:4, (1968): 60
47. Wilson, Field Instruction: Techniques for Supervision, 13-15
48. Rosenblum and Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison" 69
49. Fortune, "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement" 93-94
50. Smith, Faria and Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," 73-74,76
51. Ibid., 68
52. Davidson and Livingston, "A Relationship Model of Faculty Field Advising," 46-47
53. Raphael and Rosenblum, "An Operational Guide to the Faculty Field Liaison Role," 156-163
54. M. Urbanowski and M.M. Dwyer, Learning Through Field Instruction: A Guide for Teachers and Students, (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Family Service America, 1988): 121, 124-130
55. B.B. Koerin, M.P. Harrigan and J.W. Reeves, "Facilitating the Transition from Student to Social Worker: Challenges of the Younger Student," Journal of Social Work Education, 5:2 (1990): 202
56. Brownstein, Smith and Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, the Field, the Faculty," 241-242
57. Rosenblum and Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," 69
58. Ibid., 71
59. Ibid., 72

60. D. Livingston, K. Davidson and E.F. Marshack, "Education for Autonomous Practice: A Challenge for Field Instructors," Journal of Independent Social Work, 4:1 (1989): 80

61. K. Kissman and T.V. Tran, "Perceived Quality of Field Placement Education Among Graduate Social Work Students," Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 5:2, (1990): 30

CHAPTER THREE
ISSUES REGARDING FACULTY

Who Does Field Advising

Smith, Faria and Brownstein¹ asked the question "Who does the Field Advising?" in their survey of 54 graduate schools of social work. The answer was:

- . a few schools expected all faculty to do it
- . one school had no faculty do it; it was all done by field work staff
- . three schools had it done by the practicum director
- . four schools had it all done by practice teachers
- . thirteen schools assigned field advising to non-MSW's as well as MSW faculty.

In Brownstein, Smith and Faria², using data from the same survey, they pointed out the difficulty they had in categorizing the criteria on which decisions were based as to who did field advising. They felt that the assignment of faculty to the task was done without clear guidelines and somewhat arbitrarily. Of those who did do it, they found³ "An overwhelming number, ninety-eight percent, possessed the MSW degree. Only nine percent had a doctorate degree, with no MSW. Eight percent were doctoral students. Most were full-time, eighty-eight percent, forty-eight percent were tenured faculty, and thirty percent were not on a tenure line. Two of the programs represented in this data do have separate field faculty which explains the high number, almost a third of the faculty liaison, who are not on a

tenure line. This might prove a fruitful area for further research. Is there any difference in the work performed by liaisons who are not educators? Is this a trend in the profession, and, if so, is it a welcome trend?"

Faculty Involved in Field Advising

In her 1953 work, Nolan articulated that certain members of the teaching staff were assigned as Field Advisors to have continuing contact between themselves and the agency supervisor and themselves and the student. This role was necessary to "... insure a cohesive and progressive training experience."⁴ Sheafer and Jenkins in 1981 noted the investment necessary by both education and practice if field work is to be successful. They point out the considerable cost to the school in faculty time if the role is done substantively.⁵ The implicit assumption over the thirty years was that the Field Advisor function was a faculty responsibility.

Hamilton and Else later raise the question about who among faculty does the advising. "Decisions about the allocation of responsibility for field instruction have significant implications for the status of field education within the curriculum. If it is delegated to faculty specifically hired for that purpose, it tends to have a lower status in the curriculum. The faculty members responsible for field education often occupy lower academic ranks and sometimes even hold adjunct, non-tenure-track positions. In these

cases, the message is clear that field education is not considered as central and as critical a part of the curriculum as classroom teaching. In contrast, when senior faculty have responsibility for field, or when the functions are shared among all or a major portion of the faculty, the message conveyed is the importance of this curriculum component."⁶

Hamilton and Else argue that status is not the only thing at stake if the field advising functions are assigned only to certain faculty. They hypothesize that the integration of class and field, the foundation of social work education, is compromised.⁷

Rosenblum and Raphael⁸, writing in the same year, identified the need for the Field Advisor to be actively involved in, and knowledgeable about, all facets of the educational program. They, as virtually all other writers on field advising, are assuming that it is done by full-time faculty. Later, as Raphael and Rosenblum⁹, they reiterate their concern that the Field Advisor be knowledgeable about the whole curriculum, and the field work program, and community agencies, and current social work practice.

Smith, Faria and Brownstein¹⁰ in their survey of 54 MSW programs found the model school met seven of the following eight criteria:

1. The majority of faculty had field advising assignments.
2. Faculty were not excused from field advising because of other assignments.
3. Training was provided for new Field Advisors.
4. All Field Advisors had MSW degrees.

5. The school maintained a list of Advisor responsibilities.
6. The work of the Field Advisor was evaluated.
7. Field advising duties were taken into account for pay increases.
8. Field advising duties were taken into account for tenure.

As stated, the model school met seven of the eight criteria. One school met all eight, thirteen schools met seven, eight schools met six, sixteen schools met five, and sixteen schools met four or less. Overall, thirty-eight schools met four or more criteria and were thus rated by Smith et. al. as taking the field advising role seriously. In fact, in citing Hamilton and Else¹¹, Smith et. al. suggest that the measure of the importance of the field advising role is the extent to which it is shared among all or a majority of the faculty, their first criteria.¹²

Urbanowski and Dwyer¹³ reinforce the importance of faculty doing field advising for additional reasons. They see it as an important way for faculty to keep connected to the practicum and adjust their teaching accordingly and to keep them in touch with the realities of the students' experience.

Tensions of Doing Field Advising for Faculty

Scott Briar in an Editorial in Social Work asked why faculty submitted more manuscripts per capita to the Journal than did practitioners. He answered his own question simply. Faculty are expected to do research and publish, practitioners are not. One could add that faculty are

rewarded for doing so and practitioners are not. This may be a more complex issue than it appears, but the fact is that faculty NEED to write and get published.¹⁴

Cohen looked at the same phenomena. Cohen said that practitioners are constantly involved in theory development and testing just in order to help their daily clients. But, if there is a conflict between writing and serving the client, i.e. because of time constraints, it is writing and research that gets dropped - and clients get served. Not so in educational institutions where "... teaching itself must yield to the demands of research."¹⁵ Cohen goes on to lament the time it therefore takes to incorporate practice changes into the curriculum.¹⁶

There is not room here to do a history of the development of social work education. Suffice it to say that the training of social workers began in practice and moved later to colleges and universities. This location of social work education in an academic institution automatically causes tension. A brilliant practitioner who is capable of practicing and teaching social work may not be tenurable in a university system. Euster wrote that social work faculty themselves identified increased research and publications as ways to enhance their image in academia¹⁷, their low image and status in the university being cause for concern. There is, at this date, no debate about taking social work education out of the schools.

Frumkin, in the same year, wrote about the tension this creates between the social work school and the agencies. If faculty overemphasize practice they risk legitimacy in the eyes of the university; if they overemphasize research and teaching they risk losing the respect of the agencies. And further, an overemphasis in either direction, at least currently, could call into question their accreditation.¹⁸ The biggest potential casualty of this dilemma, of course, is field work.

Brownstein articulated the tension of a professional school in the larger university community similarly: if social work educators define themselves as practitioners they will not be viewed as credible in the university; if they define themselves as academics they will not address the practice needs of the profession. Her research noted that social work faculty were not balancing their dual roles very well. In fact, faculty were choosing one role or the other.¹⁹ An interesting note in the research is that "Those with Master's degrees as their terminal degree considered teaching the most important function in their role as educator. Those with both Ph.D's and M.S.W.'s or, D.S.W.'s, considered research and scholarship most important."²⁰

Meyer portrays the tension aptly. "... the demands that the faculty member publish his or her research in order to be promoted and tenured, has resulted in a different reward system. Practice interests, and even teaching of practice is receiving less priority attention in the present

school cultures. The model is fast becoming an academic rather than a professional one, where the pressure is to build rather than to apply knowledge."²¹

Consequences for Faculty in Being Involved in Field Advising

Given the tensions described, an important question is: Is field advising valued by the school? In their survey, Brownstein, Smith and Faria looked to see if Field Advisors felt rewarded or valued. Overall, the answer was "no". Field Advisors reported "... feeling more appreciated by their agencies and students than by their schools."²² Faculty in field advising roles reported feeling caught in a system that wanted them to be very involved in the activity, but rewarded research and publications.²³ On a scale of one to ten, with one being the most important, faculty who carried field advising duties were asked to rate their various responsibilities. They ranked their teaching as 1.32, their scholarship as 2.40, and their field advising as 3.91.²⁴ Urbanowski and Dwyer noted that field advising as a "... faculty function is not effective unless it is valued by school administrators and viewed by faculty as being as important as other teaching assignments."²⁵

Davidson and Livingston argue that if most Field Advisors are part-time or junior faculty then agencies and students may perceive field work as less important than the rest of the program. They posit that senior faculty participation in field advising is "crucial".²⁶

Issue of Part Time Field Advisors

Given the tensions inherent in using full-time faculty for field advising, why not use part-time, adjunct faculty? Frumkin, in an article looking at exchange theory and the interdependence of agencies and schools of social work raises the issue of consistency. Students flow into the agency, staff and faculty turn over, and what is the consistency in boundary-spanning positions?²⁷ The most visible boundary spanning position is that of the Field Advisor. One would have to explore the consistency of part-time adjunct personnel in field advising roles as opposed to the consistency of full-time faculty in such a position. This study has not been done. In fact, the issues of part-time adjuncts as Field Advisors have hardly been addressed.

Strong feeling, however, abounds. "... if most advisors are part-time or junior faculty, agencies and students may conclude that the field practicum is less significant to the educational program than is classroom learning."²⁸ Institutional support for part-time Field Advisors is seen as essential by Davidson and Livingston, because adjuncts "... usually have limited involvement in curriculum planning, few connections to full-time faculty or administration, and restricted accessibility to students."²⁹

Lest full-time staff, not faculty, be perceived as the answer, Urbanowski and Dwyer argue that a full-time Field Advisor, not tied to classroom or university, becomes too

specialized a role and risks being marginalized and separate.³⁰

And Gordon may have had the most interesting insight of all. Gordon indicates that one of the most important attributes of the Field Advisor is availability. Gordon talks about the frustration of a field instructor trying to reach a Field Advisor.³¹ Maybe in the field practicum, other major concerns like the link of curriculum to field aside, the most important issue is availability to both student and field instructor, whether the position is part-time or full-time faculty!

CHAPTER 3

1. H. Smith, G. Faria and C. Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," Journal of Social Work Education, 22:3 (1986): 72
2. C. Brownstein, H. Smith and G. Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," in Field Education In Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends, eds. D. Schneck, B. Grossman, and U. Glassman, (Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 1991): 239
3. Ibid., 245
4. L. G. Nolan, "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student," Social Casework, 34 (1953): 156
5. B. W. Shaefer and L. E. Jenkins, "Issues That Affect the Development of a Field Instruction Curriculum," Journal of Education for Social Work, 17:1 (1981): 20
6. N. Hamilton and J. Else, Designing Field Education: Philosophy, Structure and Process, (Charles Thomas Pub., Springfield, Ill., 1983): 50-51
7. Ibid., 51
8. A. Rosenblum and F. Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," Journal of Education for Social Work, 19:1 (1983): 70
9. F. Raphael and A. Rosenblum, "An Operational Guide to the Faculty Field Liaison Role," Social Casework, 68:3 (1987): 162
10. Smith, Faria and Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," 75-76
11. Hamilton and Else, Designing Field Education: Philosophy, Structure and Process, 51
12. Smith, Faria and Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," 77
13. M. Urbanowski and M. M. Dwyer, Learning Through Field Instruction: A Guide for Teachers and Students, (Family Service America, Milwaukee, WI., 1988): 122
14. S. Briar, Editorial, Social Work, 18:6, (1973): 2

15. J. Cohen, "Selected Constraints in the Relationship Between Social Work Education and Practice," Journal of Education for Social Work, 13:1 (1977): 6

16. Ibid., 6

17. G. L. Euster, "The Prestige of Social Work Educators in the University," Journal of Social Work Education, 16:3, (1980): 13

18. M. L. Frumkin, "Social Work Education and the Professional Curriculum Fallacy: A Practical Guide to Field-School Relations," Journal of Education for Social Work, 16:2, (1980): 94

19. C. Brownstein, "The Social Work Educator: Social Worker or Professor?," Social Service Review, 59:3, (1985): 502

20. Ibid., 500

21. C. H. Meyer, "Practice in Context: The Maturing of a Profession," Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 3:1, (1989): 155

22. Brownstein, Smith, and Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," 245

23. Ibid., 246

24. Ibid., 243

25. Urbanowski and Dwyer, Learning Through Field Instruction: A Guide for Teachers and Students, 131

26. Davidson and Livingston, "A Relationship Model of Faculty Field Advising," 51

27. Frumkin, "Social Work Education and the Professional Curriculum Fallacy: A Practical Guide to Field-School Relations," 97

28. Davidson and Livingston, "A Relationship Model of Faculty Field Advising," 51

29. Ibid., 51

30. Urbanowski and Dwyer, Learning Through Field Instruction: A Guide for Teachers and Students, 122

31. M. S. Gordon, "Responsibilities of the School, Maintenance of the Field Program," in Quality Field Instruction, eds. B. W. Shaefer and L. E. Jenkins (Longman, New York, 1982): 121-122

CHAPTER 4

ISSUES REGARDING SATISFACTION

General Satisfaction with Field Advising

Rosenblatt and Mayer looked at a sample of fifty students who were having problems with their supervisors. Despite the fact that the Field Advisor role includes problem solving student-field instructor issues, and includes determining whether a placement and an instructor will be used again, only one-third of the students made use of the Advisor.¹ They were asked the question "Why not?" The answer was straightforward. Students were afraid that the Advisor might side with the field instructor, could interpret their behavior clinically, might be friends with the field instructor, and that news of their complaint might get back to the field instructor and adversely effect their evaluation.²

Faria, Brownstein and Smith cite that there are few studies of how the Field Advisor role is seen by field instructors or students, but that the few that exist see the role indifferently or negatively.³

Student Satisfaction with Field Advising

Yelaja wrote on the student use of Field Advising. Hedging bets, the thesis was that some students would

greatly use it, seeking out their Advisor on every aspect of their social work education; some would use it only if a problem arose; and some would not use it at all.⁴

Rosenblatt and Mayer point out from their study that, for the most part, students only sought out their Field Advisors when they thought there was a crisis; not a problem, but a crisis.⁵ Interestingly, although only one-third of the fifty students who had a problem sought out their Advisor, they were very satisfied with the outcome. Rosenblatt and Mayer point out that it might be important to facilitate this communication.⁶

Fortune et. al. surveyed 101 students at a southern university on various aspects of their field work experience. It is worth noting the findings on field advising here:⁷

On a seven point scale (7 = very satisfied):		Mean
1. Contact with Field Advisor has been satisfactory to meet learning needs:		4.10
2. I am comfortable contacting my Field Advisor about problems at my placement:		4.01
3. When I have problems in my placement I go to my Field Advisor:		3.05
4. I am aware of the possible roles of my Field Advisor:		4.68
5. Communication between the school and my agency is adequate:		3.99

The issue of Field Advising and school-agency communication consisted of five items on the survey. These included the items receiving the lower ratings.⁸ "On the

open-ended question, complaints about the liaison were the single largest category of negative factors in the field experience."⁹ Despite this fact, it had little bearing on students' overall satisfaction with their placements.

Field Instructor Satisfaction with Field Advising

Faria, Brownstein and Smith found in their study (eight Masters programs, sixty-four field instructors) that Field Advisors were viewed in a fairly positive light. The perceptions of the Field Advisor's role, however, were quite diverse. They indicate a need for some role clarity and further exploration as to the use field instructors make of Field Advisors and the level at which Field Advisors function.¹⁰

Brownstein, Smith and Faria, writing later on the same survey, note that field instructors described the role of the Field Advisor "... most often, 58% of the time, as that of linkage, followed by mediator at 38%, and monitor at 36%. All other dimensions of the role were far behind."¹¹

CHAPTER 4

1. A. Rosenblatt and J. E. Mayer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views," Social Work, 20:3, (1975): 187
2. Ibid., 187
3. G. Faria, C. Brownstein and H. Smith, "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role," Journal of Social Work Education, 2, (Spring/Summer, 1988): 136
4. S. Yelaja, "Student Advising in Social Work Education," Journal of Education for Social Work, 8:1 (1972): 67
5. Rosenblatt and Mayer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views," 187
6. Ibid., 188
7. A. E. Fortune et. al., "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," Journal of Social Work Education, 21:3 (1985): 95
8. Ibid., 96
9. Ibid., 103
10. Faria, Brownstein and Smith, "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role," 144
11. C. Brownstein, H. Smith and G. Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," in Field Education In Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends, eds. D. Schneck, B. Grossman, and U. Glassman, (Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 1991): 241

CHAPTER 5

CURRENT STATE OF FIELD ADVISING

Overview of Field Advising at Columbia; 1987 - 1992

The description of field advising at Columbia University School of Social Work has not changed substantively over the last five years. The description of this activity is contained in the Field Work Manual. According to Sidney Berengarten, former Director of Field Work at Columbia (discussion on August 25, 1992) there has been a Field Work Department and Manual at Columbia since 1927. A review of the Field Work Manuals in use over the last several years revealed that the roles and tasks of a Field Advisor at the school are defined in only a page and a half. Functions are spelled out as: (1) assists in meeting the educational objectives set for the students' field work experience; (2) ensures that the relationship of the student, field instructor and agency is progressing constructively; (3) helps identify educational resources and teaching content in the field; and (4) facilitates the integration of field and class learning. (Columbia University School of Social Work, Field Work Manuals, 1991 pp.6&7, 1992 pp.5&6)

The individual tasks number seventeen:

- (1) visits agency;
- (2) plans for student work assignments and integration into the agency;

- (3) informs the agency of curriculum changes and school issues that might affect the placement;
- (4) identifies issues in the agencies that have an impact on teaching;
- (5) monitors student assignments;
- (6) has individual and/or group meetings with students;
- (7) grades the student at the end of each semester;
- (8) reads student's process, logs, etc.
- (9) assesses the progress of learning;
- (10) offers student and field instructor any ideas about issues or problems in learning process;
- (11) reads the student evaluation and may discuss it with student;
- (12) acts as mediator between student and field instructor should problems occur;
- (13) consults with Director of Field Work or the Committee on Students should the student need a change of placement;
- (14) talks with Educational Coordinator at the end of the year to review the placement;
- (15) recommends, or not, the placement for use the next year;
- (16) works with first year students to begin planning second year placement;
- (17) provides information on first year students to be sent to their second year placements.

The roles and tasks for Field Advisors, as defined in the Field Work Manual, have remained very constant over the years and were absolutely constant over the two years of this study. Of more interest is the "who" of Field Advising rather than the "what" of Field Advising. Who has done Field Advising? "Who" in this discussion refers to full-time faculty or part-time/adjunct faculty, hired specifically to do field advising. The following, constructed from Field Work Department records, is helpful in looking at this.

TABLE 1
Academic Year and Percentage of Students Covered
by Part-Time, Adjunct, Field Advisors

Year	% students covered by Adjuncts
1986-87	17%
1987-88	19%
1988-89	25%
1989-90	30%
1990-91	50%
1991-92	65%

There can be little doubt that there has been a significant increase in the use of part-time Field Advisors since 1986 at the Columbia University School of Social Work. The question is: what, if anything, does this mean?

Survey of MSW Program Field Advising

The following MSW Programs were surveyed by phone from September 1991 to August 1992 regarding their field advising model. The schools were selected on the basis of their size and regional representation.

Arkansas:

University of Arkansas

California:

University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Southern California

Illinois:

University of Chicago

Louisiana:

Tulane University

Maryland:

University of Maryland

Massachusetts:

Boston University

Michigan:
University of Michigan

Minnesota:
University of Minnesota

North Carolina:
University of North Carolina

Ohio:
Case Western

Pennsylvania:
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh

Tennessee:
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Texas:
University of Texas

Washington:
University of Washington, Seattle

Wisconsin:
University of Wisconsin

The questions asked included:

What is the label for this function, such as Advisor or Liaison?

Who does the field advising? Is it done by full-time faculty, full-time staff, part-time faculty or staff or a mix?

What are the mechanics of field advising at your school? Do Advisors meet with students individually or in groups or both? Are first and second year students advised differently?

What is the content of the advising? Does the advisor monitor the placements and/or the student progress? Does the advisor problem solve or evaluate either the placement or the field instructor for use the next year?

Who assigns the grade, the field instructor or the Field Advisor?

What training do the Field Advisors receive?

What kind of compensation do Field Advisors receive?

This survey was done simply to see where the Columbia model of full and part-time faculty as Field Advisors fit in with the picture in the rest of the country. It was already known that of the New York metropolitan area schools of social work, four were in the same position as Columbia: Fordham, Adelphi, New York University, Hunter. Each used a mix of full and part-time Advisors although the ratio varied from school to school. Only one New York metropolitan area school used a different model. The Wurtzweiler School of Social Work of Yeshiva University has the field work students advised by their practice teacher. It is important to note, however, that one-third of their practice teachers are adjuncts, not full-time faculty.

The result of the survey germane to this study is the personnel engaged in field advising. In the eighteen schools surveyed, Field Advising was done by:

Only full-time tenure track faculty:	5 schools
Only tenure track or clinical professors:	1 school
Only full-time Field Work Department staff:	4 schools
Only by part-time adjuncts	1 school
Mix of full-time faculty, part-time adjuncts, field work staff and field faculty:	7 schools

One-third of the schools had field advising done by only full-time faculty, in contrast to none in New York City.

It was clear in our phone conversations that the personnel involved in field advising was undergoing a change, planned or not. In some cases, like the experience at Columbia, the shift from mostly full-time to the use of some part-time field advisors was unplanned. In some cases the move was actually being made in the other direction. Here are some of the more telling comments:

University of Washington: "Full-time faculty did advising until this year. Starting in 1992 all field advising will be done by the Field Work Department. Faculty did the job poorly and the agencies complained."

Case Western Reserve: "We used to have faculty do it but they were too consumed with their research projects and other functions so that field advising got short changed - no follow through."

University of Tennessee: "We had some advising done by part-timers because of faculty vacancies, but this year all of it will be done by full-time faculty."

Nowhere in our discussions did anyone say that they evaluated the use of different personnel in the role of field advising and planned accordingly. The number of part-time faculty being used, however, should make such an evaluation interesting, if not necessary.

CHAPTER 6
ESTABLISHING THE BASELINE

Kahn Dissertation 1981

In 1981 Sandra Kahn did a dissertation at Columbia University School of Social Work entitled "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Social Work Schools and Field Placement Agencies in Their Joint Task of Educating Social Workers". In this study, Kahn looked at six schools of social work in 1975-76 in the metropolitan area; Columbia, Wurzweiler, Adelphi, Fordham, New York University and Hunter. Quantitative material in the document that related to field advising has been extracted to see if a picture of field advising at Columbia that predates this one can be established. Kahn presents results in the form of "all" schools where there is not a significant difference among them. Kahn breaks out the individual material when there are significant differences. In other words, aggregate material is as true for Columbia on those dimensions as Columbia-specific material is on others.

TABLE 2

In the academic year 1975-76 Kahn surveyed:		
School	# Students	# Field Instructors
Columbia	43	33
Wurzweiler	53	31
Adelphi	30	26
Fordham	75	32
NYU	53	28
Hunter	31	30
Total	285	180

In 1975-76 Columbia had 563 students in field work. Forty-three or 7.6% of them were included in this survey. Columbia had 274 field instructors, of whom thirty-three or 12% were included in the survey. These are not large numbers to be sure. These findings are presented for a frame of reference only.

The following is a synopsis of Kahn's findings from the student perspective. Remember that if the material presented represents all schools, then all schools scored about the same; when Columbia is singled out, it scored differently than the rest.¹

- 56.5% of all students said that the relationship between their Field Advisor and their field instructor was distant
- 9.3% of Columbia students said the relationship was close (the lowest score of the six schools)
- 19.3% of all students said Field Advisors made a strong effort in their social work education to integrate class and field
- 46.7% of all students said that the Field Advisor made hardly any, or no effort at all, to integrate class and field

- 75.8% of all students said the Field Advisor had hardly any, or no influence on Agency service
- 75.0% of all students rated their Field Advisor as an average educator
- 23.3% of Columbia students rated their Field Advisors as above average or excellent practitioners
- 27.9% of Columbia students rated their Field Advisors as poor or below average practitioners
- 63.5% of all students said the Field Advisor had no, or hardly any effect on their social work education. Of all the schools, Columbia ranked last on this dimension.

Since the integration of class and field is one of the most important functions of the Field Advisor (called Liaison in most places) the linkage would be an important component at which to look. Table 3 looks at who influences this.²

TABLE 3
Efforts of the Key Actors in Social Work Education
to Integrate Classroom Content with Field Experience
as Rated by Students
(N=285)

Key Actors	Strong Effort	Some Effort	Hardly Any Effort	No Effort
Field Advisor	19.3%	34.0%	26.3%	20.4%
Methods Teacher	48.1%	41.1%	7.7%	3.2%
Other Teachers	14.7%	63.9%	15.8%	5.7%
Field Instructor	27.4%	35.4%	25.6%	11.6%

Kahn addresses the fact that these findings raise doubts as to the presumed role of the Field Advisor.³ Perceived as having one foot in the school and one foot in the placement, as it were, this person is expected, in the literature and in schools of social work education, to be the bridge, link, liaison that integrates class and field.

Is this lack of seeing the Field Advisor as the one who integrates class and field due to the fact that the Advisor is perceived as, or is actually identified more closely with, one "camp" than the other? Two more tables from Kahn are interesting on this point. First, Table 4⁴ which asks the student to rate those involved in social work education as Educators:

TABLE 4
Student Ratings of Field Instructor, Faculty Field
Advisor, Method Teacher as Educator
(N=285)

Category	Excel- lent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
Method Teacher	33.0%	34.0%	18.2%	7.7%	5.3%
Field Instructor	24.6%	27.7%	29.1%	10.5%	6.7%
Field Advisor	21.6%	23.2%	30.2%	9.8%	10.2%

Second, Table 5⁵ which asks the student to rate those involved in social work education as Practitioners:

TABLE 5
Student Ratings of Field Instructor, Faculty Field
Advisor, Method Teacher as Practitioners
(N=285)

Category	Excel- lent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
Method Teacher	34.0%	33.7%	20.0%	2.5%	3.9%
Field Instructor	26.3%	31.6%	23.9%	7.7%	3.9%
Field Advisor	21.1%	25.6%	26.3%	7.7%	7.7%

Kahn follows this table with an explanation of school-to-school differences saying "there were fewer students from Columbia (23.3%) than from other schools who saw their faculty advisors as above average or excellent practitioners. This group also reflected the largest number (27.9%) who

viewed the advisor as a poor or below average practitioners."6 This is pictured in Table 67:

TABLE 6
Student Ratings of Faculty Advisors as Practitioners
by School Means
(N=285)

School	Mean	Scale
Columbia	2.349	5 = Excellent
Wurzweiler	3.491	4 = Above Average
Adelphi	3.100	3 = Average
Fordham	3.307	2 = Below Average
NYU	3.000	1 = Poor
Hunter	3.129	

In neither identity, as educator or practitioner, does the Field Advisor rate well against Method Teachers or Field Instructors. Kahn explores this further. Kahn asks the students to measure the impact these three actors have had on their social work education and includes the influence of fellow students as well. See Table 78:

TABLE 7
Student Ratings of Field, Faculty and
Student Influence on Social Work Education
(N=285)

Category	Very	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at All
Field Instructor	51.9%	27.8%	13.3%	7.0%
Methods Teacher	33.7%	42.0%	16.5%	7.8%
Field Advisor	10.9%	25.6%	28.8%	34.7%
Fellow Students	28.4%	51.9%	14.7%	5.0%

"The faculty field advisor comes through as the person having the least influence on student education. In fact,

64.5 percent of the respondents picture the advisor as having hardly any or no effect at all."⁹ Again, it is worth it to break this out by school. Table 8¹⁰ does just that:

TABLE 8
Student Perceptions of the Influence of Key Actors
on Social Work Education by School Means
(N=285)

School	N	Field Instructor	Methods Teacher	Field Advisor	Fellow Students
Columbia	43	2.9	3.1	1.8	2.9
Wurzweiler	53	3.5	3.1	2.3	3.3
Adelphi	30	3.2	3.1	2.1	2.9
Fordham	75	3.1	2.8	2.0	3.0
NYU	53	3.4	3.2	2.2	3.0
Hunter	31	3.3	3.4	2.8	3.3
Total	285	3.2	3.1	2.2	3.1

4=Very Influential, 3=Somewhat Influential, 2=Hardly Influential, 1=Not at All Influential

In order to get a grasp of how the Field Advisor could be perceived as so uninfluential in the students' social work education two factors might be looked at, and the data appear in Kahn's work. One factor would be the frequency of contact and the other, what topics were discussed.

On the first factor, frequency of contact, Kahn noted that students reported infrequent contact, and even none, when everything was going well. Students perceived the reason for contact with a Field Advisor to be centered on crisis situations in the field.¹¹

As to the content of student-Field Advisor conversation, Kahn catalogued those topics that were discussed, and

those topics that were not.¹² Among the topics discussed (by percent of students reporting that they were) were:

- Field Assignment (41.4%)
- Evaluation of Placement (39.0%)
- Assessment of Practice Skills (35.0%)
- Integration of Class and Field (24.5%)
- Problems with Field Instructor (23.5%)
- Problems in Practice Skills (18.9%)
- Class Work (10.2%)

Kahn's work reports that there were significant differences among schools (which is not broken out) but that "Integration of Class and Field" was consistent among students from different schools. As to what was hardly ever, or never discussed:

- Personal Problems (71.6%)
- Class Work (55.1%)
- Problems with Field Instructor (50.2%)
- Practice Problems (49.1%)
- Integration of Class and Field (24.5%)
- Evaluation of Placement (34.4%)
- Assessment of Practice Skills (32.2%)
- Field Assignment (26.3%)

Equally important in looking at Field Advising is the perception of field instructors. The following is a synopsis of Kahn's findings from the field instructor perspective. As with the student data, if the material presented represents all schools, then all schools scored about the same; when Columbia is singled out it scored significantly different from the rest.¹³

41.7% of all field instructors said their relationship with the Field Advisor was distant.

- 24.4% of all field instructors said their relationship with the Field Advisor was close but only 18.2% of Columbia field instructors said the same.
- 33.9% of all field instructors said the Field Advisor was "Quite a Bit" or "Very" influential in setting expectations for their performance as a supervisor but 32.8% said the Field Advisor had hardly any or no influence at all.
- 70.6% of all field instructors said the Field Advisor had minimal influence on agency service.
- 33.9% of all field instructors said the Field Advisor had hardly any, or no influence at all on student education in the field.
- 16.7% of all field instructors said the Field Advisor was very influential on student education in the field.
- 3.0% of Columbia field instructors said the Field Advisor was very influential; Columbia scored sixth out of six on this variable.
- 50.0% of all field instructors said the Field Advisor was quite a bit, or very influential on expectations of student performance in the field.
- 16.8% of them said the Field Advisor had hardly any, or no influence at all on expectations.
- 63.6% of Columbia field instructors said the Field Advisor was quite a bit, or very influential in deciding who passes and fails field work. Columbia ranked fifth out of six schools on this dimension.
- 27.2% of Columbia field instructors said the Field Advisor frequently discussed the field instructors' supervisory practice; Columbia ranked fifth.
- 63.6% of Columbia field instructors said the Field Advisor rarely discussed student supervisory practice. Overall, of all the schools, field instructors felt that the schools concentrated little on the development of their teaching skills.
- 57.6% of Columbia field instructors rated the Field Advisor as an above average or excellent educator. (Columbia ranked fourth out of six.)

51.5% of Columbia field instructors rated the Field Advisor as an above average or excellent practitioner. (Columbia ranked second out of six.)

36.3% of Columbia field instructors rated the Field Advisor as an above average or excellent scholar. (Columbia ranked third out of six.)

Field Instructors were asked the level of influence various key actors in the school/agency community had on their performance as student supervisors. The following Table 9¹⁴ explicates the findings:

TABLE 9
Influence of Key Actors on Setting Expectations
For a Field Instructors Performance
As a Student Supervisor
(N=180)

Key Actor	Very Influ- ential	Quite a Bit	Some- what	Hardly	Not at All
Field Advisor	17.8%	16.1%	25.0%	17.8%	15.0%
Your Agency Supervisor	17.8%	12.2%	17.8%	13.9%	22.8%
Other Field Instructors	4.4%	15.0%	17.2%	18.3%	33.9%
Field Work Department	8.9%	12.8%	20.6%	20.6%	26.7%
Yourself	87.9%	8.9%	---	---	---

If the Field Advisor is the link between class and field, in addition to integrating both, the Advisor should have an effect on field instructor teaching and student learning. Above was an overall picture of the effect Field Advisors have on field instructor teaching from the field instructors' viewpoint. Next, by school, is a comparison of the topics discussed by Field Advisors with field instructors. Of importance is how highly ranked is discussion of their supervisory practice. Table 10¹⁵:

TABLE 10
 Comparisons by School of Areas Discussed
 Frequently with Faculty Field Advisor
 As Identified by Field Instructor Responses
 (N=180)

School	N	Agency Service	Student Practice	Field Instructor Supervisory Practice	School Curriculum
Columbia	33	36.4%	63.7%	27.2%	36.6%
Wurzweiler	31	29.0%	93.5%	48.4%	22.6%
Adelphi	26	34.6%	96.2%	57.7%	15.3%
Fordham	32	34.4%	53.2%	12.5%	31.3%
NYU	28	32.2%	57.1%	39.2%	21.4%
Hunter	30	40.0%	93.4%	46.7%	36.7%
Total	180	24.5%	75.6%	37.8%	27.7%

If one of a Field Advisor's concerns is field instructors as teachers this was a little discussed dimension with the Columbia field instructors. Much higher rated was the discussion of Student Practice, but, though it was discussed more than the field instructor as teacher, Columbia ranked fourth out of six in having this area as part of field instructor-Field Advisor communication. Below is the field instructors' view of the Advisors' impact on student education, another glance at the same question. Table 11¹⁶:

TABLE 11
 Influence on Student Education of Field Instructor,
 Method Teacher, Field Advisor and Students
 As perceived by the Field Instructor Respondents
 (N=180)

Key Actors	Very Influential	Somewhat	Hardly	Not at All
Field Instructor	82.8%	15.0%	---	---
Methods Teacher	52.8%	41.1%	2.8%	1.1%
Field Advisor	16.7%	45.0%	30.0%	3.9%
Students	38.9%	41.7%	13.9%	1.7%

"The faculty field advisor was viewed as having the least impact upon student education. Approximately 20 per cent more of the respondents saw the students as more influential on their own education than the faculty field advisor."¹⁷ The following, Table 12¹⁸ breaks this out by school.

TABLE 12
Comparison by School of Key Actors
Judged by Field Instructors as Very
Influential on Student Education
(N=180)

School	N	Field Instructor	Method Teacher	Field Advisor	Students
Columbia	33	84.8%	56.6%	3.0%	36.4%
Wurzweiler	31	93.5%	67.7%	29.0%	29.0%
Adelphi	26	80.8%	26.9%	15.4%	34.6%
Fordham	32	78.1%	59.4%	15.6%	56.3%
NYU	28	82.1%	46.4%	17.9%	35.7%
Hunter	30	76.7%	53.3%	20.0%	40.0%
Total	180	82.8%	52.8%	16.7%	39.9%

In breaking out the schools, specifically to look at the Field Advisor impact on student education as perceived by field instructors, Field Advisors, in each school, rank fourth behind field instructors, method teachers and students. In no instance do Field Advisors fare well, but for Columbia, the perception is extreme. Equally as important as influence on student education is the influence on student performance in the field. Table 13¹⁹:

TABLE 13
Field Instructors Perceptions of the Degree of
Influence of Key Actors on Expectations of
Student Performance in the Field
(N=180)

Key Actor	Very Influ- ential	Quite a Bit	Some- what	Hardly	Not at All
Field Instructor	88.3%	6.7%	1.1%	---	1.1%
Field Advisor	22.2%	27.8%	26.7%	12.2%	5.6%
Field Work Dept.	10.6%	18.9%	27.2%	13.9%	21.7%
Class Room Teacher	6.1%	14.4%	22.8%	23.3%	25.6%
Agency Exec.	8.9%	8.3%	25.6%	24.4%	24.4%

And finally, how did field instructors view Field Advisors as Educators, Practitioners, and Scholars, arguably the parts of the sum that make up their role? Table 14²⁰:

TABLE 14
Field Instructors Ratings, By School
Of the Faculty Field Advisor
As an Excellent and Above Average
Educator, Practitioner and Scholar
(N=180)

School	N	Educator	Practitioner	Scholar
Columbia	33	57.6%	51.5%	36.3%
Wurzweiler	31	61.3%	48.4%	67.8%
Adelphi	26	57.7%	42.3%	34.6%
Fordham	32	43.8%	34.3%	31.3%
NYU	28	42.8%	42.9%	35.8%
Hunter	30	66.4%	56.7%	60.0%
Total	180	55.0%	46.1%	44.1%

Interestingly, Columbia Field Advisors ranked fourth out of six as Educators, second out of six as Practitioners, and third out of six as scholars. It is too bad that Kahn's study nowhere asked Field Advisors perceptions of themselves on any of the dimensions of their role.

The discussion of the students' responses in Kahn's work ended with the question: How often did the participants meet and what was discussed? What was discussed between field instructors and Field Advisors has already been covered in Table 10 cited above. The interest there was to look at Field Advisor attention to the teaching role of field instructors but also delineated was the fact that they talked primarily about that, agency service, student performance, and the schools' curriculum. Kahn addressed how often field instructors and Field Advisors met in Table 15²¹.

TABLE 15
Frequency of Meetings Between Field Instructors and Faculty
Field Advisors Compared by Schools
(N=180)

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

Nearly a quarter of the respondents chose "Other" as a category of frequency of meeting. "The following comments are illustrative of responses to the requests made in the questionnaire to specify what 'other' represented: 'did not meet'... 'never met'... 'no meetings'... 'rare contact'...

'seldom met'... 'two phone calls'... 'met only as I requested' ... 'never'."22

This overview of Columbia University School of Social Work Field Advising in 1975-76 is not a very positive one. Overall, from both the student and field instructor perspective, Field Advisors and field instructors were more often distant than close, Field Advisors were not strongly effective in integrating class and field, and Field Advisors had little effect on the students' social work education.

Columbia Survey 1991

The issue of field advising, and specifically the use of part-time faculty to do field advising, was a topic of ongoing discussion at Columbia in July 1990. A series of memos between a group of the faculty, the Field Work Policy Committee, and the Associate Dean articulated some of the issues. Briefly, a group of the faculty were concerned about the increased reliance on part-time faculty to do field advising. They posited that part-time faculty would not have the knowledge or "clout" that full-time faculty have and would thus be less effective. The Dean, in his "State-of-the-School: Significant Changes and Future Directions" speech of March 29, 1990 framed the issue thus: we do not know enough to have a position. He charged the Field Work Policy Committee accordingly; "(1) to acquire better data about the relative field advising capabilities of full-time and part-time faculty, and (2) to develop effective

mechanisms for averting whatever problems might be encountered by part-time field advisors that would be due to their not being full-time employees."

The Field Work Policy Committee is a standing committee in the school's governance structure. It is made up of approximately eight full-time faculty and three students. The Assistant Dean, Director of Field Work, is an ex-officio member. The same two positions were evident on the Committee. One position was that field advising should be done by full-time faculty and full-time faculty should be doing field advising. The rationale was that full-time faculty knew the school better, were more invested, and should be connected to the field in some active way.

Because of these discussions, and the lack of data, a survey was undertaken. Only the McVickar campus, which had approximately five hundred students in field work, was engaged in the study. The other campus, Purchase, had one hundred and twenty-five students in field work, but a program of mandatory field advising groups that was different from the main campus.

Both students and field instructors were surveyed about field advising. The survey for the students was quite lengthy (see Appendix One) while the survey for the field instructors was very brief (see Appendix Two). The student survey was pretested on students in two classes that were conducted by a faculty member of the Field Work Policy Committee. The Field Instructor Survey, because of its

brevity, was not pretested. When the overall survey was conducted the surveys were distributed to students through their mail folders at school and there were two boxes set up, one near the mail folders and one outside the Field Work Office for their returns. One hundred and nineteen (119) students, or approximately 20%, returned their surveys. Surveys were mailed to four hundred and ten (410) Field Instructors and they were requested to mail them back. Ninety-eight (98) or approximately 20% did as well. The surveys were anonymous, but they were coded so that it was clear whether the responder had a full or part-time Field Advisor.

TABLE 16
Percent of Responding Students and Field Instructors with
Full or Part-Time Field Advisors

	Full-Time	Part-Time
Students (N=119)	51.3	48.7
Field Instructors (N=98)	43.8	56.3

The distribution of full and part-time Field Advisors in the returns closely reflected the actual distribution for the year: 50% of the field advising was done by full-time and 50% was done by part-time Advisors.

Student Response

The survey of the students asked them to identify their method, program, and placement field of practice. It then asked them to rank the amount of activity in nine field

advising activities on a four point scale of Very Much, Adequate Amount, Minimal Amount, and Not At All. These field advising activities were : (1) providing advice and support; (2) assisting in solving field work problems; (3) assisting in negotiating between school and/or agency systems; (4) clarifying school policies and expectations; (5) monitoring student's learning progress in the field; (6) helping students focus on or understand learning goals and learning style; (7) clarifying congruence and differences between class and field work; (8) monitoring the quality of field work arrangements; and (9) referring students to educational or other resources.

The survey went on to ask how many times the student met with the advisor, were the meetings individual or in groups, how useful were the meetings, who initiated the meetings, how knowledgeable and available was the Field Advisor, and what problems did the student and the Advisor work on or discuss? Answers to these questions were yes or no, specific numbers as in the case of number of meetings, or the same four point scale described above (Very, Moderately, Minimally, Not At All).

TABLE 17
Percent of Student Having Either Full or Part-Time Advisors
and Their Satisfaction Levels on Twelve Variables
(N=119)

	Very or Moderately		Minimally, Not At All	
	F.T.	P.T.	F.T.	P.T.
Overall Satisfaction	75.4	60.3	24.6	39.7
Provide Advice and Support	72.1	55.2	27.9	44.8
Assist Solve Field Work Problems	63.3	55.6	36.7	44.4
Negotiated School and Agency	63.9	57.4	36.1	44.4
Clarify School Policy, Procedures	57.4	54.4	42.6	45.6
Monitored Student Learning	60.7	46.6	39.3	53.4
Helped with Learning Goals	37.7	41.1	62.3	58.6
Clarified Class and Field	44.3	31.6	55.7	68.4
Monitored Quality Field Work	59.0	51.7	41.0	48.3
Referred to Resources	41.0	23.2	59.0	76.8
Knowledgeable	83.6	69.6	16.4	30.4
Available	86.9	75.9	13.1	24.1

Presenting the data in percentages indicates a substantial difference between student satisfaction with full and part-time Advisors on many of the variables. Presented as Mean Scores, however, it showed no significant difference.

TABLE 18
Mean Scores of Student Satisfaction
on Twelve Variables
(N=119)

1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All			
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Sig.
Overall Satisfaction	1.92	2.22	
Provide Advice and Support	1.98	2.31	
Assist Solve Field Work Problems	2.23	2.53	
Clarify School Policy, Procedures	2.33	2.56	
Monitor Student Learning	2.34	2.53	
Help Student with Learning Goal	2.75	2.66	
Clarify Class and Field	2.74	2.98	
Monitor Quality Field work	2.31	2.41	
Refer Student to Resources	2.75	3.13	
Knowledgeable	1.79	2.05	
Available	1.77	1.90	

Field Instructor Response

Field instructors were asked what type of agency they were at, the length of time they had been a field instructor, the year, method, and program of their current student, how many times they met with the Field Advisor, and any suggestions they had for the school to improve field advising. On the same four point scale of Very, Moderately, Minimally, and Not At All Satisfied, they were asked to rate if the meetings with the Field Advisor covered their agenda, and how satisfied they were with field advising in 1990-1991.

TABLE 19
Percent of Field Instructors Having Either Full or Part-Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Two Variables (N=98)

	Very or Moderately		Minimally, Not At All	
	F.T.	P.T.	F.T.	P.T.
Meetings with Field Advisor Covered Agenda	88.1	90.6	11.9	9.4
Overall Satisfactionss with Field Advising	83.3	85.2	16.7	14.8

TABLE 20
Mean Scores of Field Instructor Satisfaction on Two Variables by Full and Part-Time Advisors (N=98)

	1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All	
	Full-Time	Part-Time
Meetings with Field Advisor Covered Agenda	1.32	1.58
Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising	1.56	1.75

The results of these surveys bear out the literature. Field Advising is not viewed very positively by students.²³

The results of these surveys bear out the literature. Field Advising is not viewed very positively by students²³ but is more positively viewed by field instructors.²⁴

TABLE 21
Mean Scores of Student and Field Instructor Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising by Full and Part-time Advisors

	1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All	
	Full-Time	Part-Time
Student Overall Satisfaction (N = 119)	1.92	2.22
Field Instructor Overall Satisfaction (N = 98)	1.56	1.75

This is believed to be, however, the first study to look at differential rates of satisfaction with full and part-time Advisors.

Summary

The surveys bore out the literature to date but also expanded it by addressing the issue of full and part-time advisors. The student data presented in Percentages is telling in that neither full or part-time Advisors fared very well. In standard academic grading (A = 90%+, B = 80%+, C = 70%+, D = 60%+) full-time faculty got a C+ in field advising. A reading of some of the twelve variables is very telling. On clarifying class and field, and helping with learning goals, two particularly academic items on which full-time faculty could be anticipated to be quite strong, less than 50% of the students viewed them as very or

moderately helpful. In fact, on helping with learning goals, part-timers actually scored marginally, though not significantly, higher!

When the data was addressed in Mean Scores, there was no significant difference between student satisfaction with either full or part-time advisors.

CHAPTER 6

1. S. Kahn, "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Social Work Schools and Field Placement Agencies in Their Joint Task of Educating Social Workers," unpublished dissertation, Columbia University School of Social Work, 1981: 100-109, and 135-152

2. Ibid., 104
3. Ibid., 105
4. Ibid., 136
5. Ibid., 136
6. Ibid., 136
7. Ibid., 139
8. Ibid., 146
9. Ibid., 146
10. Ibid., 148
11. Ibid., 107
12. Ibid., 151
13. Ibid., 180-215, 250
14. Ibid., 195
15. Ibid., 220
16. Ibid., 212
17. Ibid., 212
18. Ibid., 213
19. Ibid., 215
20. Ibid., 250
21. Ibid., 181

22. Ibid., 180-181

23. A. E. Fortune et. al., "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," Journal of Social Work Education, 21:3, (1985): 95; A. Rosenblatt and J. E. Mayer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views," Social Work, 20:3, (1975):187

24. C. Brownstein, H. Smith and G. Faria, "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty," in Field Education In Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends, eds. D. Schneck, B. Groosman, and U. Glassman, (Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., Dubuque, Iowa, 1991): 241

CHAPTER 7

INTERVENTION

Based on the initial analysis of the 1991 surveys, which only looked at the percentage point difference in satisfaction with full and part-time Field Advisors, a series of small interventions were made during the 1991-1992 academic year. Not one was a large, or macro, intervention. Rather, the hope was that a cluster of small changes and actions would effect more improvement than any single one. The interventions made are offered in the chronological order in which they were implemented.

June, July and August 1991: made more explicit and tightened the criteria for hiring part-time Field Advisors. The criteria implemented were three. All applicants for the position must (1) have ten years of post-Masters, agency based experience; (2) be an experienced field instructor; (3) have a home or office phone machine and the ability to return calls within twenty-four hours of receiving them. Previously part-time Field Advisors were simply known to the Director of Field Work as former field instructors, but there was no minimum standard of agency-based practice or the ascertaining of availability. Likewise, it is important to note that not all faculty at the school who do field ad-

vising meet these criteria, and even Practice Faculty may not meet the criteria of ten years practice experience in an agency.

July 1991: rewrote the Field Work Manual to include Part-Time Field Advisors in the section of Field Advising. This was to add legitimacy to their existence.

August 1991: divided the thirty part-time Field Advisors into two groups. The first group, sixteen brand new part-time Field Advisors, would have the Director of Field Work as their primary contact in the Field Work Department. If they had any question, concern, or suggestion they were to call the Director who would get back to them in a maximum of one day. The second group of fourteen experienced part-time Field Advisors had as their primary contact one Assistant Director of Field Work who likewise would be back in touch within a day or less. "Experienced" was defined as one or more years of field advising experience at Columbia. The Assistant Director would report to the Director any calls from part-time Field Advisors so that the Director would always be aware of the flow, or amount of communication, and the concerns or questions that had arisen among the part-time Advisors.

Also, during this month, the Orientation to Field Work materials used by faculty during the six hours of Orientation for new students in September were rewritten to include

greater specificity about the field advising role. Feedback received from the faculty was positive.

September 1991: instituted a mandatory, monthly seminar with all part-time Field Advisors led by the Director of Field Work. There were two groups for the seminars. One group was of the new Field Advisors and the second was of the experienced ones. Each month, for each group, one hour was devoted to a substantive issue: curriculum changes, Fields of Practice, Methods, Programs and Sequences, feedback from the Field Work Policy Committee, gatekeeping, and the activities appropriate for the next month. The second hour was devoted to individual student problems which usually led to fruitful discussions.

Also this month the use of Phone Mail was structured. (Phone Mail is the Columbia form of phone message machines.) The structure was that any Field Advisor who had a problem or a question that occurred after five o'clock, and could or should not wait until the next day, was instructed to call the phone line of the Director of Field Work. The Director picked up the calls every evening at nine and returned them between nine and ten p.m. unless informed by the Field Advisor to do otherwise. This practice was extended to all Field Advisors, not just part-time ones.

At the end of the month, one office was located to be the Part-Time Field Advisors' Office (full-time faculty doing advising had their own offices). While individual mail

folders for each of the part-time Field Advisors had been instituted in the Field Work Office the year before, this was the first-time they had a specific office of their own. It may seem ridiculous to applaud one office for thirty part-time Field Advisors, which necessitated a rather complicated sign-up system, but they viewed this as a significant improvement. Also, it meant that students were seeing their Advisor in a regular space month after month rather than wandering all over the building trying to find them for their appointments.

October 1991: the same Assistant Director of Field Work who acted as the liaison to the fourteen experienced Field Advisors began providing technical assistance to any part-time Field Advisor bringing a student to the Committee on Students (COS). Bringing a student to the COS for problems in the field is usually a painful experience for the Advisor as well as for the student. Procedures are rigidly adhered to and several memos supporting the reason for bringing the student must be prepared. The Assistant Director ensured that the procedures were followed and helped prepare what are called the Short and Long memos. This made bringing students to the COS a less traumatic experience, at least for the Field Advisor.

Also this month, separate meetings were established for those part-time Field Advisors who were carrying Social Administration students. These students make up less than

eight percent of the students in field work but their field program is entirely different from everyone else's. This extra support to the part-time Field Advisors was in response to Social Administration students' concern that advisors did not understand their assignments and practicum.

Part-time Field Advisors were very appreciative of the changes that were made. They expressed feeling more connected to the School and the Field Work Department. They said they felt more supported and more prepared to do their job.

Why These Interventions Were Made

As described above, the results of the 1991 survey indicated that there should be an attempt made to improve the satisfaction rate with field advising, particularly among students. The scores were too low if you view this as an important function, and allocate it significant resources. The changes made were discreet and small with the hope that they would have an aggregate effect. Even though the data, when further analyzed by mean scores, showed no significant difference in satisfaction levels between full and part-time Field Advisors, the part-time Advisors were targeted. It was decided to direct the activities toward the part-time Field Advisors for two reasons: (1) they had scored marginally lower than the full-time faculty in the surveys about field advising, and (2) the Field Work Department

could mandate a program for the part-time Advisors, authority it does not have with full-time faculty.

In making these changes the Field Work Department followed Wildofsky: "Planning... necessitates a causal theory connecting the planned actions with the desired future results. Planning also requires the ability to act on this theory; it requires power. To change the future, one must be able to get people to act differently than they otherwise would."¹ As stated, it was only with the part-time Field Advisors that the Field Work Department had any power. In fact, over the past two years four part-time Field Advisors have been let go because they did not meet adequate standards in their field advising. During the same time two full-time faculty did not meet any standards, yet the Field Work Department could do little. Also, there was some hope that if the changes made part-time Field Advisors substantially better at their job, full-time faculty might seek out the same training and coordination that the Field Work Department offered. (Of course, the reverse was also possible. If the part-time Field Advisors received a more positive evaluation than full-time faculty, some of whom do not want to do field advising anyway, they may say the case is made for it all to be done by part-timers.)

In addition to having power over the part-timers there was another reason for directing the planned change at a smaller unit. Lindblom best described the reason as the "art of sub-optimizing." He postulates that it is possible

to solve "... some lower-level problems, and that difficulties increase and our special competence diminishes by an order of magnitude with every level of decision making we attempt to ascend."²

Sub-optimizing was an important consideration in designing any intervention to be made in 1991-1992. The feeling was that changes to improve the situation needed to be made but there was no data to inform what the plan or model should be. The only data available, on arguably too small a sample, was the Kahn dissertation referenced above.³ Without data of any kind it would have been premature to make a major change which would no doubt have philosophical, political and budget ramifications.

In addition to lacking data to support a major change, "sub-optimizing" was important for another reason. To make any major change in the model, or operation, of Field Advising at Columbia would require the cooperation of at least the following committees: Field Work Policy Committee, Committee on Instruction, Committee on Academic Appointment if there were to be a change in faculty roles, and the School Council. The first three committees have approximately fifteen members drawn from the faculty, administration and student body. The last, the School Council, has over sixty-five members drawn from the same three groups. In 1990-1991 the Field Work Department went through the process of having all field instructors awarded an adjunct academic status. This change in policy

(heretofore only field instructors with years of experience were awarded this status), upon which everyone agreed, and which had no cost implications, took seventeen months and nine committee meetings to resolve.

As stated, it appeared from the analysis of the percentage point spread between satisfaction with full and part-time Field Advisors that an intervention should be made within the academic year. This would have been precluded if the committee process had been engaged.

CHAPTER 7

1. A. Wildofsky, "Does Planning Work?," The Public Interest, 24, (Summer, 1971): 101
2. C. E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through'," Public Administration Review, 19, (1959): 237
3. S. Kahn, "An Analysis of the Relationship Between Social Work Schools and Field Placement Agencies in Their Joint Task of Educating Social Workers", Unpublished Dissertation, Columbia University School of Social Work, (1981)

CHAPTER EIGHT
MEASURING THE IMPACT

Columbia Survey 1992

The survey of students and field instructors was repeated in May 1992. The same surveys were distributed in the same way as the previous year. The return rate, however, was higher. One hundred and forty one or twenty-eight percent of the students completed the questionnaire. Two hundred and thirteen, or fifty-two percent of the field instructors did the same. The proportion of full and part-time Field Advisors mirrored the actual distribution as shown in Table 22. In the 1991-1992 academic year thirty-five percent of the students had full-time Field Advisors as compared with sixty-five percent who had part-time ones.

Table 22

Percent of Responding Students and Field Instructors
with Full or Part Time Field Advisors

	Full Time	Part Time
Students (N=141)	35.2	64.8
Field Instructors (N=213)	37.2	62.8

Student Response

The student response in 1992 exactly mirrored the response in 1991. Again, the differences were stark if one

only looked at percentages. Differences evaporate when one examines mean scores.

Table 23
Percent of Students having Either Full or Part-Time Advisors
and Their Satisfaction Levels on Twelve Variables
(N=141)

	Very or Moderately		Minimally, Not At All	
	F.T.	P.T.	F.T.	P.T.
Overall Satisfaction	58.0	48.9	42.0	51.1
Provides Advice and Support	50.0	43.5	50.0	56.5
Assist Solve Field Work Problems	42.0	37.8	58.0	62.2
Negotiated School and Agency	36.0	31.9	64.0	68.1
Clarify School Policy, Procedures	38.0	34.1	62.0	65.9
Monitored Student Learning	40.0	37.0	60.0	63.0
Helped with Learning Goals	30.6	27.5	69.4	72.5
Clarified Class and Field	22.6	14.3	78.0	85.7
Monitored Quality Field Work	44.0	29.3	56.0	70.7
Referred to Resources	32.0	18.7	68.0	81.3
Knowledgeable	70.0	57.1	30.0	42.9
Available	64.0	69.6	36.0	30.4

Table 24
Mean Scores for Student Satisfaction
on Twelve Variables
(N=141)

1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All

	Full-Time	Part-Time	Sig.
Overall Satisfaction	2.40	2.59	
Provides Advice and Support	2.44	2.65	
Assist Solve Field Work Problems	2.64	2.90	
Negotiated School and Agency	2.80	3.01	
Clarify School Policy, Procedures	2.80	2.93	
Monitored Student Learning	2.64	2.79	
Helped with Learning Goals	2.98	3.11	
Clarified Class and Field	3.22	3.41	
Monitored Quality Field Work	2.64	2.94	
Referred to Resources	3.10	3.29	
Knowledgeable	2.04	2.37	
Available	2.14	2.10	

Field Instructor Response

Field instructors were again surveyed in the same manner. Surprising was the rate of return, two hundred and thirteen or fifty-two percent of the field instructors completed the survey. The same two questions were centered on: Did your meetings with the Field Advisor cover your agenda, and, overall how satisfied were you with field advising?

Table 25
Percent of Field Instructors Having Either Full or Part Time Advisors and Their Satisfaction Levels on Two Variables (N=213)

	Very or Moderately		Minimally or Not At All	
	F.T.	P.T.	F.T.	P.T.
Meetings with Field Advisor Covered Agenda	86.3	91.1	13.8	8.9
Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising	85.0	78.5	15.0	21.5

Table 26
Mean Scores of Field Instructor Satisfaction on Two Variables by Full and Part Time Advisors (N=213)

1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All

	Full Time	Part Time
Meetings with Field Advisor Covered Agenda	1.51	1.62
Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising	1.62	1.86

The results were the same as in 1991: Field instructors were far more satisfied with their experience with field advising than were students. This was true whether the instructor had a full or part time advisor. See Table 27 for student/field instructor comparison.

Table 27
 Mean Scores for Student and Field Instructor Overall
 Satisfaction with Field Advising
 by Full and Part Time Advisors

1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All		
	Full Time	Part Time
Students (N=141)	2.40	2.59
Field Instructors (N=141)	1.62	1.86

Summary

A baseline was established in 1991 on student and field instructor satisfaction with field advising. Looking at the percent differences it appeared that there was less satisfaction with part-time Field Advisors. A series of interventions were implemented, described in Chapter 7. When further analysis was performed and showed that by mean score there was no significant difference in student and field instructor satisfaction with field advising by full or part-time Advisors the interventions were continued anyway. Part-time field advising had grown to 65% of all the field advising done at Columbia. To intervene and build knowledge and skill among the part-time Advisors was seen as potentially having a positive effect on the majority of field advising. Alas, this was not the case. While the survey was repeated in 1992 and showed, again, no significant difference in student and field instructor satisfaction with full and part-time Advisors, it did, in the student surveys, show an overall drop in satisfaction with field advising as a whole. Table 28 presents all field advising (whether by

part-time or full-time advisors) and student satisfaction in mean scores for 1991 and 1992.

Table 28
Mean Scores for Student Satisfaction on Twelve
Variables for All Advisors, 1991 and 1992

1 = Very, 2 = Moderately, 3 = Minimally, 4 = Not At All

	1991 (N=119)	1992 (N=141)	Sig.
Overall Satisfaction	2.07	2.52	***
Provides Advice and Support	2.14	2.58	***
Assist Solve Field Work Problems	2.38	2.81	**
Negotiated School and Agency	2.44	2.94	***
Clarify School Policy, Procedures	2.44	2.89	***
Monitored Student Learning	2.44	2.74	*
Helped with Learning Goals	2.71	3.06	**
Clarified Class and Field	2.86	3.34	***
Monitored Quality Field Work	2.36	2.84	***
Referred to Resources	2.93	3.22	*
Knowledgeable	1.91	2.26	**
Available	1.83	2.11	**

* = Sig. at .05, ** = Sig. at .01, *** = Sig. at .001

In 1991, 68.0% of all the students, who had either full or part time advisors, said that they were Very or Moderately satisfied. By 1992 the percentage of students that satisfied drop 16 points to 52.1%. At the same time there was no such decline in satisfaction evidenced by the field instructors. See Table 29.

Table 29
Mean Scores for Field Instructor Satisfaction on
Two Variables for All Advisors, 1991 and 1992

	1991 (N=98)	1992 (N=213)
Meetings with Advisor Covered Agenda	1.45	1.54
Overall Satisfaction with Field Advising	1.66	1.76

CHAPTER NINE
EXPLANATIONS

In summary, student satisfaction with field advising could be categorized as fair in 1991. A number of interventions were made, targeted at the part-time Field Advisors, who, in 1991 did 50% of the field advising, and in 1992 did 65% of the field advising. By the time of the 1992 survey, student satisfaction had dropped from fair to poor. In neither year was there a significant difference in the student satisfaction levels between full or part-time Field Advisors. In order to find out what had happened an attempt was made to set up three Focus Groups with second year students in October 1992. They would only have experienced the field advising in the school year 1991-1992 but those who had experienced both years had already graduated.

Flyers were put in the mail folders of all the second year students at the McVickar Campus, approximately two hundred and seventy students. The flyer asked students to sign up for one of three meetings to discuss field advising with the Assistant Dean and Director of Field Work. Since space would have to be limited only the first fifteen to sign up for each time slot could be accommodated. It was anticipated that far more students would want to participate than could be scheduled since it was assumed that field advising

was a pressing topic with the students. That assumption was based on: (1) all the faculty discussion on the subject and, (2) the presumption that student interest had been piqued by simply administering the surveys in 1991 and 1992. Exactly eight students signed up.

The students were asked to respond to three questions in an open-ended manner. First, How did you experience field advising last year? Second, What activities made up the field advising? And third, How satisfied were you with the field advising and what suggestions do you have to make it better? It was possible in the discussion to identify whether a student had a full or part-time Field Advisor. Of the eight students, three or 37% had a full-time Field Advisor. This corresponds to the 35% of the total student population who had had full-time advisors in that year. The discussion by the eight students can be grouped as follows:

- 2 had a full-time faculty person in a special project and were delighted with the field advising. They experienced the advising as supportive, appreciated the monthly meetings the professor had with them, and had no suggestions to make.
- 1 described having had a "great" placement and wonderful field instruction. This student said field advising was, at best, redundant and, at worst, intrusive. This student suggested stopping field advising and putting the resources elsewhere.
- 3 had "problems" in the field. Two had part-time and one had a full-time Field Advisor. They were angry that the Field Advisor could not fix the problem. They all had adequate supervision and appropriate assignments so that changing their field placements was never an issue. The "problems" were identified by the students as

(1) supervision not being supportive enough, (2) clients being resistant or difficult, (3) agency being in some chaos, etc. Because the Field Advisor could not "fix" these situations the students were dissatisfied with their field advising even though the Advisors did all the required activities, i.e. visiting the placement, meeting with students, reading process, etc. Their suggestion was to hire only people who could "fix" problems.

1 student reported that she did not know how to use field advising. She was unclear as to the role of the Field Advisor. She reported that she was nevertheless satisfied with field advising because her placement was fine and she did not need it anyway. She suggested more content on using field advising in the Student Orientation to Field Work and reinforcement of that content in the practice classes. Upon exploration, it was learned that the Field Advisor did all the necessary activities of field advising but the student never grasped the purpose.

1 student reported that the Field Advisor basically took over the field instruction. The field instructor became overwhelmed at the agency and did not have time for the student. The student loved the work and the clients and wanted to remain at the site. Unknown to anyone, the Field Advisor started weekly supervision with the student and in the student's eyes "saved the placement." The student was very satisfied with the field advising and suggested we only hire people who are willing to leap into the breach.

Overall, the responses of the students echo many of the responses others have received from such studies.¹ While the responses were not surprising, the lack of attendance was. One class of second year students was asked by their instructor why so few people, in fact none from that class, had attended the meetings to discuss field advising. Some in the class of twenty-five said "I didn't see the flyer" or "None of the times were good for me." But the majority

response was "Oh, field advising, it's ok." "What's to say? My field work is fine." And finally, "It's really not that important."

CHAPTER 9

1. A. Rosenblatt and J.E. Meyer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views," Social Work, 20:3 (1975): 187; G. Faria, C. Brownstein and H. Smith, "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role," Journal Of Social Work Education, 2 (Spring/Summer, 1988): 136

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION

This study shows that it is possible to have the same levels of student and field instructor satisfaction with both full and part-time Field Advisors. It also replicated the findings of others: there is little student satisfaction with field advising¹ even though students reported overall satisfaction with their placements.²

In studying the role and functions of field advising the question emerged: Is this role entirely different from any and every other social work professional role? Or is there another role in social work or social work education which is analogous? The answer is yes. The role of the case manager is significantly similar to that of the Field Advisor.

According to Weil and Karls³ "Case management is... a series of actions and a process to assure that clients of human services systems receive the services, treatment, care, and opportunities to which they are entitled. It is also a means of accounting for service delivery and the expenditures of funds and resources in providing services to vulnerable target populations." Ballew and Mink⁴ posit the case manager as the overall coordinator: "The case manager must attempt to coordinate his or her own work with that of

any other relevant service provider to achieve goals which the case manager and the client consider desirable..." In Columbia's field advising model, the Field Advisor coordinates with the Field Work Department, the agency serving as the base for the practicum, the field instructor, the faculty and curriculum of the school, and so on, on behalf of their "client" the student.

In fact, though, underpinning the role of coordinator is the role of "problem solver". According to Weil and Karls quoting Grisham, White and Miller⁵, "The case manager assumes many roles but underlying them is the primary role of 'problem solver who acts with and on behalf of clients to assist them to function as independently as possible.'" This is important to note since the work of Rosenblatt and Mayer points out that students sought out their Field Advisors when there was a crisis, not a problem, but a crisis.⁶ Crisis intervention theory, then, would seem to be an important body of knowledge for Field Advisors to know and be able to use.

Also, not every problem is solvable, and, student and Field Advisor may not view the same set of circumstances as a "problem". Problem definition may be a fertile area for further study regarding field advising.

Weil and Karls⁷ define the essential elements of case management as "... client identification, assessment of need, service planning, service coordination and linking, and the monitoring and continuous evaluation of the client,

of service delivery, and of available resources." They go on⁸ to define three models of case management as provided by professionals. These models are "(1) the generalist case manager or broker model, (2) the primary-therapist-as-case-manager model, and (3) the interdisciplinary team model."

Briefly, the generalist case manager model puts the case manager in the primary role of accessor and coordinator of needed services. The case manager details the needs of the client and seeks out the appropriate services and coordinates their timely and adequate provision. Beyond ongoing coordination and monitoring, the case manager does not have additional responsibility.⁹

In the second model, the case manager is a service provider as well as a coordinator of other services. The service the case manager provides is therapy and as the therapist/case manager she or he accesses other services the client may need. The case manager provides one of the services and coordinates and monitors the others.¹⁰ In the third model, an interdisciplinary team functions as the case manager, no one member of the team assumes overall responsibility.¹¹

How should a school decide on its model of field advising? Clearly schools do make a decision, conscious or not. In Chapter 2, in the section on models of field advising, a continuum was developed of "most active" to "least active" models of field advising. The most active, articulated by Sentman¹² mirrors the second model of case management: the

primary-therapist-as-case-manager. The present Columbia model of field advising would mirror the first model, the case manager as generalist or broker. Decisions as to the amount of activity engaged in by the Field Advisor, or the case management model of field advising that is used, would be based on many questions but of primary importance is one: Who is the client (the student, the field instructor, the agency, the faculty?)

This is not to imply that a school need have only one model of field advising. The high rate of satisfaction with the field work experience both at Columbia and as evidenced in the literature¹³ could argue for a differential model: Field Advisor as coordinator/broker where the field work experience was good to excellent, and, Field Advisor as primary teacher (not therapist) where the field work experience was less than adequate.

Weil and Karls identify fifteen major responsibilities for the case manager¹⁴. These include: Problem Solver, Advocate, Broker, Diagnostician or assessor, Planner, Community or service organizer, Employee and system boundary spanner, Service monitor and system modifier, Record keeper, Evaluator, Consultant, Colleague and collaborator, Service coordinator, Counselor or therapist, and Expeditor. Previously cited in this text is the work of Smith, Faria and Brownstein¹⁵ who identified the roles of the Field Advisor as: Advisor, Monitor, Consultant, Teacher, Mediator and Advocate. They identified the functions as Practicum Place-

ment, Linkage, Evaluation and Administration. The overlap of case manager and Field Advisor roles is startling.

And finally, Weil and Karls point out that "The case management function must be suited to the organization as well as its clients. That is, the case management system must fit the organizational system and support desired patterns of organizational behavior."¹⁶ One could add that it would also have to support the organizational goal as well.

If the goal of a school of social work is to educate and thus professionalize students, and the Field Advisor acts as a case manager, it is not difficult to see why the Field Advisor may not be viewed positively by the student. First, the Field Advisor is a broker, not a central figure in the student's experience. The Field Advisor brokers, coordinates, the components that make up the student's social work education experience. The Field Advisor is in no way as central to the experience as the field instructor who has the day-to-day educational responsibility for field work. Second, all the coordination and problem solving in the world may not make an imperfect situation less so. And ease, comfort, and satisfaction are not essential in a placement for it to be a powerful learning experience. A Field Advisor, in the interests of educating and professionalizing students, may not advocate on their behalf for ease of assignment or choice of clientele. Thus, a student could be having a meaningful placement experience and still be dissatisfied with the Field Advisor. Following this

analogy, it would be the same as a client who is challenged by the case manager to do more and more for her or himself, and might be gaining mightily, but would rate the case manager poorly because their personal comfort level was low.

One important issue to consider is that the Columbia model of field advising does not differentiate among students. The list of tasks contained in the Field Work Manual is the same list of activities to be completed whether a student is marginal, average or stellar in her or his learning. The Columbia model views the student as the client and sees optimal learning when both the field instructor and Field Advisor are adequate in their roles.

If, on the other hand, the field instructor is adequate, but the Field Advisor does not know how to coordinate the placement, the curriculum, the faculty, the Field Work Department, all on behalf of the student, the Columbia model would view the learning situation as compromised. The student would learn because of the importance of the role of the field instructor, but, the student's learning would not be maximized as in the first case.

Continuing to look at adequacy in these roles, if the field instructor is inadequate and the Field Advisor is adequate, the Columbia model would assess minimal learning to occur. Any learning would be due to the intervention and active coordination by the Field Advisor of additional teaching resources on the student's behalf. This may include a secondary assignment within the agency with a more

adequate task (though still not primary) supervisor. Or, this could move to the extreme of actually changing models: the Field Advisor moves from being the generalist case manager/broker to actually being the provider of the supervision itself. While students may be grateful for this intervention, it is not a model that itself works optimally.¹⁷

And finally, there is the hopefully infrequent situation where both the field instructor and the Field Advisor are inadequate. The field instructor cannot or does not teach and the Field Advisor neither brokers additional teaching resources nor leaps into the breach. In this worst case scenario it is the responsibility of those with overall responsibility for field instruction to remove the student (or the field instructor or the Field Advisor) and assure an adequate learning environment. Use of the placement, the field instructor, and the Field Advisor in the future must be carefully determined.

But the Columbia model aside, does not this description of the Field Advisor as case manager, with the student as client, beg for a definition of differential roles for the Field Advisor? Sometimes more active, sometimes less, sometimes the broker and sometimes the, or one of the, providers, should all be acceptable roles for the Field Advisor based on the assessment of the situation. If this were the model of field advising, if it were based on assessment and contracting like most social work

interactions, then the directions to Field Advisors would not be to do the dozen or so tasks in a field work manual but to do what was needed to make sure that the student learned up to their potential.

This would mean that either each Field Advisor would have to have a number of roles with which they were comfortable or that there would have to be specialists assigned to problem students, difficult agencies, complex situations, etc. The only problem with moving toward a model of field advising with so much discretion in it is the issue of accountability. Field advising has not just an educational function but an administrative one as well. Social work education is very decentralized, and many schools have grown quite large over the years. As much as one could argue for Field Advisors having more discretion in their definition of their role, with differential amounts and kinds of activity based upon the needs of the student, the field instructor, and the placement, some common tasks to all would have to be retained for administrative and accountability purposes.

But, even more fundamental is the question heretofore unasked: If the Field Advisor is like a case manager, who is the client? Rosenblum and Raphael argue that the field instructor is the primary educator of the student and that the Field Advisor's activities should be directed to her or him and not the student.¹⁸ The field instructor, as usually more consistent in the field work experience (students spend

a maximum of nine months in a particular placement) may be the more appropriate client. As the Field Advisor works with the instructor, year after year, the teaching capacity of the instructor is maximized as students cycle through annually. The work of Rosenblum and Raphael, cited above, is one of very few articles to center on the primacy of the relationship between the Field Advisor and the field instructor and therefore raises the question as to who should be the client in this model. The data presented here in Chapters Six and Eight, which indicate a significantly higher level of satisfaction with field advising by field instructors than by students, would also seem to support this idea.

Important to remember, as well, is Latimer's concern that too much field advising is a sign that the overall field work program is weak.¹⁹ Latimer calls for the differential roles described above with very active field advising being needed, and therefore occurring, in few cases, if the overall program is strong. Latimer is the only one in the literature to see more field advising as such an indication and is one of a very few who argue that field advising is a residual service.

The analogy of the Field Advisor to the case manager is a new one and bears exploration. The question of who is the client is a crucial one in this regard.

Clearly, more needs to be done in looking at the role(s) of the Field Advisor. As stated at the outset, not

much has been written about this role and function and virtually nothing has been written about the use of differential personnel. In fact, both in the literature and in the schools themselves, single models of field advising are the norm. Articles are written, and field work manuals and practices articulate, a single mode of doing field advising. This mode may be more or less active, more or less complex, and more or less valued by the institution. Nowhere has there been an articulation of the need for differential roles and functions based upon an assessment of the educational situation. This seems surprising since assessment plays such a crucial role in the practice of social work. And, if we develop this analogy of the Field Advisor as case manager, not only do we need to look at a variety of models for doing field advising but we need to determine who the client is, and if the client is always the same.

This raises some questions for Columbia University School of Social Work for the next few years at least. Can Columbia respond to the need for differential field advising roles? Can Columbia assess field work situations and prescribe more or less Field Advisor activity, and the implementation of some or all of the functions available? To implement a structure that takes into account the real variety of field work experiences and matches it with an appropriate field advising activity available from a menu of different kinds of interventions would be a real challenge.

To have different kinds of Field Advisors for different situations, the specialists as it were who deal with crises, is another way to address the same question. Whether a new model were a menu of activities and level of effort for each Field Advisor to chose from, or, a variety of types of Field Advisors to be assigned or accessed for particular situations, any change would require all those involved, faculty, field instructors, students, etc. to give up an ideological position on what the ONE model of field advising SHOULD be.

In conclusion, though this study has shown that it is possible to have no difference in student and field instructor satisfaction with full or part-time Field Advisors, it has raised serious questions about field advising in general. It has articulated a social work role, that of case manager, as analogous to that of Field Advisor. But most importantly, the study has described the need for an assessment to be made in each field work situation for the implementation of differing models. Either various levels of activity and functions can be used in fulfilling the role of Field Advisor, or, different personel with differing areas of expertize can be assigned to accomplish the same educational goal. This choice of models challenges the current situation wherein virtually each school has only one, single mode of field advisement.

CHAPTER 10

1. A. Rosenblatt and J. E. Mayer, "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views," Social Work, 20:3 (1975): 187 and G. Faria, C. Brownstein and H. Smith, "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role," Journal of Social Work Education, Spring/Summer, 2:136
2. Fortune et. al., "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," Journal of Social Work Education, 21:3 (1985): 196
3. M. Weil and J. M. Karls, Case Management in Human Service Practice, (Jossey-Bass, Pub., San Francisco, CA., 1985): 1-2
4. J. R. Ballew and G. Mink, Case Management in the Human Services, Charles C. Thomas, Pub., Springfield, Ill., 1986): 7
5. Weil and Karls, Case Management in Human Service Practice, 2
6. Rosenblatt and Mayer, "Objectional Supervisory Styles: Student Views," 187
7. Weil and Karls, Case Management in Human Service Practice, x
8. Ibid., 44
9. Ibid., 46
10. Ibid., 46
11. Ibid., 48-49
12. L. Sentman, "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative in Field Work," Social Service Review, 23:3 (1949) 337-339
13. Fortune et. al., "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," 103
14. Weil and Karls, Case Management in Human Service Practice, 20-21

15. H. Smith, G. Faria and C. Brownstein, "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study," Journal of Social Work Education, 22:3, (1986): 73-74,76

16. Weil and Karls, Case Management in Human Service Practice, 319

17. A. Gitterman, "The Faculty Field Instructor in Social Work Education," in The Dynamics of Field Instruction: Learning Through Doing, (Council on Social Work Education, New York, 1975): 31-39

18. A. Rosenblum and F. Raphael, "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison," Journal of Education for Social Work 19:1, (1983): 69

19. E. Latimer, "Comments on Dr. Yelaja's Paper on Student Advising," Journal of Education for Social Work, 8:1 (1972): 71-72

Appendix 1

FIELD ADVISING: STUDENT EVALUATION

Sequence:

- Direct Practice (1st year only)
 Clinical Practice (2nd year only)
 PPS (2nd year only)
 SA1
 SA2

Type of Agency

- Medical Center
 Psychiatric Hospital
 Nursing Home Settlement House
 Family & Children's Agency
 World of Work
 Community Center
 Drug or Alcohol Treatment Program
 Other (Please specify) _____

Program Category

- ASP
 EXP
 RRP
 Regular Program (2 year/full-time)
 Dual Degree Program (Specify) _____

Faculty field advisors may be involved in the following kinds of activities. To what extent did your faculty field advisor engage in the following activities with you? Please check appropriate rating category.

Amount of Activity
(Check one)

Activities

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1.1 | Provide advice, support: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.2 | Assist in solving field work problems: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.3 | Assist in negotiating between School and/or agency systems: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.4 | Clarify School policies and expectations: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1.5 | Monitor student's learning progress in the field: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 1.6 Help student focus on undergraduate learning goals and learning style: _____
- 1.7 Clarify congruence and differences between class and field work: _____
- 1.8 Monitor the quality of field work arrangements (assignments, supervision, workload): _____
- 1.9 Refer students to educational and other resources: _____

Second year students skip to Question #3.

2. Please answer the following questions only if you are currently a first year student.

- 2.1 How many times have you met with your faculty field advisor so far this year?
 _____ times in a group
 _____ times individually
 _____ Other: specify _____
- 2.2 How useful to you were group meetings with your advisor?
 ___ very ___ moderately ___ minimally ___ not at all
- 2.3 How useful to you were individual contacts?
 ___ very ___ moderately ___ minimally ___ not at all

3. Please answer the following questions only if you are currently a second year student.

- 3.1 How many times did you meet with your field advisor this year?
 ___ once ___ twice ___ More: How many ___ ___ Never
- 3.2 How useful to you were these meetings with your advisor?
 ___ very ___ moderately ___ minimally ___ not at all
4. Who initiated the first contact with your field advisor?
 ___ you ___ your advisor
5. How knowledgeable of the School's procedures, policies and systems do you believe your faculty field advisor is?
 ___ very ___ moderately ___ minimally ___ not at all

6. How available to you did you perceive your faculty field advisor to be?

___ very ___ moderately ___ minimally ___ not at all

7. What problems or issues did you and your faculty field advisor work on or discuss? Please list, indicate if the issue(s) was resolved or improved, and the extent to which you feel your advisor was helpful.

Problem:	Improved or Resolved		Advisor Helpfulness		
	Yes	No	Very Much	Some-What	Not at All

7.1

7.2

7.3

8. Was your faculty field advisor also your faculty advisor?

___ yes ___ No ___ Unsure

9 What suggestions do you have for the School to improve field advising?

4. What suggestions do you have for the School to improve field advising?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, D.(1974) "Practice and Education: A Commentary"
Social Work, Vol.19,No.6, pp.651-653
- Arkava, M.L. & E.C. Brennan, eds.(1976) Competency-Based Education for Social Work: Evaluation and Curriculum Issues, Council on Social Work Education, New York
- Ballew, J.R. & G. Mink(1986) Case Management in the Human Services, Charles C. Thomas Pub., Springfield, Ill.
- Berengarten, S.(1957) "Identifying Learning Patterns of Individual Students: An Exploratory Study" Social Service Review, Vol.31,No.4, pp.407-417
- _____.(1961) "Educational Issues in Field Instruction in Social Work" Social Service Review, Vol.35,No.3, pp.246-257
- Berkowitz, S.J.(1968) "Agency-School Communications and Relationships: Redefinition of Agency-School Partnership" Social Work Education Reporter, Vol.16,No.4, pp.59,60,69
- Billingsley, A.(1964) "Bureaucratic Professional Orientation Patterns in Social Casework" Social Service Review, Vol.38,No.4 pp.400-407
- Blankenship, R.(1977) Colleagues in Organization; the Social Construction of Professional Work, John Wiley & Sons, New York
- Bogo, M.(1981) "An Educationally Focused Faculty/Field Liaison Program for First-Time Field Instructors", Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.17,No.3, pp.59-65
- Bogo, M. & E. Vayda(1987) The Practice of Field Instruction in Social Work: Theory and Process, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Buffalo
- Brennan, W.C.(1973) "The Practitioner as Theoretician"
Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.9,No.2, pp.5-12
- Briar, S.(1973) Editorial, Social Work, Vol.18,No.6, pg.2

- Brownstein, C.(1981) "Practicum Issues: A Placement Planning Model" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.17, No.3, pp.52-58
- _____.(1987) "The Social Work Educator: Social Worker and Professor?" Social Service Review, Vol.59, No.3, pp.496-504
- Brownstein, C., H. Smith, G. Faria(1991) "The Liaison Role: A Three Phase Study of Schools, The Field, The Faculty" in Field Education In Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Trends, eds. D. Schneck, B. Grossman, & U. Glassman, Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co., Dubuque, Iowa
- Burack-Weiss, A. and F. Brennan(1991) Gerontological Social Work Supervision, The Haworth Press, New York
- Burion, W.A.(1976) "The Laboratory as an Element in Social Work Curriculum Design" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.12, No.1, pp.36-43
- Cassidy, H.(1969) "Role and Function of the Coordinator or Director of Field Instruction" in Current Patterns in Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education, edited by B. L. Jones, Council on Social Work Education, New York, pp.147-155
- Cohen, J.(1977) "Selected Constraints in the Relationship Between Social Work Education and Practice" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.13, No.1, pp.3-7
- Danbury, H.(1986) Teaching Practical Social Work: A Guide for Supervisors, Gower Pub. Co., Great Britain
- Davidson, K. & D. Livingston(1987) "A Relationship Model of Faculty Field Advising, Arete, Vol.12, No.2, pp.45-52
- Emerson R. & M. Pollner(1987) "Dirty Work Designations: Their Features and Consequences in a Psychiatric Setting" in Things That Matter: Influences on Helping Relationships, H. Rubenstein & M. Block, eds., Macmillon Pub., New York
- Euster, G.L.(1980) "The Prestige of Social Work Educators in the University" Journal of Social Work Education, Vol.16, No.3, pp.13-20
- Faria, G., C. Brownstein, H. Smith(1988) "A Survey of Field Instructors' Perceptions of Liaison Role", Journal of Social Work Education, Spring/Summer, No.2, pp.135-144

- Fellon, P.A.(1982) "Responsibilities of the School, Administrative Support of Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction, Sheafar & Jenkins, eds. Longman, New York
- Finestone, S. (1967) "Selected Features of Professional Field Instruction" Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol.3, No.2, pp.14-26
- Frey, G.A.(1990) "A Framework for Promoting Organizational Change" Families in Society, Vol.71, No.3, pp.142-47
- Fortune, A.E. et. al.(1985) "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement" Journal of Social Work Education, Vol.21, No.3, pp.92-1-4
- Frumkin, M.L.(1980) "Social Work Education and the Professional Curriculum Falacy: A Practical Guide to Field-School Relations" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.16, No.2, pp.91-99
- Garrett, A.(1954) "Learning Through Supervision", Smith College Studies in Social Work, Vol.24, No.2, pp.3-109
- Gartner, A.(1976) "The Preparation of Human Service Professionals", Human Sciences Press, New York
- Gilpin, R.(1963) Theory and Practice as a Single Reality, North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill
- Gitterman, A.(1975) "The Faculty Field Instructor in Social Work Education" in The Dynamics of Field Instruction: Learning Through Doing, Council on Social Work Education, New York, pp.31-39
- _____.(1989) "Field Instruction in Social Work Education: Issues, Tasks and Skills" The Clinical Supervisor, Vol.7, No.4, pp.77-91
- Gitterman, A. & N.P. Gitterman(1979) "Social Work Student Evaluation: Format and Method" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.15, pp.103-108
- Gitterman, A. & I. Miller(1978) "Supervisors as Educators" in Supervision, Consultation, and Staff Development in the Helping Professions, eds. Kaslow & Associates, Jossey-Bass Publishers, California
- Gordon, M.S.(1982) "Responsibilities of the School Maintenance of the Field Program" Quality Field Instruction, Longman, New York, ed. by B.W. Shaefer & L.E. Jenkins, pp.116-135

- Gruwell, M.l.(1968) "Development of Tools for Education Research" in Field Learning & Teaching; Explorations in Graduate Social Work Education, Council on Social Work Education, New York, pp.68-92
- Hamilton, G.(1949) "The Interaction of School and Agency" Social Work Journal, Vol.30,No.2, pp.76-87
- _____.(1954) Theory and Practice of Social Casework, Columbia University Press, New York
- Hamilton, N., J. Else(1983) Designing Field Education: Philosophy, Structure and Process, Charles Thomas Pub., Springfield, Illinois
- Hawthorne, L.(1986) "Developing A Professional Model of Field Administration: The University of Southern California Plan" paper presented at CSWE, APM, Miami
- Henry, C.S.G.(1975) "An Examination of Fieldwork Models at Adelphi University School of Social Work", Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.11,No.3, pp.62-68
- Irving, H.H.(1969) " A Social Science Approach to a Problem in Field Instruction: The Analysis of a Three Part Role Set", Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.5, Spring, pp.49-56
- Jears, M.S.(1978) Role Analysis in Field Social Work: The Development of a New Model, Devon Social Services Department, University of Bristol
- Jones, B.L., ed.(1969) Current Patterns in Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education, Council on Social Work Education, New York
- Kahn, S.(1981) An Analysis of the Relationship Between Social Work Schools and Field Placement Agencies in Their Joint Task of Educating Social Workers, Unpublished Dissertation, Columbia University
- Kaslow, F.W.(1977) Supervision, Consultation, and Staff Training in the Helping Professions, Jossey-Bass Pub., San Francisco
- Kendall, K.A.(1978) Reflections on Social Work 1950-1978, International Association of Schools of Social Work, New York, Vienna
- Kissman, K. & T.V. Tran(1990) "Perceived Quality of Field Placement Education Among Graduate Social Work Students" Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, Vol.5,No.2, pp.27-30

- Koerin, B.B., M.P. Harrigan and J.W. Reeves(1990)
 "Facilitating the Transition from Student to Social Worker: Challenges of the Younger Students" Journal of Social Work Education, Vol.26,No.2, pp.199-207.
- Latimer, E.(1972) "Comments on Dr. Yelaja's Paper on Student Advising" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.8, No.1, pp.71-72
- Leader, A.L.(1971) "An Agency's View toward Education for Practice" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.7,No.3, pp.27-34
- Lewis, H.(1982) The Intellectual Base of Social Work Practice: Tools for Thought in a Helping Profession, Lois and Samuel Silberman Fund, New York
- Libaissi, M.F.(1982) "An Integrative Approach to Primary Prevention in the Field" in Education for Primary Prevention in Social Work, Joan P. Bowker, ed., Council on Social Work Education, New York, pp.75-92
- Lide, P.D. & G. Alexander(1975) "An Educational Partnership: Preparing Social Workers for a Changing Society" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.11,No.1, pp.94-98
- Lindblom, C.E.(1959) "The Science of 'Muddling Through'" Public Administration Review, Vol.19, pp.79-88
- _____.(1979) Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving, Yale University Press, New Haven
- _____.(1980) The Policy-Making Process, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Livingston, D., K.W. Davidson, E.F. Marshack(1989)
 "Education for Autonomous Practice: A Challenge for Field Instructors" Journal of Independent Social Work, Vol.4,No.1, pp.69-82
- Martin, M.L. & S. Alper(1989) "Mutual Responsibility in Supervision: A Student Workshop" Arete, Vol.14,No.1, pp.52-56
- Meyer, C.H. (1986) "Integrating Practice Demands in Social Work Education" Social Casework, Vol.49, pp.481-486
- _____.(1989) "Practice in Context: The Maturing of a Profession", Journal of Teaching in Social Work, Vol.3,No.1, pp.151-160

- Middleman, R.R. & G.B. Rhodes(1985) Competent Supervision: Making Imaginative Judgments, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Nolan, L.G.(1953) "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Social Work Student" Social Casework, Vol.34, pp.156-161
- _____.(1954) "The Faculty Consultant in Relation to the Supervisor and the Agency" Social Casework, Vol.35, No.2, pp.62-67
- Patchner, J.(1983) "The Practitioner Becomes a Student: The Stresses of Transition" Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, Vol.2,No.2, PP.21-23 and 31
- Raphael, F. & A. Rosenblum(1987) "An Operational Guide to the Faculty Field Liaison Role" Social Casework, Vol.68, No.3, pp.156-163
- Raskin, M., ed.(1989) Empirical Studies in Field Instruction, Haworth Press, New York
- Ray, J., S.A. Minty, S.C. Matison, & J. Tucker(1990) "Women's Content: Involving Faculty and Students in Organizational Change" Journal of Teaching in Social Work, Vol.4,No.2, pp.19-36
- Rein, M., S. White(1981) "Knowledge for Practice" Social Service Review, Vol.55,No.1, pp.1-4
- Reynolds, B.C. (1942) Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work, Russel & Russell, Inc., New York
- Robinson, V.(1949) The Dynamics of Supervision Under Functional Controls, University of Philadelphia Press, Philadelphia
- Rosenblatt, A. & J.E. Mayer(1975) "Objectionable Supervisory Styles: Student Views" Social Work, Vol.20, No.3, pp.184-189
- Rosenblum, A. & F. Raphael(1983) "The Role and Function of the Faculty Field Liaison" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.19,No.1, pp.67-73
- Schubert, M.(1963) Field Instruction in Social Casework: A Report of an Experiment, University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Schultz, M. & W.E. Gordon(1977) "Reallocation of Educational Responsibility Among Schools, Agencies, Students, and NASW" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.13, No.2, pp.99-106

- Segel, B. & M.J. Austin(1974) "Innovation in Field Instruction: Community College Teaching and Staff Development" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.10,No.1, pp.77-80
- Sentman, L.(1949) "Some Observations on the Role of the Faculty Representative in Field Work" Social Service Review, Vol.23,No.3, pp.337-346
- Shaefor, B.W. & L.E. Jenkins(1981) "Issues that Affect the Development of a Field Instruction Curriculum: Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.17, No.1, pp.12-20
- _____.(1982) Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, Longman, New York
- Sikkema, M.(1968) "Analysis of Explanations Reported by Schools in the Working Party" Field Learning and Teaching; Explorations in Graduate Social Work Education, Council on Social Work Education, New York, pp.8-25
- Slocomb, G.A.(1991) "A Framework for Understanding the Liaison Process", Australian Social Work, Vol.44,No.3, pp.29-35
- Smith, H., G. Faria, C. Brownstein(1986) "Social Work Faculty in the Role of Liaison: A Field Study", Journal of Social Work Education, Vol.22, No.3, pp.68-78
- Steiner, J.R., F.A. Bokenhausen & R.E. Mundy(1990) "A Social Work Field Code of Transgressions" Journal of Teaching Social Work, Vol.4, No.2, pp.187- 94
- Tropman, E.J.(1977) "Agency Constraints Affecting Links Between Practice and Education" Journal for Education for Social Work, Vol.13, No.1, pp.8-14
- Urbanowski, M. & M.M. Dwyer(1988) Learning Through Field Instruction: A Guide for Teachers and Students, Family Service America, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- Vargus, I.D.(1977) "Supervision in Social Work" Supervision of Applied Training; A Comparative Review, D.J. Kurpius, R.D. Baker, & I.D. Thomas, eds. Greenwood Press, Conn. pp. 153-182
- Vayda E. and M. Bogo(1991) "A Teaching Model to Unite Classroom and Field" Journal of Social Work Education, Vol.27,No.3, pp.271-278

- Weil, M., J.M. Karls, and Associates(1985) Case Management in Human Service Practice, Jossey-Bass Pub., San Francisco
- Weissman, H. & M. Weil(1978) "Successes and Failures in Integrating Services and Helping Families" in Integrating Services for Troubled Families: Dilemmas of Program Design and Implementation, ed. H.H. Weissman, Jossey-Bass Pub., San Francisco, pp.95-120
- Weissman, H., I. Epstein, and A. Savage(1983) Agency-Based Social Work: Neglected Aspects of Clinical Practice, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Werner, R.(1969) "The Director of Fieldwork - Administrator and Educator" Current Patterns in Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education, edited by B. L. Jones, Council on Social Work Education, pp.157-164
- Wildavsky, A.(1967) "The Political Economy of Efficiency" The Public Interest, Vol.8, Summer, pp.30-48
- _____.(1981) "Does Planning Work?" The Public Interest, Vol.24, Summer, pp.95-104
- _____.(1982) "The Self-Evaluating Organization" Public Administration Review, Vol.32, No.5, pp.509-20
- _____.(1989) Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis, Little, Brown and Company, Boston
- Wilson, S.(1981) Field Instruction: Techniques for Supervision, The Free Press, New York
- Yelaja, S.(1972) "Student Advising in Social Work Education" Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol.8, No.1, pp.64-70