Order Number 8801729

Utilization of andragogical principles in a bachelor of social work program

Lewis, Patricia J., D.S.W.

City University of New York, 1987

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

UTILIZATION OF ANDRAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES IN A BACHELOR OF SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM

by

PATRICIA J. LEWIS

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

1987

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

9/28/87
Date

Robert Salmon, Chair

9/28/87
Date

Harold Weissman
Executive Officer

Robert Salmon

Harold Weissman

Florence Schwartz

Roselle Kurland

The City University of New York

Abstract

UTILIZATION OF ANDRAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES IN A BACHELOR SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM

by

Patricia J. Lewis

Adviser: Dean Robert Salmon

A descriptive study utilizing an andragogical approach to instruction within a field instruction seminar. The project was carried out in three semesters, a pilot study lasting one semester and a two-semester project. Students involved in the project shared in planning learning goals, learning modules and evaluative strategies with the seminar instructor. These were implemented and constituted the goals and objectives of the Senior field seminar. Both students, the seminar instructor and other program faculty were involved in the evaluative process. Students conducted both formative and summative evaluations; faculty were involved in the final evaluation. Outcomes indicated positive results from the use of andragogical principles in a learning environment.

Acknowledgements

My thanks to Dr. Harold Weissman for channeling my energies and thoughts in the right direction and for finding the best committee ever. To Dean Robert Salmon, my committee chair and to Dr. Florence Schwartz and Dr. Roselle Kurland my everlasting thanks. They were always supportive, their academic direction was superb and most importantly I never felt I was alone. To my committee:

I can no other answer make
but thanks,
And thanks.

12th Night

III. iii. 14-15

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING ANDRAGOGY

The planning and implementation of this project has utilized the theoretical formulation of Andragogy, a concept defined by Malcolm Knowles as "the art and science of helping adults learn."[1] The body of andragogical theory developed out of the need to mark the distinctions between the tradition of pedagogy and the relatively new science of teaching adults to learn. Prior to the 1960's, the focus in adult education was primarily on training, as opposed to educating, those individuals who, for a variety of reasons, returned to a learning environment after an absence of several years. Education was often aimed at helping adults acquire basic skills, or in retraining as structural changes occurring in the economy caused unemployment for certain workers. Those goals continue to be a focus for adult education. James Wright wrote recently of the need for a partnership between the educational and industrial sectors of our society in the task of retraining adults for the 1990's. He cited the loss of jobs in basic industries and the need for workers in white-collar and high technology areas. Wright described a joint public and private effort undertaken by the town of Lewiston, Maine, to plan for retraining a fairly large group of unemployed adults. The need for basic skill training, reading, writing and mathematics, as well as vocational retraining were identified by the planning group.[2]

During the past 10 years, two demographic factors, the dwindling numbers of traditional age students and the

increasing number of older students, many of them women, who are attending college, have initiated new interest in andragogy on college campuses.

Today, many of the adults entering college through continuing education divisions are seeking baccalaureate degrees rather than one or two courses to upgrade professional or vocational skills. This influx of older students has prompted educators to look more closely at traditional teaching methods and to recognize the differing educational needs of the adult learner.

Theories of adult learning take into account the changes that occur over time in the biological, psychological and social aspects of the individual's life. Although the research indicates that aging has an effect on intellectual performance, there is a great range of individual differences. Motivation and the environment are as important to the adult's ability to learn as they are to the child's. Whereas the rate at which the adult learns may slow down, learning efficiency remains constant.[3]

Experience is one of the advantages of age that may have both positive and negative effects on how the adult learns. For example, unhappy school experiences as children can be inhibiting to later learning. Learning new skills may be hampered by the need to unlearn former "skills". Mezirow suggests the adult learner must sometimes be freed from inhibiting cognitive patterns - patterns that are often reinforced through life experience.

Our perceptions of the world are molded by our cultural backgrounds and life-long interaction with others. Belief in stereotypes such as "a woman's place is in the home" may also hinder learning.[4]

Experience may also be a rich resource for the adult learner. The adult by virtue of age difference has, first of all, more experiences than does a younger person, in addition to many different kinds of experience. As a person matures, he/she accumulates a number of social roles that often include taking responsibility for the welfare of others. An adult's life is both qualitatively and quantitatively different from that of a child or adolescent. Adult's expectations, conditioned by past experiences, also differ; they have a broader base upon which more learning can accumulate. One's life experience is also a resource one can share; therefore, adult learners may act as resources for each other. Life experience influences the individual's ability to relate learning to practical "here and now" situations - an activity the research confirms as a characteristic of the adult learner.[5] Viewing experience in both its aspects is an important consideration in designing learning programs.

Adults also differ from the young in their self-concept. The mature adult sees himself/herself as independent, responsible and self-directing. The experience over-time in work situations and within social networks modifies an individual's sense of self. Knox cites the

tendency in adults to become more tolerant and understanding of life situations and themselves.[6] Adults who perceive themselves as having accomplished a number of life goals have a need to be respected for their achievements and to be treated as non-dependent persons. Achievement through life also gives the individual a sense of power and enhances his/her motivation to learn.[7] Lindeman described the kind of person who continues to learn through life ". . . a personality in whom many negative aims and desires have already been eliminated . . . such personalities seem to want, among other things, intelligence, power, self-expression, freedom, creativity . . . they are searchers after the good life - they want to count for something."[8]

Adults who return to college are fulfilling a self-motivated need, behavior that can be viewed in the context of human motivation as "positive striving". The concept of "positive striving" developed through the work of several theorists as a result of the idea that self-fulfillment and the need to enhance one's relationships within society were important motivating forces.[9] The adult learner may also be viewed in terms of Maslow's theory of self-actualization as a person seeks to reach his/her potential.[10] Robinson suggests that the adult's belief in the value of education as a means to help a person understand and adjust to life situations is a powerful motivator for learning.[11] Generally, the older student has clearly defined educational goals and that sense of knowing what one wants from an

experience also acts as a motivator. Learning experiences for adult students should take into account this self-striving, highly motivated orientation to education.

Although the study of how adults learn can be traced to the twenties in the writing of Eduard Lindeman, the philosophical foundations of adult learning developed somewhat earlier. The Chautauqua movement that began after the Civil War stressed the importance of life-long learning through prescribed reading, summer schools and voluntary associations. During the late 19th century, continuing education through extension programs was begun at colleges and universities. They offered the opportunity of higher education to working adults. Elias and Merriman suggest that the revival of liberal arts after the First World War also provided a basis for liberal adult education. The development of a philosophy of adult liberal education was further enhanced by Great Books programs and the culturally oriented programs created for the adult interested in intellectual growth.[12]

According to Malcolm Knowles, American interest in adult education was advanced in the twenties through the writings of Thorndike and Lindeman. Thorndike demonstrated through his research that adults do not lose the ability to learn as they grow older. Thorndike's work provided scientific foundation upon which andragogical theory developed. Lindeman's writings provided the "artistic stream" from which we learned how adults learn. Lindeman

described an educative process that differed from conventional education premised upon certain assumptions about the adult learner.[13]

Lindeman's conception of adult education grew out of his own experience returning to college after several years of working and his observations of European educational programs. His view of the purpose of adult education was to "put meaning into the whole of life,"[14] rather than to satisfy vocational needs. He stressed the importance of life experience as a basis for learning and cited the need for curricula that focused on the student rather than the subject. He felt others' experience is no substitution for one's own, in his words, "Experience is the adult learner's living textbook".[15]

Lindeman discussed the value of self-expression; an ability that may be enhanced by education. Education is also essential, he continued, in helping the individual become aware of extrinsic factors that in many ways determine behavior. Lindeman spoke of education as a liberating process that prepares the individual for conscious choice.[16]

In a recent article, Stephen Brookfield detailed the extent of Lindeman's contribution to andragogy. According to Brookfield, Lindeman saw clear distinctions between the educational needs of children and adults, emphasizing the informal and non-directive teaching methods for the adult learner. Adults, by virtue of their experience, are creative learners, able to critically assess theoretical

concepts and utilize them in practical ways. Lindeman proposed the small group as the most effective setting for adult education and cited learner-input as an essential component. Reflective discussion was the method he viewed as best suited to the adult learner.[17]

Interest in adult learning continued through the 50's and 60's, as continuing education programs developed in institutions of higher learning and through efforts of industry and business. A number of approaches to learning, such as Behaviorism, Humanism and Competency-based education influenced the development of a set of assumptions about how adults learn - assumptions that defined adult learning as an activity that differed from the learning of children and adolescents. Verner cited a number of factors that had impact on the development of continuing education - the expansion of knowledge in human psychology; the cultural changes that have occurred during the last two decades and the explosion of high technology in science and industry. Those factors provide the basis for adult education and help to differentiate it from traditional and formal education programs. He described four ways in which continuing education functions for the adult learner:

> Expansional. Individuals enter into adult life with various degrees of competence for the tasks which adulthood imposes. No individual is ever fully equipped for all the responsibilities of adult life; therefore, he must acquire new knowledge and skills continuously as his responsibilities develop and change through the years. Thus, as each stage of life expands the range of personal responsibility, adult education helps

> an individual to expand his competence from those skills involved in a vocation or profession to those involved in being a spouse, a parent, or a citizen.
>
> Participational. A democratic society demands the informed participation of its members in the processes of government. This participation calls into play a variety of skills and knowledge not normally acquired by individuals through ordinary educational channels. Adult education provides access to knowledge pertinent to local, national, and international issues as well as training and practice in the skills of civic participation.
>
> Integrational. In a lifetime of living in society, individuals accumulate a vast store of information and knowledge about a great range of subjects. Most of the problems which plague individuals could be resolved through the application of the knowledge they already possess. To do this, however, they must learn to integrate knowledge with experience in order to identify what must yet be learned and so that new knowledge will have meaning with respect to what is already known. The inability to identify the need for new learning is the greatest barrier to personal growth. Through systematic adult education, individuals can learn to identify their educational needs and to master the intellectual process that will enable them to integrate knowledge and apply it to the resolution of recurring problems.
>
> Personal. Maturation is a lifelong process that requires continuous learning as an integral part of living and growing. Such learning will free the individual from ignorance, from obsolete attitudes and values, and from irrational or immature behavior. Adult education provides access to learning through which an individual achieves continuous growth toward maturity in all phases of life.[18]

Verner contended that knowledge of the learner was essential in planning the learning experience and this included knowing learner needs and goals. He viewed the adult learner as one who enters an educational program for personal development as well as to gain problem-solving skills. Since adult students often have diverse back-

grounds, varying experiences and individual learning goals, the adult educator must be able to select and organize learning activities into a coherent experience.[19] Part of that planning process includes evaluation.

He stated:

> When evaluation is built into the learning process, it serves as both a check on goal achievement and as a medium for strengthening and extending motivation. Research indicates that awareness of progress is essential to continued learning: therefore, evaluation should provide continuous integrated measurement of progress. Such evaluation must be personal rather than competitive so as to enhance the internal motivation of the participant.[20]

Kidd also cited the need for an environment that is neither hostile nor highly competitive. He noted the emotional climate of the institution as an important aspect to the returning adult student. This includes not only the classroom, but other institutional facilities as well. He cautioned against using the group as the only method of teaching adults and proposed that learning goals should be taken into account when organizing the environment. In addition to the manner in which learning activities are organized, considering the environment must also be weighed. The adult educator provides the conceptual framework to which the learner may relate, not only his/her life experience, but also knowledge from theory. Kidd states, "The key to learning is engagement - a relationship between the learner, the task or subject matter, the environment, and the teacher."[21]

Knox suggests that adults venture into an educational setting with specific ideas and goals and that their success is a function of previous experience. That experience may include past learning attempts and may also include current educational needs. He cites the importance of congruence between the learner's goals and those of the educational program and suggests that participation by the adult learner in selecting learning activities is a way to achieve harmony. Knox emphasized, as did Kidd, the adult's need for a conceptual framework around which learning will take place. He described this in terms of a cognitive structure - that organizes the individual's previous knowledge and allows learning to accumulate. When prior learning or experience has not produced adequate cognitive structures, the instructor's intervention can be helpful. Adults benefit most from education where they are involved in setting goals and where learning can be related to their current life needs.[22]

Knowles offers the concept of self-directed learning to describe the adult learner's participation in the educative process. He defines self-directed learning as:

> the process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes.[23]

The above concept is essential to Knowles' theory of andragogy and it is contingent upon certain assumptions he

describes about the adult learner: (1) As the person matures he/she becomes more independent; (2) Life experience is an asset and a resource for the learner; (3) A person's readiness to learn "develops from life tasks and problems"; (4) Learning is "task or problem-centered" and (5) The adult learner is motivated by intrinsic rather than extrinsic rewards. Attitude is also important. Knowles views the adult learner as one who knows when to be receptive to being taught without losing that sense of self-direction.[24]

Knowles describes the andragogical model as an organic or process model, one that deals with content in a different manner than a pedagogical approach. The andragogical teacher is concerned with involving students in the process of learning. Knowles' Process Model contains the following elements:

(1) establishing a climate conducive to learning;
(2) creating a mechanism for mutual planning;
(3) diagnosing the needs for learning;
(4) formulating program objectives (...content) that will satisfy those needs;
(5) designing a pattern of learning experiences;
(6) conducting these learning experiences with suitable techniques and materials; and
(7) evaluating the learning outcomes and diagnosing learning needs.[25]

Knowles contrasts the process model with that of the content model. One of the differences, an important one, is the role of the teacher. Traditionally, the teacher made the decisions as to what was taught, arranged the curriculum and utilized a didactic approach. The process

model, on the other hand, expects the teacher or facilitator to share with students in creating the optimum environment for learning to take place. The student is also involved in utilizing the above described elements of Knowles' Process Model. Content may be the same in both approaches, the difference is in how it is transmitted. Knowles' approach also suggests differences in the nature of the student. In self-concept, experience and readiness to learn, the adult differs from the young student, and this notion provides part of the foundation of Knowles' approach to instruction.[26]

Knowles refers to the learning climate as both physical and interpersonal. The need for space, light, ventilation, etc., is recognized by all educators. It is the human and interpersonal climate that differentiates the andragogical approach. Knowles describes the teacher-learner interaction as one in which there is mutual respect, collaboration, consensus and support. Both teacher and student participate in planning and decision-making for diagnosing needs and setting goals. The environment is informal and evaluation takes place by mutual assessment.[27]

Knowles emphasizes the importance of the psychological climate as a basic first step to learning. A supportive, non-threatening environment allows the learner to express himself/herself freely and openly. Collaboration rather than competition sets the scene for sharing of ideas and

experiences - it allows the adult learner to utilize his/her own experience and that of the others as a resource. The setting, whether classroom or seminar, becomes an arena for learning. Knowles cites a number of group work techniques such as arranging the seating, introducing each individual, and orienting each to purpose - as ways to structure a favorable teaching environment.[28]

Knowles uses the terms facilitator or leader when describing the adult educator. He suggests the self-directed, highly motivated adult learner benefits more from non-directive learning. He writes of the creative educator whose teaching methods consider the learner first; who facilitates the process of learning in an open, non-threatening environment.[29] In The Modern Practice of Adult Education, Knowles identified sixteen principles of teaching that consider the characteristics of adult learners and support the notions of participation, mutual sharing, and self-evaluation.[30]

Robinson affirms the importance of the learning environment; he speaks of the "adult atmosphere". . . a "climate of mutual respect, a friendly, informal, supportive atmosphere".[31] He also supports the idea of a teacher as facilitator or helper, one who endorses self-discovery and encourages mutual trust and respect within the classroom. The most effective andragogical teaching is people-centered, in which instruction is geared to student needs and their degree of readiness. Robinson adopted from Kidd

the notion of relevancy, relationship and responsibility when planning learning experiences in adults. Adults engage in education in order to satisfy a self-perceived need. Learning, therefore, must be relevant and related to those needs since it is the learner who learns he/she must be helped to determine learning goals and the terms of evaluation.[32]

The andragogical approach to learning promotes self-evaluation as the most effective method to assess performance, knowledge or skills, but, as Knowles contends, there is not a substantive body of knowledge available presently within andragogical theory in regard to evaluation. He writes of the strong tradition of competition for grades in education that may be threatening to the adult learner and suggests establishing an environment conducive to self-diagnosis. The evaluative process within an educational setting might consist of determining the present level of knowledge or skills, setting desired goals, and assessing whether those goals were met. Traditional educational methods dictate that the instructor take primary responsibility for evaluating performance while andragogy gives the learner a substantial part in the evaluation process. Andragogical theory is formulated, in part, on the notion that learning is a life-long activity; evaluation, therefore, is never a final process, it is a way to raise one's learning goals to a higher level.[33]

Utilization of Andragogical Principles

During the eighties, teaching institutions have been experiencing a new phenomena - a dwindling college-age population. To counter dwindling enrollments, colleges are reaching out to the adult student. Andragogy has enjoyed a resurgence of interest as institutions modify traditional views about learners to entice and hold the adult student. Andragogy has called for a redefinition of the role of the teacher, as well as the learner and new insights into the process called learning. An approach that takes into account the principles developed by Andragogists is contract learning. A learning contract is an agreement between the student and instructor regarding what is going to be learned, the method of learning and the method of evaluation. In practice, the contract becomes the planning piece of the course of study. It allows maximum participation of the learner, while providing a framework within which learning can proceed. The contract is formal in the sense that both the student and the instructor sign it, but it is not legally binding. It provides a method for including the experience and resources of the learner in the learning process. Knowles suggests the roots of contract learning can be found in the practice of independent study begun in the 1920's. It utilizes the ideas about the adult learner proposed by andragogists such as the need to be self-directing; to utilize experience; to gear learning to relevancy and current needs. He writes:

> One of the chief virtues of contract learning is its almost infinite flexibility. Its heart is the process of negotiation between learners, facilitators and resource persons.[34]

Dr. Lois Muzio of Empire State College also stressed the flexibility of the learning contract. Each contract is an individualized learning module corresponding to the needs and goals of the student. She suggests that planning is integral to an optimum outcome for both learner and instructor. It is an ideal method to utilize with adult learners and useful with certain modifications with younger students.[35] Clark suggests the learning contract takes into account that people are different. These differences may effect learning, and, therefore, the contract helps to define the specific needs of each learner. Students are able to negotiate with an instructor the purpose and plan for study in addition to the strategies for evaluation. The process of negotiation assumes that both are active participants and that learning strategies will more closely identify with the individual student's goals and objectives. He also cited the flexibility that seems to be inherent in individualized learning contracts. Clark also suggested the need to prepare both students and faculty for this approach since it differs greatly from traditional pedagogical approaches. It fits well with the adult learner's characteristics cited by Knowles and others and mentioned above.[36]

Learning contracts have been useful in a number of

situations within College Misericordia's Social Work Program. During the Fall, 1986 Semester, a learning contract format was utilized with an adult student who is working full-time. Negotiations during the planning phase led to an agreement that considered the instructor's expectations for the course, as well as the student's needs. The student found it well-suited to her current life situation as it enabled her to continue working toward a baccalaureate degree while carrying family and job commitments. A modification of the learning contract was used in a field seminar during the same semester as an inducement to senior students to finish a series of writing assignments. Students planned individually their expectations for completing and handing in each paper. They took into consideration their other course work, part-time jobs and other commitments and set dates they felt were realistic. Each student completed a simple form with dates specified, signed the contract and returned it to the instructor. The instructor felt it was a successful strategy - it provided a structure wherein students took on a major part of the responsibility to complete an assignment in a timely fashion. It also was an exercise in planning for them. Only one student was unable to meet the contract times; but she re-negotiated her contract with the instructor.

There seems to be a dearth of information about the effectiveness of learning contracts as a learning strategy. A recent study conducted by Rosemary and Edward Caffarella

investigated whether learning contracts enhance adults' readiness and competencies for self-directed learning. They used a pre and post test on one hundred and sixty-three students from six universities to measure any significant gain in their competencies and readiness for self-directed learning. They used two instruments, the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale and the Self-Directed Learning Competencies Self-Appraisal Form, both administered by the professors teaching the courses at the beginning and end of the term. They found that the use of learning contracts had no effect on students' self-directed learning readiness, but that there was a significant increase in three of the twelve competencies. The students, who were graduate students, increased their ability to a) translate learning needs into learning objectives, b) identify human and material learning resources, and c) select effective strategies for using learning resources. The authors concluded that learning contracts should not be viewed as a major tool for the enhancement of the skills and competencies of self-directed learning. The study was focused on one use and not a primary use of the learning contract. More research needs to be undertaken.[37]

Andragogical principles have also been applied in other ways, and in settings that include business and industry as well as the college classroom. Knowles' recent text, Andragogy in Action, described two programs that are particularly relevant to this project. The first was

implemented at the University of Georgia School of Social Work within their MSW and BSW programs. Faculty used a step-by-step approach that introduced andragogical principles to BSW students in their sophomore year. In a second introductory course, students were asked to think about their own learning needs and to formulate, as a group, objectives for the course. The instructor acted as a facilitator lending structure to the planning. This conforms to the principles of mutual planning and diagnosing learning needs. Responsibility for their own learning was increased in the junior year. They were asked by their educational advisors to examine their own learning styles, and this information was passed on to their field instructors. The agency was able to use that information to structure a field experience suited to the individual learner. In courses other than the field, students assumed responsibility for learning strategies and participated in their own evaluation. A senior seminar, taken in the last quarter, allowed the student to assess his/her entire college program and to plan for future learning needs. The program promoted the concept of life-long learning that is self-directed by giving students first-hand experience in planning for their own learning.

Field instructors for both BSW and MSW students provided another andragogical experience. Students, first, selected a practicum site that met their own style of learning and objectives. They set up interviews and had

major responsibility for selecting a field site. Once a site was chosen, the student designed a learning plan that included strategies for evaluation according to a framework provided by the school. Students were expected to be assertive in planning and carrying out field tasks. Evaluation was focused on learning accomplishments. MSW students cited "critical incidents" within their field experiences and explained how objectives they chose were carried out. This provided evidence for grading the student. A final elective seminar for MSW students offered them an opportunity to utilize andragogical methods in a non-threatening environment and to learn by "doing". Students were given basic information about andragogy and asked to design a seminar referring to that theory. According to the instructor, the students extended themselves way beyond course requirements and exhibited a strong commitment to planning and carrying out tasks they had designed. Program faculty saw their roles as facilitative and encouraging rather than directing. They further saw the program as taking advantage of the basic principles of andragogy since students' learning needs provided the starting point for further planning. The authors concluded that their program, by allowing students a measure of autonomy within the educative process, enhanced their ability to carry out professional roles.[38]

Another attempt to utilize adult learning theory was carried out at the School of Social Work, University of

Victoria, British Columbia. The author used certain assumptions about the way in which adults learn to design a learning assignment. The first assumption noted by the author was the notion of teaching as learning - that teaching others enhances one's own learning. Other assumptions utilized were:

> the adult self-concept requires that such people be regarded as capable of self-direction; the adult has a fund of life experience, which can contribute to the learning enterprise; the adult is susceptible to learning at certain "teachable" moments; and the adult has a problem-centered orientation to learning which places a value on ideas that have immediate utility.[39]

Students were assigned a topic to research and, as part of the assignment, were to devise a learning kit. The objective was for them to design an instructional program from which others could learn. In order to design the learning kit, students had to think about the needs and motivations of the prospective learners, create the learning methods to accomplish those needs and plan evaluative strategies. One benefit from the assignment was that students had to have a solid understanding of the course content in order to promote learning in others. According to the author, the assignment helped students view their own learning styles and encouraged creative learning. Although the program was not evaluated on how well it promoted learning, students were enthusiastic and positive about the experience.[40]

An andragogical approach to training Children's Aid

Society workers was used a number of years ago by the Ontario Ministry in Canada. Trainees utilized Knowles' ideas in regard to the experienced adult learner who brings to the learning-teaching environment a wealth of experience, a high degree of independence and a need to learn in order to solve specific problems. Trainers viewed the staff of Children's Aid Society (CAS) as individuals who possessed those qualities. Using andragogical principles, they designed a training course that included the following ideas:

1) Course would be designed by the workers:

2) Participants would negotiate with trainers and other resource persons for course content;

3) The planning, diagnosing and negotiating would constitute a significant part of the training course.

After a period of initial distrust of that process by the trainees, an occurrence not unusual for learners faced with a new approach, workers were able to select training activities and content for the workshop. Trainees found the CAS workers lacked group problem-solving skills, and this slowed down the development of the planning process. A research format was included in the training workshop to assess changes, if any, in the trainees. The results of the research indicated that the program was effective in promoting personal growth and in developing worker strength in self-awareness and problem solving.[41]

The application of adult learning principles in a

policy/issue class for social work students was described in a recent issue of Lifelong Learning. The instructor's goal was to help students see the connection between policy and practice. He used a technique he called the "letter to the editor" in which students were asked to select an article or a TV or radio program pertaining to a problem or issue in the field. They were to analyze the material and write a letter to the editor of rebuttal, support or clarification of statements made in the article or program. The letter was then presented to the class for a critique. The assignment incorporated certain andragogical principles espoused by Coolie Verner, such as the importance of student participation, the dynamic nature of learning, the need for learning to be goal-directed and the need for a supportive environment. Others, such as the current application of learning and that learning needs to be reinforced, were also taken into consideration. Students also had practice in communicating both in writing and verbally to their peers. The assignment was deemed a success by the authors; in addition to being an interesting exercise, it gave the students an opportunity to "practice" policy. It also enhanced the student's ability to understand the importance of linking policy to practice in social work. The article emphasized the usefulness of an andragogical approach to teaching and, according to the authors, an approach that would be beneficial in a senior seminar.[42]

A fundamental assumption of andragogical theory is

that the adult learner must participate in planning his/her learning goals, learning methods and evaluations. Rosenblum and Darkenwald studied the effect of adult learner participation in course planning on their subsequent achievement and satisfaction. They utilized a post-test only control group design in two short seminars given to two groups of personnel in a large psychiatric hospital. The groups consisted of nursing supervisors and a group of other supervisory personnel who worked in the food service and maintenance divisions. Each of these were divided into experimental and control groups. Experimental groups participated in planning the seminar, whereas the control groups were introduced to goals and methods that had been planned by the experimental groups with the instructor. Outcomes of the evaluation indicated that the control groups tested slightly higher in both achievement and satisfaction. The authors concluded that participation had no direct effects. They noted that all groups tested high in achievement and satisfaction. In considering the results, they suggested that control groups might have benefitted from the planning of their co-workers and had their seminar been somewhat different, satisfaction might not have been as high. For practical application, the authors suggested that "it may not be necessary to repeat participatory planning procedures if the primary concerns are achievement and satisfaction."[43]

In a recent article Conti and Welbam described a study

that examined the impact of teaching style and of learning style on the academic achievement of 256 adult learners. Teaching style was measured with the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) that gives the instructors overall preference style - high scores indicate a learner-centered approach and low scores a teacher-centered approach. Those who support a learner-centered approach conform to Knowles' description of the adult teacher/facilitator. They encourage participation by learner and foster flexibility in the classroom. The teacher-centered instructor is more directive in the classroom. Students' learning style was measured with the Canfield Learning Style Inventory, which conceptualizes learning style as composed of a) conditions, b) content, c) mode of learning and d) expected level of success. The most important finding of the study was that teaching style has a significant effect on student achievement and that a collaborative mode is effective for teaching adults. The learning style findings indicated that a knowledge of students' learning styles may not be of tremendous value in facilitating student achievement. The authors suggested that "teachers need to take a careful look at themselves and their actions ... more importantly, it demonstrates the importance of practicing a teaching style which consistently treats adults with dignity and respect."[44]

Sample and Kaufman have proposed the idea that adult education needs to expand its borders and take a more

holistic approach. Educators must include in the design of adult education programs a way to include the social impact of programming. Adults seek education, on the one hand, to solve current life needs. The authors suggest that adult education programs do not take that idea seriously into account. A holistic approach requires that a program or organization include an external perspective in assessing needs. They asked the question, "Do adults learn anything that has validity and utility to them when they must perform and contribute in the real world of today and tomorrow?". A comprehensive description of their program may be found in the January and February, 1986 volumes of Lifelong Learning. Their program is not specifically relevant to this project; but the question they asked - Are adult education programs relevant? - has relevancy.[45]

The usefulness of Andragogy has caught the attention of many disciplines. The tenets and principles described by Lindeman, Knowles and others have provided a practical and useful foundation for many programs of adult education. Programs geared to the traditional age scholar have also attempted to mold the principles of andragogy with those of pedagogy to create a better teacher-learner environment. This project has taken into account Knowles' description of the adult learner as a self-directed, independent person capable of taking responsibility for his/her own learning; a person who also seeks learning in regard to career needs and goals - learning that is relevant.

The importance of the relationship between education and practice in social work underscores the need for relevancy in the design of educational programs. This project, which has utilized andragogical principles, is an explicit demonstration on the BSW level of andragogy in action. The intent was to provide useful information about the application of those principles for program design on both BSW and MSW educational levels.

Notes, Chapter I

[1]Malcolm S. Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980), p. 43.

[2]James E. Wright, "Retraining the Adult Workforce," Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research. Vol. 7, No. 2 (October, 1983): 21-24.

[3]J.R. Kidd, How Adults Learn. (New York: Association Press, 1973), pp. 53-61. Jennifer Rogers, Adult Learning. (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971), pp. 51, 52.

[4]Jack Mezirow, "A Critical Theory of Adult Learning and Education," Adult Education. Vol. 32, No. 1 (Fall, 1981): 3-22.

[5]Kidd, ibid., pp. 45, 46.

[6]Alan B. Knox, Adult Development and Learning. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), pp. 331, 343.

[7]Russell D. Robinson, An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change. (Wisconsin: Omnibook Co., 1979), p. 11.

[8]Eduard C. Lindeman, The Meaning of Adult Education. (New York: New Republic, Inc., 1926), pp. 13-14.

[9]Kidd, ibid., pp. 101, 102.

[10]Ibid., pp. 107, 108.

[11]Robinson, ibid., p. 1.

[12]John L. Elias and Sharan Merriam, Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education. (Huntington, New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1980), pp. 19, 20, 21.

[13]Malcolm S. Knowles, 3rd ed. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. (Houston: Gref Publishing Company, 1984), pp. 28-31.

[14]Lindeman, ibid., pp. 7, 8.

[15]Ibid., p. 10.

[16]Ibid., Chapters IV and V.

[17]"The Contribution of Eduard Lindeman to the Development of Theory and Philosophy in Adult Education," Adult Education Quarterly. Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 1984): 185-191.

[18]Coolie Verner with Alan Booth, Adult Education. (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 10.

[19]Ibid., pp. 51, 52.

[20]Ibid., pp. 56, 57.

[21]Kidd, ibid., pp. 245, 257, 266.

[22]Knox, ibid., pp. 425, 426, 428.

[23]Malcolm Knowles, Self-Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1975), p. 18.

[24]Ibid., p. 21.

[25]Knowles, 1984, ibid., p. 117.

[26]Malcolm Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species 3rd ed. (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1984), pp. 115-118.

[27]Knowles, 1975, Appendix-Learning Resource A. and Knowles, 1984, p. 223.

[28]Knowles, 1984, pp. 223-227.

[29]Ibid., pp. 193-197.

[30]Ibid., p. 57.

[31]Robinson, ibid., p. 42.

[32]Ibid., pp. 42-45, 63-66.

[33]Knowles, ibid., 1980, pp. 229-247.

[34]Malcolm Knowles, Using Learning Contracts. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1986), pp. 42-44.

[35]Workshop at College Misericordia, Dallas, Pennsylvania, January 22, 1986.

[36]Thomas F. Clark, Xeroxed handout from Workshop on Alternative Learning Strategies, College Misericordia, Dallas, Pennsylvania, November 7, 1986.

[37]Rosemary Caffarella and Edward Caffarella, "Self Directedness and Learning Contracts in Adult Education," Adult Education Quarterly. Vol. 36, No. 4 (Summer, 1986): 226-234.

[38]Allie C. Kilpatrick et al., "Social Work Education at the University of Georgia." Malcolm Knowles, Andragogy in Action. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984), pp. 243-263.

[39]Andy Farquharson, "Learning Through Teaching Among Undergraduate Social Work Students." Knowles, ibid., 1984, p. 266.

[40]Knowles, ibid., 1984, pp. 265-272.

[41]Bernard Gelfand et al. "An Andragogical Application to the Training of Social Workers," Journal of Education for Social Work Vol. 22, No. 3 (Fall, 1975): 55-61.

[42]Joseph Davenport, III and Judith Davenport, "The 'Letter to the Editor': An Application of Verner's Principles of Adult Learning." Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research, (September, 1984): 11, 12.

[43]Sandra Rosenblum and Gordon Darkenwald, "Effects of Adult Learner Participation in Course Planning on Achievement and Satisfaction." Adult Education Quarterly Vol. 33, No. 3 (Spring, 1983): 147-153.

[44]Gary L. Conti and Ruth B. Welborn, "Teaching-Learning Styles and the Adult Learner." Lifelong Learning (June, 1986): 20-23, 24.

[45]John Sample and Roger Kaufman. "A Holistic Program Development Model for Adult Educators." Lifelong Learning Jan. Vol. (January and February, 1986): 18-23.

CHAPTER II

THE FOCUS OF UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

This chapter intends to describe the focus of social work education as it has unfolded over the past few decades and as it is currently viewed.

Education for Social Work developed from the practice experiences of social reformers and charity workers of the 19th Century. The objective or focus then - to prepare for practice - remains the primary focus of social work education today. While input into the educational system by practitioners has diminished, social work educators continue to rely upon the professional community for an integral part of the educational experience. In order to prepare the student for professional practice, social work educators have had to mold various theories from a number of disciplines into a coherent, consistent whole. This process has spanned more than five decades and has included a continuous study of both graduate and undergraduate education.

A description of a number of major curriculum studies prepares the way for an understanding of how the focus for undergraduate social work education developed.

In 1948, a major study of social work education was sponsored by the National Council on Social Work Education. The purpose was to establish a framework within which the nature of social work and social work education could be clarified. The study, under the direction of Ernest Hollis and Alice Taylor, focused on such fundamental issues as the philosophy of professional education, the relation of

general and liberal arts to professional education, and accreditation of social work programs. Although undergraduate programs in Social Welfare were a reality, the major concern in the Hollis-Taylor Study was graduate education. The study itself was a move, along with the formation of the National Council on Social Work Education, to support professional education and unity among social work educators.[1]

Of the five recommendations that were articulated, one related to the purpose or focus of undergraduate education. The following is a summary:

1. Undergraduate Education should provide education in general concepts of social welfare to other professions as well as to social workers.
2. Undergraduate programs should develop a concentration in Arts and Sciences basic to graduate professional educational programs in social work.
3. The undergraduate college was seen as the place for training technicians for work in social welfare agencies. These were described as less than degree programs best placed in colleges currently offering other vocational or semi-professional programs.[2]

The above recommendations implied the non-professional status of the B.A. worker and defined the undergraduate program in social work as preparatory. The inclusion of -

preparation for other professions - reinforced the attitude that education for social work at the B.A. level should be of a general nature similar to that of other academic programs. The report referred to a continuum of social work education not unlike that of education for lawyers and physicians. The implication was that social workers should continue on to graduate school in order to become professionals. The report gave major responsibility to college administrators and educators in other disciplines in the design of the undergraduate curriculum. A review of the study indicates that, during the late forties, there was no clear focus for undergraduate social work educators relevant to the profession. Experts at that period of time did not view undergraduate education as the only preparation needed for professional practice.

Five years after the Hollis-Taylor Report, the Council on Social Work Education (C.S.W.E. so-named in 1952) commissioned an extensive and comprehensive study of social work education. The purpose of that study, under the direction of Werner Boehm, was to examine the state of social work education in light of current needs of the time as well as those of the future. It was hoped that educational objectives could be identified for each level of social work education that would enhance selection of learning experiences and evaluation criteria. The report was published in Thirteen Volumes; Volume II, coordinated by Herbert Bisno, focused on the function, content, and

organization of undergraduate education. Material for the undergraduate project was gathered from 79 colleges and universities; 51 of whom were constituent members of C.S.W.E. The material focused primarily on what existed at that point in time with some input from practitioners.[3]

The report concluded that an appropriate goal for undergraduate programs was preparation for employment as well as for graduate study. The title given the B.A. worker was - Social Work Associate. The role of the undergraduate curriculum was to bring together liberal arts and professional education. The project defined four major content areas to be included in undergraduate curriculums - socio-cultural basis of social work, group basis of social work, social work and the functioning of individuals, and the components of professional social work. The acceptance of these content areas, the planning of appropriate learning experiences and evaluation by educational institutions and the profession would legitimize both the programs and the Social Work Associate.[4]

In regard to employment, project participants viewed current practice in the field as the basis for their conclusions. They found that much of the direct services to clients were carried out by persons without specific social work training. Employment decisions in agencies were often made on the basis of expediency. In addition, there were no national standards for differentiating social work and non-social work functions. This caused great difficulty

for the researchers in their attempt to set limits or boundaries for practice in regard to workers from undergraduate social work programs. They concluded that, "at the very least, the student who takes the proposed undergraduate program of social work education should be much better prepared than a student without such preparation to be employed in social work."[5]

The undergraduate project as part of the larger curriculum project recognized the viability of undergraduate education for social work, at least from the point of view of undergraduate educators. The study itself and the conclusions reinforced the semi-professional status of the B.A. worker. The variety of employment practices in the field underscored the attitude that only graduate workers were professional workers. The greatest number of programs studied were housed in departments of sociology with the result that course offerings were limited by other than professional standards. Autonomy as a pre-requisite for professional status in both education and practice was denied the B.A. graduate.

The Bisno report can be viewed as a beginning in the slow but growing realization that the B.A. worker could be seen as a professional worker. Social work educators, particularly at the undergraduate level, were utilizing employment experiences of B.A. workers to help to give more focus to undergraduate social work education. Curriculum studies also helped to begin the formation of a course of

study that would lead to what the profession accepted as professional practice. The next major study of undergraduate education was undertaken by Syracuse University School of Social Work. In 1969, Syracuse began a study of undergraduate education funded by a contract with Veterans Administration. The study was a result, in part, of the recognition that manpower needs in the system of social welfare were growing. It was also an effort to maintain standards and professionalism within the field of social work. The project, under the direction of Lester Glick and Thomas Briggs, was an extensive study of undergraduate education and the B.A. worker. Educators, organized into four task forces, reported on the state of undergraduate education in the areas of course content, field experience, elective courses and the continuum in social work education. The report of the project was published in two volumes. Volume II focused on a number of studies dealing with the utilization of baccalaureate-level practitioners in social work and Volume I examined curriculum offerings from a number of undergraduate programs. Suggestions for curriculum development were offered to planners with the goal of enhancing the professional competence of B.A. workers. The study was a blending of what B.A. workers were actually doing in the field and how practitioners viewed their competence with what the goals of educational programs should be in terms of practice and educational concerns. The study indicated B.S.W. workers were involved

in more direct service activities than M.S.W. workers and that supervisors judged their work to be of high quality.[6]

During the time the Syracuse study was in progress, two developments took place in the field - N.A.S.W. opened its membership to B.S.W. graduates from C.S.W.E. approved baccalaureate programs and C.S.W.E. began to strengthen standards for undergraduate programs. This move on the part of C.S.W.E. led to the promulgation of standards for the accreditation of Baccalaureate Social Work Programs in 1974.

The Syracuse study was one of a number of manpower utilization projects undertaken in the 60's. The combined results signified the coming of age of the B.A. worker. Although the graduate of a baccalaureate program had gained status in the eyes of the profession, there were issues still to be resolved. One crucial issue was the lack of consensus by agencies that the B.S.W. graduate had social work skills and knowledge superior to those of B.A. workers from other disciplines. Many graduate schools of social work viewed the growth of B.S.W. programs with dismay. They saw the movement as weakening the professional status of the M.S.W. degree.

The changes that occurred in both practice and education during the 60's were instrumental in the establishment by C.S.W.E. of two task forces in 1972 - one on social work practice and education, the other on structure and quality in social work education. In 1976 C.S.W.E. issued the

policy statements that resulted from the task force findings. The policy statement from the task force on structure and quality began with the words, "There are two entry level professional degrees: the baccalaureate and the masters."[7] These words and the recommendations that followed served to reinforce the professional status of the B.S.W. graduate. Accreditation of undergraduate programs had been a reality for two years; a reality that graduate programs were beginning to recognize in their curriculum planning.

The Task Force report cited the baccalaureate degree as the first professional degree and stated, "the curriculum should include a required core of professional knowledge, skills and attitudes and content in basic supporting disciplines.[8] They differentiated the graduate degree program as one which consists of specialized education. It seemed natural to confer responsibility for the core to the undergraduate programs, and this occurred - but the task force also took into consideration the considerable number of students who would enter an M.S.W. program without the "core". For those students, graduate programs might also offer the requisite core of social work education. A minority report appended to the study's report suggested the baccalaureate degree as the generalist degree, and that suggestion became an important point of focus for many undergraduate programs. The B.S.W. became a "generic" degree and B.S.W. programs trained generalist social

workers.

C.S.W.E. accreditation standards provide a broad guide for program planners to follow. The expectation of a core body of knowledge is implied in the standards. Certain content areas were required of an undergraduate program such as:

> Knowledge of people as individuals and as members of families and other groups and as members of organizations and communities. Knowledge of the relationships among human biological, social, psychological and cultural systems in addition to content in cultural, racial and ethnic diversity.
>
> Knowledge of the philosophical, historical foundations of social welfare systems and content that enables students to analyze programs, policies and issues.
>
> Knowledge of social research and an understanding of its application to practice.
>
> Knowledge of social work practice with people as individuals and as members of families, small groups, organizations and communities.[9]

In addition to the above content, C.S.W.E. required that students have an opportunity to practice their skills in a field setting. Agencies had to be chosen with care and supervision was expected from both the college and the agency. In earlier standards, a minimum of 300 hours was stated; in the 1984 revision, a program was expected to describe fully the field program and no minimum number of hours was stated.

The 1984 revised standards also stated, "the baccalaureate is the first level of professional education for entry into the profession."[10] Curriculum content was

described as the professional foundation. According to C.S.W.E., B.S.W. programs should emphasize direct service to clients and that students be prepared for generalist practice. The standards do not suggest autonomous practice for B.S.W. graduates. The focus seems to be on educating an individual who understands client problems and the human environment, one who can act as a broker of service. The B.S.W. worker is a general practitioner, a direct service worker whose services to clients must be supervised, preferably by the M.S.W.

A curriculum study that had a great impact on undergraduate social work programs was begun by West Virginia University in 1975. The project, funded by the then Department of Health, Education and Welfare, published its findings in 1978. The project's purpose was two-fold - to strengthen curriculum building and to engage social work practitioners in curriculum planning. The final outcome of the project was to identify ten competencies that every student graduating from a baccalaureate program should have. They are:

1. Identify and assess situations where the relationship between people and social institutions needs to be enhanced, initiated, restored, protected or terminated.

2. Develop and implement a plan for improving the well-being of people based on problem assessment and the exploration of obtainable goals and available options.

3. Enhance the problem-solving, coping and develop mental capacities of people.

4. Link people with systems that provide them with resources, services and opportunities.

5. Intervene effectively on behalf of populations most vulnerable and discriminated against.

6. Promote the effective and humane operation of the systems that provide people with services, resources and opportunities.

7. Actively participate with others in creating new, modified or improved service resource opportunity systems that are more equitable, just and responsive to consumers of service and work with others to eliminate those systems that are unjust.

8. Evaluate the extent to which objectives of the intervention place were achieved.

9. Continually evaluate one's own professional growth and development through assessment of practice behaviors and skills.

10. Contribute to the improvement of service delivery by adding to the knowledge base of the profession as appropriate and by supporting the standards and ethics of the profession.[11]

Input from practitioners was an important component of the project; input far greater than had previously been attempted in curriculum studies. That fact, plus the extent of federal funding, had significance for the B.S.W. worker. Professional social workers in the field had begun to accept the B.S.W. into their ranks. Program planners, with the help of practitioners, had begun to express expectations in terms of what a B.S.W. worker should do in addition to what they should know.

The skills implied by the competencies such as assessment, treatment planning, brokering services, and advocacy were skills of a general practitioner. The study empha-

sized the belief within the profession that the B.S.W. was the first-line worker with generic skills. The focus, then, for baccalaureate programs was to build curriculums to meet those expectations. Many of Pennsylvania's undergraduate social work programs utilized the project's findings to modify and improve their social work curricula. College Misericordia was among them.

In 1976, the University of Montana implemented a competency-based curriculum in its undergraduate social work program. The modification of their curriculum developed over a two-year period during which the planner took into consideration the program's service area needs as well as the growing expectation among social work educators for accountability. Their program focus was to prepare B.S.W. workers who had a generalist problem-solving orientation. They expected their graduates to face a variety of problem situations while in practice and, therefore, needed to possess competencies that were broadly based. Their curriculum study resulted in a modification of their program and the addition of an exit examination for social work students in which they were expected to demonstrate certain skills. College Misericordia adopted and modified that examination for use in their program. The Montana experience emphasizes the generalist focus for undergraduate education.[12]

Pennsylvania State University's social work program has utilized both the Montana and the West Virginia studies

to organize their curriculum around a competency based model. In a recent paper, Gelman and Wardell articulated a set of "exit competencies" they expected their students to have acquired. They are related to the ten competencies listed in the Baer and Federico study. This is another example of undergraduate program support for a generalist focus. The competencies clearly set down the skills necessary to approach and help solve a wide variety of individual and social problems. Intervention by the B.S.W. worker is seen as the initial step in the treatment process and often ends as the worker links clients to other service delivery systems.[13]

Accreditation of undergraduate social work programs led to dilemmas regarding the continuum in education and in practice. Gwen Andrew proposed a schematic approach founded on four propositions based on the definitions of practice, learning hierarchies, strategies, and organizational arrangements. She suggested that educators sort out the concepts necessary to practice as her first proposition. Secondly, clients had a right to a treatment plan at their point of entry to service. Her approach emphasized the importance of M.S.W. competence for the intake worker, a somewhat different view from the above mentioned competency-based studies. Her third proposition suggested that learning is hierarchal - simplest concepts could be taught at the first level (BSW) and then incorporated into more complex concepts and principles at the M.S.W. and

Ph.D. levels. Her final proposition stated the view that practice methods should be the major determiner of the theoretical concepts to be included in the curriculum. In her analytic schema, she suggests several practice concepts relevant to the BSW worker - Evaluation of need, Resource seeking, Referral advocacy and Support. In practice, she underscored the idea of a team approach wherein the MSW worker would take major responsibility. Her approach suggests that undergraduate education provide a foundation upon which higher levels of social work can build. She does not deny the implication of the BSW worker as a generalist; she emphasizes the need for close supervision of the beginner as she describes the BSW worker.[14]

Constable wrote of the change in focus at the undergraduate level once accreditation became fact. The bachelot's level programs changed their focuses "from pre-professional to professional and their purpose to that of preparation for practice."[15] He described the curriculum content as generic and therefore useful in describing the foundation knowledge for all levels of social work education. It allows social workers the opportunity to practice in a variety of fields and is indispensible as a base for specialization. The generic knowledge base provided the core content for curriculum building at the undergraduate level and prepared the BSW worker for a variety of tasks in the field and for advanced standing in MSW programs. The focus for undergraduate education continues to emphasize

the generic approach.[16]

A pilot project undertaken at the College of New Rochelle defined a number of tasks and competencies expected of undergraduate social workers to enhance the linkage between BSW and MSW programs. Tasks were identified as "role clusters" and practice utilizing certain roles was often a progression of tasks. The functions as role clusters viewed as most appropriate to the BSW worker were those of Broker, Care Giver, Advocate and Outreach Worker. One of the differences between the graduate and undergraduate student was the ability to understand the dynamics of a situation and to master more complex tasks. The graduate student appeared to have a higher level of competence in those areas as well as in research and supervision of other workers. The study reinforced the view that certain roles such as broker and advocate are clearly seen as roles which the BSW can carry out effectively.[17]

In an article describing a design for incorporating human behavior in an undergraduate curriculum, Guidry states, "if the expectation is preparation for generalist practice, then the education to meet that expectation should be generalist also."[18] Curriculum design needs to take account of the profession's expectations of the BSW worker. They are neither therapists nor specialists, but rather practitioners competent in the problem-solving approach to client intervention. BSW workers need a wider range of knowledge than the specialist in order to work in

a variety of settings. They are expected to understand the inequalities and stresses of social life as well as the problems and crises of the life cycle. Guidry further cited the need for the generalist worker to understand the mechanisms of change, both planned and unplanned, and how they effect human behavior. She proposed a broad foundation of learning in human behavior as essential to the BSW worker.[19]

Dinerman recently cited the lack of continuity between BSW and MSW curricula. The expectation for a non-redundant educational continuum has not been met. In her view, we have not delineated the roles and tasks of the MSW from the BSW worker. She sampled 56 BSW and MSW programs to investigate the curricula content currently offered in those schools. There was great diversity among BSW as well as MSW programs even though the programs were accredited and followed the guidelines set down by CSWE. MSW programs tended to focus on social welfare and an analytic approach, whereas BSW programs focused on values and the profession of social work. Practice courses in BSW programs described as generic, also varied, with most emphasizing casework or employing a casework approach. Dinerman's study indicated that entry-level social workers may be more competent in some areas than graduate level workers. BSW programs build upon a liberal arts base which guarantees the BSW student will have a broad social science base. Her findings implied the BSW worker was able to assess situations and

help in a variety of problem areas and that the undergraduate programs were oriented to a generalist approach to social work. She concluded that the profession must take a harder look at educational programs and clearly define the "core" if there is one. If BSW's work at the client-facing level in public agencies, then those tasks and roles should help to shape the content of practice courses.[20]

According to Michael Kolivzon, the most recent Curriculum Policy Statement (CPS) from CSWE has created several dilemmas for curriculum planners. The Policy Statement clearly provides for a professional foundation to be provided in both BSW and MSW programs. This foundation or core became, very quickly, the focus for undergraduate programs. Where better to provide a group of foundation courses than at the baccalaureate level? The more than three hundred baccalaureate programs quickly assumed their task was to provide this foundation knowledge and skill clusters to their social work students. Since many students enter MSW programs without a BSW degree, the core must also be provided at that level. Kolivzon describes certain dilemmas - one that there is great ambiguity within curriculum guidelines; another is found in the plethora of terms such as "generalist," "specialist," "core," "base" and "professional foundation". Each carries a different meaning and planning, particularly for specialization, becomes very difficult. The CPS requirement of a professional foundation implies an extremely broad area of

knowledge and skills, one that MSW programs find difficult to provide. The emphasis on curriculum building has been on a continuum or vertical sequencing of content. Kolivzon suggests we must also develop horizontal integration of content and learning experiences as a method of utilizing instructional resources and tracking students interested in specialization. Vertical sequencing of social work curricula has provided the current focus for undergraduate programs on providing the professional foundation content.[21]

Although the broad-based generalist model for undergraduate education focuses primarily on general practice, undergraduate programs do offer special training in specific fields of social work. The community needs that constitute the environment within which a program resides often act as incentives to offer these specialties. Rural social work is a case in point. Many programs throughout Pennsylvania reside in or are contiguous to rural areas and their students are placed in agencies dealing with rural populations. The most current Curriculum Policy Statement (CPS) from CSWE states as a requirement that undergraduate programs build upon a strong liberal arts base in addition to providing the professional foundation knowledge. Martinez-Brawley cites the CPS as creating the incentive to design curricula that is interdisciplinary in nature. She describes interdisciplinary as referring to the contributions other disciplines and fields can make to social work offerings. She uses rural social work as an example of a

specialty that draws upon an interdisciplinary body of knowledge. Rural social work is oriented to generalist practice; its nature leads to practice by problem areas. The knowledge base needed for practice in that field is related to the body of knowledge delineated by social work, for example - cultural anthropology, rural sociology, etc. Although the focus for undergraduate social work curricula continues to be generic, a specialty such as rural social work, which can be described as a generalist practice, fits in well with BSW curricula.[22]

Anderson has proposed a generic model that provides a framework for BSW curriculum planning. In his description, he defines a number of terms he feels have led to confusion in defining the focus for entry level professionals:

> Generic refers to the elements of social work that are characteristic of all social workers . . . . . Generalist refers to the social worker's knowledge and skills for practice. Unlike the specialist, the generalist has a wide range of knowledge, methods and skills to bring to bear in social work situations . . . . Direct service refers to specific activities in which social workers help consumers directly . . . . Indirect services, on the other hand, focus on the institution of social welfare . . . . include planning, program development, etc.[23]

He concludes that entry level social work may be described as "direct-service generalist practice."[24] Focus flows from social works purpose and function - to bring together needs with resources and to mediate. Therefore, the role of the worker is to provide services that match people's needs. In Anderson's model, the worker must be able to assess the problem situation, and the client in

setting goals, and help the client reach those goals. The worker must acquire assessment, communication and problem-solving skills and be able to integrate the knowledge gleaned from the professional core and liberal arts base. The BSW worker in Anderson's view is a generalist and the undergraduate curriculum must prepare the student with an integrated, yet broadly-based, curriculum.[25]

Pincus and Minahan described the focus of social work practice as the "interactions between people and systems in the social environment."[26] The purpose of social work is to ameliorate the distress clients might feel from life situation problems utilizing the strengths and goals of the client. Social problems that individuals face can arise from a number of areas that include conducting life tasks and interacting with resource systems. Worker's tasks include problem-solving, delivery of concrete services, linking clients with resources and, in some instances, acting as agents of social control. Pincus and Minahan refer to practice methods, but their approach has implications for other areas of the curriculum. In order to interact with systems, one must have knowledge of organization theory, human behavior, social policy planning plus others. Although they use a general systems approach to practice and refer to the worker as a change agent, their ideas parallel the generalist approach cited by others.[27]

Several studies have looked at specific parts of the social work curriculum to determine whether a clear separa-

tion of course content is possible between BSW and MSW levels. A recent study by Michael Siepel viewed policy course content of both BSW and MSW programs. The purpose was to see whether specific knowledge and skill-building differed at each level of social work education and what linkages existed between those levels. He hoped to clarify curriculum building for future planning. Study findings indicated no agreement among educators in regard to appropriate policy content, and therefore it becomes difficult to make judgements about student competence. He sees a part of the problem in the very general guidelines from the recent (1984) Curriculum Policy Statement conceived by CSWE. Confusion seems to stem from the position that the professional foundation is taught at both levels of education - BSW and MSW - and no distinction is made for content at each level. Expectation is that both levels will prepare the student to be equally competent in regard to the professional foundation. Siepel suggests that, since a minimum requirement for the student is to understand the framework of social policy analysis, then content must be similar. Therefore, other areas of the curriculum might lend themselves to distinctions in course content. Though the focus for the BSW programs tends to be much clearer than that for the MSW, much work still needs to be done in designing the continuum in social work education.[28]

Anderson recently wrote in regard to the generic-specific issue as it impacts on the continuum in social

work education. He suggests that the history of curriculum planning signifies a direction from generic to the specific for both the general focus in social work education and the content. Educators at both levels must prepare the student to incorporate the professional foundation and be able to use that knowledge skillfully, with attention to values in practice. The difference may be seen in expected outcomes. "The objective of the BSW foundation is preparation for immediate practice, while the objective of the MSW foundation is preparation for the concentration or advanced practice."[29] The focus for the BSW program is to teach theory in such a way that the BSW worker can translate it into principles and skills for direct service practice.[30]

Anderson cites a number of task analysis studies that view the role of BSW as case managers; a role that requires a number of skills such as assessment, interviewing, brokering, coordinating and advocacy, skills that are generic in nature and basic to all social work practice. He suggests both levels of social work education develop upon a single foundation that "includes both generic and specific competencies for beginning and advanced direct service generalist practice."[31] His position ocncurs with the ideas of others cited above, that the focus for undergraduate education is on generalist conception of practice. He differs somewhat in stating that MSW practice is also generalist practice with a higher level of skill.[32]

Griffin and Eure surveyed 312 BSW programs in an

effort to identify the content within the professional foundation. They found agreement among BSW program directors and a high degree of consistency within content areas. The results indicated that content at the BSW level emphasizes

1. an understanding of social policy making and the service delivery system;
2. understanding human diversity and the results of minority status;
3. skills that enable the worker to assess problem situations; communicate with the client and engage him in a helping relationship;
4. research has less importance at BSW level;
5. values and ethics of professional practice.

It appears that BSW program directors agree that the focus for undergraduate education is to prepare a general practitioner, one who gives direct service to clients with strong professional supervision.[33]

Summary

The above survey of the literature indicates that the tasks and roles BSW workers take on have acted as one of the determining factors in specifying the focus for undergraduate education. The early curriculum studies stressed the non-professional status of the BSW worker; a stance that was often contrary to their responsibilities in the field. Course content was viewed more as general or liberal education and preparatory for graduate education in social work. In the fifties, schools of social work began to take a more rational view of undergraduate education.

Content on the undergraduate level was seen as preparation for a career in social work on a very minimal level. The BA worker was viewed as an assistant rather than a free-standing professional. During the sixties, manpower needs provided the impetus for another look at undergraduate education. There appeared to be a dearth of workers prepared for positions in social welfare. In addition, BA workers were providing direct service to clients and were often in supervisory positions after a number of years experience in the field. Their educational background was varied - from music to physics - few were products of undergraduate social work programs.

The professional organizations - N.A.S.W. and the Council on Social Work Education - took steps during the late sixties and early seventies to support the idea of a professional worker at the BA level. The baccalaureate degree from a CSWE approved undergraduate program provided admission to the NASW and shortly after CSWE developed an accreditation process for baccalaureate programs. Once that occurred, a more specific focus could be articulated for undergraduate education.

Accreditation of undergraduate social work programs spawned a continuing discussion and debate of several issues - the content and sequencing of the professional foundation; planning for a continuum in social work education, and the locus for specialization. The professional foundation provides basic knowledge of the profession, its

values and skills; it therefore provided a beginning structure for undergraduate programs. Course content developed from the expectations for professional education and the tasks deemed appropriate at the beginning level of professional education. The studies that have been carried out during the seventies and eighties have indicated a general agreement among undergraduate social work educators about the focus and guidelines for curriculum development for undergraduate social work programs. The BSW worker is viewed in a number of roles - case manager, advocate, broker, problem-solver and teacher. All may be subsumed under the heading of a generalist social worker. That designation, according to most educators, provides the focus for BSW programs.

The Undergraduate Social Work Program At College Misericordia

College Misericordia is a four-year liberal arts college sponsored by the Sisters of Mercy of the Union. It began in 1924 as a woman's college to provide young women of working class background the opportunity to attend college. It became co-educational in 1975. Social work courses, as electives, were offered within the sociology department as early as the 1940's. Social work was a career option for young women in Luzerne County and many of the public agencies hired Misericordia graduates. In 1969 the college began to plan, in earnest, to develop a program in social work and in 1971 they hired a full-time graduate

social worker as director of that program. The program was approved by CSWE in 1974 and accredited in 1975.

In 1980 the social work program supported the findings of the West Virginia Curriculum Study and moved to adopt a competency-based approach for the curriculum. Program objectives and course content were modified to meet, where possible, the ten competencies listed in the West Virginia study. An exit exam, similar to the Montana Curriculum Study Competency Exam, was also adopted as a way to measure the competence of program graduates.

The curriculum is organized with a liberal arts core curriculum, a social work core, a set of social work elective courses and a field instruction sequence.

The liberal arts core curriculum consists of the following courses:

Anthropology	3 credits
Art	3 credits
English Composition	3 credits
English Literature	6 credits
History	6 credits
Mathematics	6 credits
Music	3 credits
Philosophy	6 credits
Political Science	3 credits
Religious Studies	6 credits
Science	6 credits
Total	54 credits

The student may choose among a number of offerings within History, Literature, Mathematics and Religious Studies. The core is expected to provide a solid liberal arts foundation upon which the social work core is designed.

The social work core consists of:

Psycho-Social Foundation:

Introduction to Psychology
Social Problems
The Family
Cultural Minorities
Maladaptive Behavior
Adaptive Behavior

Social Work Policy Sequence:

Introduction to Social Welfare
Social Welfare Policies and Services

Social Work Practice Sequence:

Communication Skills
Social Work Methods and Processes I and II

Research:

Basic Statistics
Research Methods

Field Instruction:

Community Service
Junior Field Instruction
Senior Field Instruction

The student is also required to choose two social work elective courses from a cluster of eight that are offered every year. These are usually taught by practitioners from the surrounding community.

The Junior field instruction course consists of two days per week for one semester. The Senior field instruction requirement may be fulfilled by a concurrent placement of two days per week for two semesters or a modified block placement of four and one-half days per week for one semester. Program faculty view the senior field experience as a culminating experience in which students have the

opportunity to utilize theoretical concepts as they sharpen practice skills. Each student in field attends a field seminar that meets once a week; its purpose is to help the student integrate theory with practice and provide an arena which allows them a link to the program.

The program expects to graduate an individual whose educational experience has been broadly conceived rather than specialized; an individual prepared to practice social work in a variety of settings. That expectation provides the focus for College Misericordia's social work program - to prepare the generalist social worker.

This chapter has dealt with the idea that there is a focus for undergraduate education - to prepare an individual to enter professional practice who is able to help any number of different clients solve a multitude of problems. What is implied is that worker must have the maturity and self-assurance to take on professional practice. There is, unfortunately, nothing in the literature that suggests an andragogical approach to instruction might enhance the worker's ability to be self-assured and able to make judgements. Andragogy is premised upon the notion that participation by the learner enhances the learning process and reinforces the self-directing independent characteristics of the learner. The intent of this project was to utilize an andragogical approach to instruction in an effort to test that approach's efficacy for undergraduate education.

Notes, Chapter II

[1]Ernest V. Hollis and Alice Taylor. Social Work Education in the United States. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951) pp. 7-10.

[2]Ibid., pp. 395-397.

[3]Herbert Bisno. The Place of the Undergraduate Curriculum in Social Work Education. Volume II. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959) pp. 13-15.

[4]Ibid., pp. 90-107.

[5]Ibid., p. 76.

[6]Lester Glick, ed. Undergraduate Social Work Education for Practice: Report of the Curriculum Building Project Conducted by Syracuse University School of Social Work. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971) pp. 1-6.

[7]Policy Statement on Social Work Practice and Education and Structure and Quality in Social Work Education. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976) Part II, p. 1.

[8]Ibid., p. 3.

[9]Handbook of Accreditation Standards and Procedures. Rev. July, 1984. (New York: Council on Social Work Education) Section 7, pp. 6, 7, 8.

[10]Ibid., Appendix I, p. 5.

[11]Betty L. Baer and Ronald Federico. Educating the Baccalaureate Social Worker: Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Project. (Mass.: Ballenger Publishing Company, 1978) pp. 86-89.

[12]Morton Arkava and E. Clifford Brennen. Competency-Based Education for Social Work: Evaluation and Curriculum Issues. (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976).

[13]Sheldon Gelman and Patrick Wardell. "Exit Competencies": The Assessment of Baccalaureate Social Work Students' Professional Development. (Paper presented at Annual Program Meeting of C.S.W.E. New York, NY, March, 1982).

[14]Andrew Given. "Doing Concepts: Thoughts Toward Resolution of the Continuum Dilemma." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 12, No. 1 (Winter, 1976):3-9.

[15]Robert Constable. "New Directions in Social Work Education: The Task Force Reports." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Winter, 1978):23-28.

[16]Ibid., 1978.

[17]James J. Magee. "Linkage and Progression of Associate-Baccalaureate-Graduate Students in Field Instruction: Report From a Pilot Project." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter, 1979):59-64.

[18]Rosalind Guidry. "A Design for Teaching Human Behavior in a Generalist Undergraduate Program." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 15, No. 2 (Spring, 1979):47, 48.

[19]Ibid., pp. 45-50.

[20]Miriam Dinerman. "A Study of Baccalaureate and Master's Curricula in Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 18, No. 2 (Spring, 1982):84-91.

[21]Michael Kolivzon. "Conflict and Change Along the Continuum in Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 20, No. 2 (Spring, 1984):51-57.

[22]Emilia Martinez-Brawley. "Interdisciplinary Aspects of the Baccalaureate Curriculum in Rural Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 20, No. 2 (Spring, 1984):51-57.

[23]Joseph D. Anderson. "Generic and Generalist Practice and the BSW Curriculum." Journal of Education for Social Work. Vol. 18, No. 3 (Fall, 1982):39.

[24]Ibid., p. 39.

[25]Ibid., pp. 40-44.

[26]Allen Pincus and Anne Minahan. Social Work Practice: Model and Method. (Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1973) p. 3.

[27]Ibid., pp. 4-10.

[28]Michael Seipel, M.A. "Content Analysis of Social Welfare Curriculum." Journal of Social Work Education. No. 2 (Spring/Summer, 1986):53-60.

[29]Joseph Anderson. "BSW Programs and the Continuum in Social Work." Journal of Social Work Education. No. 3 (Fall, 1985):64.

[30]Ibid., pp. 63-65.

[31]Ibid., p. 70.

[32]Ibid., pp. 65-70.

[33]Jerry Griffin and Gerald Eure. "Defining the Professional Foundation in Social Work Education." Journal of Social Work. No. 3 (Fall, 1985):73-79.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This project was an exploratory study intended to provide, through a descriptive process, new insights in regard to andragogical theory. The project utilized an andragogical approach to instruction within a baccalaureate social work program. The goal - to compare the experience of senior social work students who participated in the project with Malcolm Knowles' assumptions and descriptions of adult learners. The intention was to build upon the andragogical model designed by Knowles and others and provide material for further study.

In keeping with andragogical theory, there are certain assumptions upon which the project was structured. First, the assumption that the senior student has passed through a life development process from "old" adolescent to young adult during the first three years in college. Second, that seniors are knowledgeable through their field experiences of the current methods of practice and areas of interest within the professional community. That understanding coupled with their first-hand knowledge of the program curriculum allowed them to make effective and valuable contributions to their own educational goals. Third, as seniors preparing for the job market, they have specific needs that might not be addressed within the social work program curriculum. In the past, the planning and implementation of the curriculum conformed to a pedagogical approach to learning. This project, in its intent to share educational planning with students, was a depar-

ture from the faculty-directed, subject-centered curriculum development process that was found useful in the past. Utilization of an andragogical approach takes into account the contribution the adult student can make to his/her own educational planning as individuals and in a group. Program faculty expected the benefits espoused by andragogical theorists to accrue to both students and the social work program. A long-range goal was to utilize project findings in modifying the on-going curriculum planning process and the design of specific courses.

The design and implementation of this project fell within a limited time period of three semesters. Project objectives may be stated as follows:

1. To stimulate interest in an andragogical approach to educational planning.
2. To provide information in regard to a faculty/student participative planning process.
3. To provide information about the practical application of andragogical theory.
4. To explore the potential contributions undergraduate students may make to curriculum design.
5. To test the efficacy of an andragogical model as a framework for continuing student participation in curriculum design.

To achieve those objectives, the program design included the following:

1. Implementation of a preliminary planning process that will explore and compare educational goals selected by faculty with those selected by students.

2. Implementation of a participative planning process within a senior seminar that will utilize Knowles' Process Model design.

3. Assessment of the planning process as it unfolds and evolves within the senior seminar.

4. A comparative analysis of our senior social work students' experience with the theoretical principles of andragogy.

5. An outcome evaluation of student performance that will include student self-evaluations, instructor and faculty evaluations.

Project Setting

The locus for this study was the senior field instruction seminar, a course required of all seniors who are enrolled in a field practicum. The senior field requirement is met by one of two field options - a concurrent placement of two days per week for two semesters or a block placement of four and one-half days per week during the Fall Semester. The senior student must also complete a competency exam - a series of eight papers that draws material from his/her practice experience and from prior coursework. Because of the more demanding nature of the block placement, in terms of time, most students choose a concurrent placement. The field practicum is viewed as one of the principle means for reinforcing and integrating the academic curriculum, and the field seminar is looked upon as the vehicle for enhancing those processes. In addition, the seminar is expected to enhance that transitional process the students go through - from student to practitioner.

In order to meet those expectations, it was felt essential to keep the seminar group small in number. That was done by dividing the senior field students into two seminar groups. For the past several years, seminar enrollment has fluctuated between six and nine, paralleling our senior enrollment that has ranged from twelve to eighteen students.

The seminar instructor's tasks have been to plan learning strategies for the seminar, act as liaison to agencies and to monitor the students' progress toward completion of the competency exam. The instructional approach was pedagogical in that the instructor planned learning goals, designed learning activities and determined the students' final grade. Evaluation of the students' performance in the agency and seminar was based on criteria and a weighted scale that had been created by social work program faculty. The seminar outline spelled out field requirements, course objectives and provided students with a format to follow for seminar discussions in addition to describing the nature of those discussions.

As the setting for this project, the seminar differed from previous seminars in two distinct ways. The role of the instructor changed from a directive to a facilitative role, and that of students from passive to self-directed learners. In effect, students took an active role in decisions regarding their learning goals, the means to reach them and the strategies for evaluation. The sub-

stance of the seminar also differed since students shared in the determination of what took place. A major concern was to structure the seminar to enhance the role of students and instructor. The expectations were that students viewed the instructor as a resource and that they were comfortable in their planning roles.

The model chosen to be followed in structuring the seminar was Malcoln Knowles' Process Model, a model designed for the self-directed adult learner. It is premised on certain assumptions about the adult learner that might be described as follows:

1. As individuals mature, they develop the capacity for independence that leads to -
2. A need to be self-directing and autonomous.
3. An adult's life experience may be viewed as an educational resource that can be shared.
4. Adults, by virtue of their life cycle roles, have specific educational needs directly related to those roles.
5. Adults' first priority in education is the acquisition of skills that are competency-based and useful for current life needs.[1]

The principle elements of Knowles' Process Model that will provide the framework for the seminar design are:

1. Creation of a learning environment that is non-threatening and flexible.
2. Development of structures that encourage participation of seminar members.
3. Establish means of identifying learning needs.
4. Promote the development of learning goals.
5. Foster the development of learning experiences.

6. Establish the context for acquisition of skills and competencies.

7. Stimulate the design of evaluative strategies.[2]

The model stresses the development of a participative process between student and instructor - there is mutual sharing throughout. Knowles views the educational climate as a crucial factor in promoting learning. It must convey the notion that the individual student is of primary importance; learning, therefore, revolves around his/her needs. It is a process model in that the instructor sets the stage for learning, but does not plan the content. The model implies movement that is on-going and in one sense never-ending since learning continues to occur throughout life.

Plan For Implementation

The project began during the 1985 Spring Semester. The first part may be described as a preliminary planning phase in which senior social work students and social work faculty were asked to participate. They were organized into two separate planning groups - their task to select and conceptualize educational goals for the senior field seminar. This part of the project extended over a period of approximately eight weeks, during which time the groups worked independently. Preliminary discussions with the faculty suggested the number of meetings needed to complete the task differed for each group. The decision was made to ask the students to meet twice a week for one and one-half hours. Faculty met as necessary, during the same time

period; as expected, three meetings sufficed.

The instructor's function in both groups was to act as facilitator and observer. As the student group progressed, the expectation was that leadership would emerge from within the group so that, eventually, input came primarily from students. The facilitator helped the student group focus their discussion and acted as a resource. The facilitator's role in the student group differed somewhat from that with faculty, as the plan was to participate more actively with students. Each group carried out its task with as little input from the other as was possible given the circumstances.

The second part of the preliminary phase consisted of several combined meetings. Both groups came together to share their ideas and to negotiate, where necessary, a final list of educational goals. The expectation was that these goals would reflect student needs more accurately than was the case in the past. Student participation in planning learning goals also reflected an andragogical approach to instructional design. The final educational goals and the information gleaned from an assessment of this preliminary phase provided a base from which the next phase of the project was implemented.

Findings from the preliminary phase were incorporated in the two-semester field seminar scheduled for the 1985-86 academic year. The structure and organization of the seminar followed Knowles' Process Model to allow students a

share in planning for their own educational experiences. Participation in developing the seminar included mutual assessment of learner needs, formulation of educational objectives, selection of learning formats and activities, and development of self-evaluation strategies. Educational goals articulated by students and faculty during the Spring '85 semester were shared with seniors during the first few meetings of the 1985 fall seminar.

The fourteen weeks of the Fall Semester during which the seminar met were divided into three time periods. A tentative plan allowed four weeks for students to explore and plan educational objectives; seven weeks for implementing learning activities and three weeks for students to review their progress in meeting educational goals and to begin the task of planning for the Spring 1986 field seminar.

Following the semester break, students were asked to resume the tasks of review and re-diagnosis of educational needs. The project continued until students articulated concerns more closely linked to careers than to academic needs. For example - requests for job interviewing skills constituted movement toward careers and the job market. When that point was reached, the final project evaluation took place.

Data Collection and Evaluation Procedures

As stated above, the focus of this project was to explore the utility of an andragogical approach to instruc-

tion. Evaluation included a description of the processes that occurred throughout the project and an assessment of the final effects. During the program phase, evaluation essentially involved formative strategies, described by Scriven and others as those assessments made during operation of a program or project.[3] Students, as participants, made assessments at certain intervals during the project, and the facilitator, as an observer-participant, described the processes that occurred and compared them to andragogical theory.

In an attempt to evaluate outcomes, both students and faculty made final assessments. There was no attempt to measure causal relationships or to generalize the findings; instead, outcomes were descriptive in nature. Students made assessments of their own progress toward reaching educational goals. In their final evaluation, information was gathered about whether their participation in planning learning goals and activities enhanced their learning. The final evaluation by faculty was a collaborative effort undertaken by the three full-time social work faculty members. As the project came to an end, they met a number of times to discuss their perceptions of student performance. Their judgements took into consideration the field evaluations submitted by agency field supervisors and the students' written competency papers. Discussions also included subjective impressions based on student/faculty interactions during their final year on campus. As the

description in Chapter II indicates, College Misericordia's program is small and there is frequent contact between faculty and students. This contact seems to intensify during their final semester as students prepare to graduate. In addition, all three faculty have contact in the classrooms. The other two social work faculty team-teach a required senior course that is given in the Spring Semester and the Project Facilitator has responsibility for the senior field seminar (the setting for this project). Discussions in regard to students focused on what is believed to have been the effects of an andragogical approach to teaching on their performance. In a limited sense, the group of students, who participated in the project, were compared to previous groups. Faculty and students both view the senior field experience as an important component in their development as professional social workers. Their performance in the field is a function of their ability to operationalize theoretical concepts. It is also the arena where it is hoped they will develop other qualities such as:

*a sense of responsibility for their own actions;

*the ability to be self-directing and autonomous;

*the ability to make decisions independently.

The project's intention was to enhance the development of those qualities by sharing with students the responsibility for their own learning. The judgements made as the project ended included a consideration of that intent.

Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures

A number of methods were employed to gather and assemble relevant data. They included tape recordings of planning sessions, logs of observations of the investigator, attendance records, and group discussion records. Tape recordings were utilized to review the extent and quality of student's participation in planning sessions that took place during the 1985 Spring Semester. Faculty planning sessions and the combined faculty/student sessions were also recorded on tape. These plus the logs of observations kept by this investigator were used to describe the processes by which learning goals were explored and finalized. An analysis of those processes as they compare with andragogical theory were monitored and described in Chapter IV.

Monitoring measures continued during the second part of the project that began in the Fall 1985 Semester. Logs were kept of each session of the field seminar. Taping was used selectively during this time. The logs, written directly after each session, documented the investigator's observations of group processes, attendance and participation of students. Materials designed by students as part of learning formats also became part of the record-keeping. A primary focus for collection of data was to gather information relative to the students' experiences as they planned educational goals, designed learning activities, and chose evaluation strategies. This material provided the data base for the analysis of the processes as they

occurred over the life of the project. The intention was to compare what occurred during the seminar with the processes and expectations that have been described by andragogical theorists.

Students' first task in the Fall '85 was to plan educational goals. As that task ended, a questionnaire was administered to elicit students' perceptions of the planning process (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was designed to generate information related to Knowles' Process Model (described on p. 10). The questions were both closed-ended in that they limited responses to yes - no - or somewhat and open-ended to the extent that respondents were also given the opportunity to comment.[4] The following issues were explored:

1. Students' perceptions of the seminar environment.
2. The nature of their participation in the planning process.
3. Their views in regard to the educational goals that were chosen.

As the Fall Semester ended, students were asked to respond once again to a questionnaire (see Appendix B). The intent was to allow students to judge the extent to which the seminar was of benefit as a learning experience. Questions were open-ended to allow a free-flowing response from students.[5] They responded again to questions about the learning environment and seminar members' participation. In addition, they were asked if learning activities were related to their experiences in the field and if

certain aspects of the seminar were helpful to their professional growth. They were also asked to review the educational/professional goals that they developed and to rate their progress toward reaching them. That process allowed them to review and evaluate the substance of the seminar and to begin planning for the following semester. This is in keeping with the principles of Knowles' Process Model in that learners re-diagnose learning needs as an important part of the dynamics of learning.[6]

As mentioned, planning for the Spring Semester began as part of the evaluation process in the Fall and continued as students met again in January. They had an opportunity to review what had been accomplished and to identify learning needs for the Spring Semester Seminar. The facilitator continued to facilitate these processes and to provide information and help in carrying-out learning activities. The field seminar as a regularly scheduled course continued until the last week in April; the project ended as students articulated learning needs that linked them to the job market. At that point, students and faculty were asked to complete the evaluation.

The faculty's final evaluation procedure has been described above. Students conducted a self-evaluation in which they were asked to rate themselves as well as the seminar. A questionnaire was administered to students; so designed to enable them to respond freely and fully (see Appendix C). Questions related to their efforts in plan-

ning a seminar and how it was helpful to their own educational progress. They were asked to assess their progress in relation to the educational goals they developed and to assess their own confidence and competence as practitioners.

The evaluation of this project over time is described in Chapter IV. Outcomes of the evaluation processes are explained in Chapter V; conclusions and implications in Chapter VI.

Notes, Chapter III

[1]Malcolm Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980) pp. 43, 44.

[2]Idem, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. 3rd ed. (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1984) pp. 116, 117.

[3]Michael Scriven, "The Methodology of Evaluation" in Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. Carol H. Weiss, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972) p. 126.

[4]Clare Seltig, Lawrence S. Wrightsman and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976) pp. 310, 312.

[5]Ibid., p. 312.

[6]Knowles, ibid., 1980, p. 49.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter describes the processes that evolved during the implementation of this project. It includes an analysis of the relationship of those activities to andragogical theory. There were two stages to this project - the first, a pilot study carried out during the Spring, 1985 Semester and the second, a year-long seminar encompassing two semesters - Fall, 1985 and Spring, 1986. The time phases are depicted in the following charts:

TIME CHART - SPRING SEMESTER, 1985

Goal Planning With Students	Faculty Planning Sessions
Session 1-January 30, 1985	
Session 2-February 4, 1985	
Session 3-February 11, 1985	
Session 4-February 13, 1985	
Session 5-February 18, 1985	
Session 6-February 20, 1985	
Session 7-February 25, 1985	Session 1-February 25, 1985
Session 8-February 27, 1985	Session 2-February 26, 1985
Session 9-March 4, 1985	Session 3-March 1, 1985

Combined Faculty/Student Planning Sessions

Session 1-March 6, 1985

Session 2-March 8, 1985

There were several reasons for engaging in a pilot study. First, was the expectation of utilizing an andragogical approach with students in a year-long field seminar during the 1985-86 academic year. The intention was to utilize the knowledge gained from the pilot study in that

endeavor. Second, the social work faculty was interested in knowing how student ideas in regard to educational needs would mesh with theirs. A very wide gap between the two might discourage an attempt to test-out an andragogical approach in the Fall. Third, an intention to compare the learning needs articulated by senior students with those espoused by adult learning theorists. The latter information would also be helpful in the next stage of the project.

Knowles and others have described the learning needs of adults as different from those of the younger student. Life experience, life cycle stage and current roles influence the educational decisions made by adults. Adults develop according to life cycle events much the same as children develop over certain crucial periods in their lives. For adults to learn, they need to be educationally challenged in ways that differ from traditional pedagogical ideas. Robinson suggests the "Three R's of Adult Learning" are comprised of Relevancy, Relationship and Responsibility.[1] Educational goals and activities must make sense to the adult learner, and they must be related to his/her current life needs. Most importantly, the adult must be allowed to assume responsibility for his/her own learning. A learning environment designed with those motives in mind acts as an incentive to the adult who wishes to return to the classroom.[2]

Bergevin states that goals should be realistic and

attainable. When goals are difficult to attain, the desire to learn diminishes. Desired educational outcomes should be described as specifically as possible, and they should allow for small successes along the way. Achievement then becomes the incentive for continued learning.[3] This idea is reinforced by Verdiun, Miller and Greer who suggest that, when goals are difficult to attain, frustration results. They believe that the adult student is more individually unique than the younger student, therefore, educational goals and objectives must reflect this uniqueness. An adult's life experience is a foundation and a starting point from which learning and the selection of learning goals must proceed.[4]

Verner also cites the divergent backgrounds the adult learner brings to the learning situation and the need for clarity in specifying goals. Since goals are translated into learning tasks, they must be functional, as well as related directly to the educational needs of the adult. This can be achieved by allowing the adult student to participate actively in planning those goals.[5] Knowles, too, stresses the need for mutual planning and decision-making within the framework of adult education. He places responsibility upon the teacher or facilitator for providing an environment wherein the adult feels secure in his ability to participate actively. Participation does not end at the point where goals have been articulated, rather it continues throughout the learning/teaching situation from selec-

tion of goals to evaluation and rediagnosis.[6]

It is Knowles' description of the characteristics of the adult learner and the factors that set him apart from the younger student that will provide the standard for comparison in this part of the project. An adult's experience and the various social roles he performs sets him apart in what has been described as readiness to learn. Those factors can also be identified as a basis for motivation to learn and how one incorporates knowledge best. Practical application of knowledge is an essential strategy for the adult educator. Adults learn for the "here and now" and this, according to Knowles, becomes apparent in their educational planning.[7]

The adult learner has a strong sense of self-direction and a clear idea of the path to self-improvement. This allows for rational planning of educational goals. It also gives the learner a sense of "owning" those goals which enhances one's determination to reach them. Another area in which the adult learner differs from the younger student is in the ability to share experiences as a strategy for helping others in the learning situation. Through their life experiences and successful social role behavior, adults are rich resources in the classroom, and most theorists recognize the benefits to learning that flow from the adult student's active participation in the classroom. The ideal strategy for the adult educator is to allow a "flowering" of the adult student's ability for self-direction

and his role as a resevoir of experiential knowledge.[8]

In keeping with the above ideas from andragogical theory, the following questions were utilized as standards for comparing the educational planning activities of the senior Social Work majors:

1. Were students willing to participate actively during the planning sessions?
2. Were students able to share their experiences in ways that were helpful to goal planning?
3. Were students helpful to each other throughout the planning sessions?
4. Did students exhibit the self-directing characteristics described by andragogical theorists?
5. Did students express the need to link learning goals to current learning needs?
6. Were educational goals clearly related to current educational and professional needs?

The Participants

Twelve senior social work students and four full-time social work faculty participated in the planning sessions. The student group was both homogeneous and heterogeneous. Homogeneous in that they shared several characteristics - they were senior social work majors who share educational goals, their cultural backgrounds were similar - middle class, white, and they may be viewed as "experts" in the task they performed. Expert in the sense that they had, at that time, completed all but one of the social work major course requirements. They were knowledgeable about the social work program and the network of agencies and services within the community. They had all completed two

semesters of fieldwork and were engaged in their final field requirement during the planning sessions. They were in age, sex and life experience a diverse group. Their ages ranged from 21-42; eleven were female and one was male. Two were married with intact families; one was divorced and rearing two children alone. These three were adults in terms of their age, the social roles that they carry out and in terms of their life experience. Of the nine who were single, all were working - two in full-time positions and seven part-time in jobs within the field of social work. They may be defined as young adults whose social roles are not yet as varied as those of the older three students, but as individuals who have taken on responsible adult roles. They were also viewed as adults in terms of their self-concepts. Their number, 12, was small enough to allow participation from each member, yet large enough to allow for occasional absenteeism. The full-time social work faculty included three graduate social workers (two in doctoral programs) and two psychologists who have completed their doctoral studies. One psychologist participated in the study; the other was committed to a part-time counseling practice and did not have enough free time.

The Planning Sessions

The student planning sessions extended to nine meetings of an hour each. Faculty met three times for an hour and a half each time, and there were two combined faculty/student sessions of an hour each.

Since this would be a totally new approach in the field seminar, the students were prepared during the last seminar in December (1984) that they would share in planning educational goals and activities for the Spring semester seminar. All students in field met as one group beginning in January, 1985 for as long as was necessary to design the seminar. They were asked to give some thought to the planning task and bring their ideas to the seminar in January.

The first meeting of the Spring Semester was held on January 30. The students had, by that time, returned to their field placements. The focus for the first meeting was to begin to set the stage for planning, as Knowles suggested, in a comfortable, non-threatening environment. Students were asked if they had thought about the task that had been outlined during the final meeting in the Fall. Most of them were quite frank about stating they had not thought about the seminar during the holidays. Those that were not busy with family had worked full-time. There was agreement that the holidays were a busy time and a needed break in the routine. The planning task was re-introduced, students were asked to think about their experiences to date in the field and in the classroom. The issue for discussion was their educational needs as senior social work students. Simply - What would they like to accomplish in the field seminar that would cap their academic experience.

One of the students said that she needed to talk about her placement; she did not feel that she was doing enough or that she was given enough responsibility. She suggested that her placement might be better for a junior rather than a senior student. The group was asked if they had any suggestions for J. to make her placement more productive. Several of the students talked about what they had done and suggested that J. first might approach her supervisor with the problem and frankly ask for more responsibility. This led to a discussion of the positive and negative aspects of supervision. One of the older students described a situation that she had faced in her agency for which she felt she was unprepared. The other two "older" students mentioned that agencies seem to expect more of an older student, and this could be both beneficial as well as detrimental. It was decided to keep a list of the topics they thought were important, and supervision was first on the list. Another student said information about field agencies should also go on the list. The others agreed and added that the information should be forthcoming in the sophomore year - perhaps "by bringing agency people in." The discussion then turned to course work and several ideas about scheduling of courses. The discussion was lively - as everyone had something to say about the Research and Basic Statistics Courses. Suggestions were for re-scheduling those courses; the concern was to be able to repeat the courses, if need be, prior to the senior year.

As the seminar ended, the group realized that goals for the seminar had not been discussed, rather the discussion focused on problems in the field and in specific courses. Some solutions had been offered.

Seminar met again on Monday, February 4, 1985. The discussion was opened by asking if anyone wanted to comment on the last session. No one volunteered until one student spoke up and asked the facilitator, "What do you think about it?" The response was that goal-planning had not begun, but that the discussion in the last session was important. Several agreed that the previous week's discussion was valuable - "those were things that must be discussed, if not for us, for future students." Attention was focused on the task - to share in planning learning goals for the seminar and in designing some activities related to the goals. One of the students asked for an example relative to their needs. Attention was drawn to the needs discussed during the previous session. After some thought, the group agreed that they were not appropriate for a senior field seminar.

The group picked up on one suggestion from last session, "bringing agency people in"; discussion focused on whether it would be beneficial during a Spring seminar. Several felt it should be done during Sophomore year, that Senior year was "too late". One of the students asked if anyone was sure of what the profession's expectations of the BSW graduate might be. Several then discussed the

implications of this issue in regard to jobs after graduation. They began to focus on questions such as, "What agencies will hire us" and "What can we do with our degrees." They were asked to share the roles in which they were functioning in the agency and whether they thought that might give them some idea of what they would do after graduation. This led to a discussion of the kinds of roles they felt they could handle - such as brokers and advocates. Three of the students mentioned their roles as case managers in the Bureau of Aging and said that staff with baccalaureate degrees seemed to also be functioning in that role. The outcome of this discussion was the assertion that they might lack experience, but they have a solid foundation.

The group met for the third session on the 11th of February. At this session the beginning focus was on the themes that had been re-occurring. Two issues were emerging - one was what they needed now as senior social work students and the other - what they might be able to do after graduation. The purpose of the group was re-introduced - to plan educational goals and activities that we would implement in the last half of the seminar. This led to a discussion of how the seminar fits into the curriculum and how it should function. Learning formats of previous seminars were discussed. The seminar has functioned as a place to discuss "problems in the field" and as a setting to enhance the integration of theory with prac-

tice. The students agreed they needed the seminar; without it they might feel isolated. The previous semester (Fall, 1984), each student was required to present a case to the seminar for discussion and compare what they were doing to theory. They felt that had been helpful, but they were ready to move on to something different.

Several of the students mentioned how busy they were and felt they needed a session or two on "burn out" or stress management. That led to a discussion of the kinds of workshops and in-service opportunities available at their agencies. They decided that information on stress management was available in the field and, therefore, need not be included in the goals for the seminar.

Meetings, so far, had taken place twice a week. As this was beyond the one hour per week requirement, the group voiced concern by asking how long the twice weekly meetings would continue. After some discussion, it was decided to continue to meet twice a week until learning goals were ready to be implemented. The group negotiated for time off at the end of the semester as compensation.

Discussion then focused on setting ground rules about the decision-making process during the group sessions. It was decided that decisions should be made by a majority vote - that not all ideas would be incorporated in the seminar. There was a need for the group to be more specific about their learning needs and to focus more clearly on their goals. The group decided to set priorities for

discussion, and to plan to implement their ideas during the last half of the semester. It was felt that four more sessions would bring the planning to an end.

The Facilitator's Role

Knowles cites a number of principles of teaching that enhances the adult learners' growth and development. They include providing a non-threatening setting in which there is mutual respect between learners and teacher. Activities such as encouraging participation, acting as a resource and sharing one's expertise are requisites for learning to take place.[9] During the first three sessions, the group facilitator tried to provide a comfortable environment by accepting the students' ideas and needs as valid. A minimum amount of structure was provided by explaining the purpose and encouraging students to take responsibility for the discussion. During the first session, their need to discuss a number of problems in the field was recognized and accepted. Rather than insisting the group start on the planning task, an open-forum for discussion was decided on so that the group would not miss important issues. During the second session, the facilitator provided initial structure by asking the group to comment on the previous session and by honestly responding to their query of, "What did you think?" In addition, the facilitator helped the group to focus their discussions and relate them to the planning task. In the third session, the group was offered some help in pulling together the issues that had been discussed

and in providing structure to the sessions. An example of structure was the "majority rule" decision. By the end of the third session, the group was strongly encouraged to become more specific in defining goals and learning activities. The facilitator's approach was patterned after that of Knowles who distinguishes between the role of teacher/instructor and that of a facilitator.[10] The approach utilized in the first three sessions was non-directive.

Analysis

In a number of ways, the students fit into Knowles' idea that individuals accustomed to a long history of pedagogy find it difficult to take the initiative in planning for their own educational needs.[11] This was indicated by their hesitancy in getting to the task. It was not until well into the second session that they began to focus on educational needs. The need for structure and focus was also apparent as suggested by Chene and Rachal.[12] They clearly asked for direction from the group facilitator in the second session and seemed more comfortable when provided with some structure for the discussions.

The focus for the first few sessions was to create an environment conducive to student participation and begin the task of planning learning needs. That appeared to have occurred. The students discussed a number of topics freely and were uninhibited about asking for the facilitator's opinion and in negotiating for time-off at the end of the semester. They were also able to share some of the nega-

tive experiences they had in the field.

Knowles states the need for mutual trust to develop so that learners feel free to share their experiences and the need to respect each others opinions.[13] The students were attentive to each other and were responsive to suggestions in a positive way. During the first session, one of the students related a situation in which she had been "called on the carpet" by the agency director. She felt her supervisor had not prepared her for the role responsibility the director expected. Other students commented in a supportive way and some offered problems they had encountered. This was one of several examples that indicated the students were able to share experiences as a method to learn and that, as adult learners, they were able to be responsive to each others needs. They were exhibiting what Knowles describes as a collaborative relationship, one that is necessary for learning to take place.[14] A recurring idea was the need for changes that would benefit other students. In the first session, their discussions centered more upon past experience and changes that might be implemented for freshman and sophomore students. It was not until well into the second session that they began to discuss what might be considered current needs. Knowles suggests, as do other andragogists, that the adult learner is able to relate learning to current life needs.[15] It was at that point the seniors were beginning to focus on current learning needs related to their field experiences.

Knowles states that the adult learner has a need to be self-directing and autonomous.[16] It appears the seniors were beginning to take more responsibility for planning and directing the process during the third session. They initiated the topics for discussion and were able to decide what might be relevant for the seminar. Some of the characteristics of the adult learner were beginning to be obvious in the senior students.

Some differences between the traditional age students and the three older students began to be apparent. Although all of the students were hesitant about assuming responsibility for planning goals and activities initially, the older students were able to assume the planning role more quickly. They tended to take the lead in sharing their experiences in the field and in their personal lives. They also appeared to have more confidence, be more self-assured - it was an older student who shared negative experiences she had in the field - a type of sharing students tend to avoid. It was also an older student who initiated the discussion in regard to compensation for the extra time they spent in seminar.

In the fourth session, some of the ideas students brought to the last session were summarized. A number of the issues translated into practice issues as it appeared the students thought there was a need to include "how-to" courses during the senior year. One student mentioned that she had a "reluctant" client and wondered how to engage

this type of client in a helping relationship. Another suggested that perhaps the client did not trust her. One of the students said "a worker has to be up-front with a client, tell her who you are and what you can do for her." Another of the students said she remembered that from Methods I. This led to a discussion of what was included in the content of practice courses and in their practice electives. The group felt that theoretical concepts far outweighted the practical aspects in most courses. The program offers practice electives each semester for junior and senior students. Nine of the twelve students in the group had elected to take certificates in Gerontology or Child Welfare and their electives were concentrated in those areas. This led to a discussion of their placements and the kinds of roles they assume. Most students had experience in linking clients to services within the community. Two of the students who were placed in the Area Agency on Aging related their experiences. One told of helping an elderly client get a wheelchair and of how she had to call three agencies for information. The other related her experience in helping an elderly man get home health services for his wife. The student then explained to the others a new pilot project intended to help the infirm elderly stay at home. Discussion focused on how others in the group also had experience in brokering services within the community. They talked about the kind of skills that were important and how their placements helped

to improve those skills. They agreed that knowing the social welfare service system was a basic skill and how to communicate with an elderly client was another. One of the students whose placement was in a family welfare agency told of how his supervisor helped him to speak more easily to his clients. He suggested communication with a variety of clients was another basic skill. The group decided that a basic skills course that concentrates on practical application should be given in the senior year. The students were asked to think about what would be practical for the remainder of the seminar - what skills could be reinforced and how. The idea that they had the opportunity to plan for their own learning was reinforced.

In the beginning of the fifth session, the idea that the task was to plan learning goals and activities was reinforced. The group was asked - how to operationalize the learning needs discussed in the past two sessions. One of the students stated that the discussion in regard to skills was not finished and suggested that the ability to prioritize was an important skill and that it was related to our professional values. A discussion of ethics in practice ensued as students began to discuss how they had learned to set priorities during their own agency experiences. One student said, "When I have more than one case, I try to help the most vulnerable client first." Another said, "Ethics is involved when the worker has to share information and that having the client sign a release form

was not enough." The group agreed that a worker had to be careful and consider the client's best interest first. The facilitator asked the group where in the curriculum was the question of ethics addressed. After some discussion, it was decided that ethics were discussed in a number of classes, but that it was in placement that students began to utilize professional values. The group again stressed the importance of confidentiality as one deals with clients. One mentioned how one might forget in the "heat of practice" and that one learns by practice.

The facilitator then asked the group to consider how the issues of ethics and values might be operationalized in the seminar. It seemed difficult to pin them down to this task, whereas they all enjoyed the discussions. The facilitator suggested that some of the things they discussed as important would fit into sophomore and junior courses, but that the group needed to think about what could be accomplished within the seminar. One of the students suggested that the two placements she had been involved in had given her good experience and direction, but that what she needed now was information about how agencies describe the role of a caseworker. The others agreed that was important. The session ended with a discussion of how the students, themselves, could contribute to the seminar. One of the students mentioned that she would be willing to share her experiences in the field if others thought it would be helpful. Another supported that idea by saying, "We are,

after all, seniors with at least two semesters of field instruction and also personal experiences."

The group began the sixth session by focusing on the prior discussions and an attempt was made to prioritize our educational needs. The facilitator suggested that group members, in turn, state their priority and then decide where needs were similar. One of the group mentioned jobs as a priority and several immediately agreed. One of the group said, "That is certainly something we all have in common." The facilitator then asked the group to concentrate on what kinds of information they were seeking at that point. A group member said, "I think at this point I am interested in trends; trends in social work related to client care as well as jobs." Another mentioned that "knowing what was new in the field was important when looking for a job." The discussion of the job market ocntinued and the group decided that an understanding of trends would indicate where jobs were most plentiful and which agencies were hiring new workers. Several of the students has called the local Employment Security Agency and they shared the information they received with the group. Another offered the information that many of the jobs in public agencies are first posted in-house before becoming available to the community. One of the group who worked part-time in a community facility for mentally retarded clients said her agency had jobs available, but that salaries tended to be low. There was a short discussion about

whether or not to take a low-paying job as a start in the field. The group decided, "only as a last resort."

The facilitator began to summarize the discussion. It appeared that students wanted information about jobs and related issues such as "how to interview" in the Spring semester. Discussion then focused on trying to finish the planning phase in the next two weeks and the facilitator asked the group to formalize their ideas by putting them down on paper. The group was reminded that part of the task was to plan learning activities.

The Facilitator's Role

Knowles and others stress the importance of involving the learner in the planning process. Knowles cites behavioral theory as reinforcing his idea that individuals feel a commitment to an activity when they have shared in planning.[17] The facilitator was guided by that tenet during the fourth, fifth and sixth sessions. As discussions proceeded, each group member was asked for an opinion or comment to insure that everyone participated. Some of the students were more reticent than others; they needed more support from the facilitator to feel comfortable in the group. Another task Knowles writes about is that of helping the learner make decisions that are outcomes of the group's mutual assessments.[18] Encouraging everyone to participate followed from that idea. Also, during the fifth and sixth sessions, the group was helped to prioritize their learning needs and come to some agreement on

which were appropriate for the Spring semester. The group had met for six sessions and it was obvious they were a working task-oriented group. The facilitator encouraged a continuance of the mutual sharing and decision making processes carried on by the group. Structure was also provided by the facilitator at various times during the past three sessions by helping the group to focus on their task, summarize the discussions and plan for each subsequent session.

Analysis

During the fourth, fifth and sixth sessions, discussions were often lively and there did not seem to be any hesitancy about sharing opinions and experiences. According to Knowles, this is a characteristic of the adult learner that can be brought forth by a non-directive approach to instruction.[19] By that time in the life of the group, mutual sharing of ideas and experiences had been achieved. It appeared that the three older students had set an example for the younger ones in the group during the first three sessions, bo by the fifth, the younger students seemed more willing to share. The facilitator's actions had encouraged mutual sharing of experiences and the older students were supportive of that activity.

The ideas that students spoke about in terms of educational needs appeared to be directly related to their present activities. That behavior conforms to the adult learner according to andragogical theory. The need to

become more skillful in dealing with clients related to their field practicum and to the careers they would shortly be entering. They were able to look at the skills they had acquired in a self-confident manner, such as knowledge of the social service system and the ability to understand a client's needs. As the discussions continued, they were able to note realistically what had transpired in the past three years and what their current needs were. They began to articulate a readiness to move into a different phase of their lives as they moved closer to graduation. By the end of the sixth session, it was clear that they were thinking about career opportunities. Preparation for current life demands and the ability to see themselves and their needs realistically are also characteristics of the adult learner. Both the older and younger students were in agreement about needing career information and had been able to look at their accomplishments during the course of their college experience and make realistic assessments of continued professional growth.

Skill-building is directly related to current roles and to roles the students will assume as they begin their careers. Their discussions of the B.S.W. degree and the profession's expectations clearly indicated that the students were concerned about current needs and were looking at their situations, as BSW workers, realistically. One of the tasks of the facilitator during the sessions was to help focus the discussion, but students gradually ini-

tiated topics and material to be discussed. They readily shared their experiences in their field agencies and it became clear they were able to exhibit self-directing characteristics as they carried out tasks in their agencies. The central thrust of Knowles work speaks to the self-directing characteristics of the adult learner, their need to have input and a certain amount of independence.[20] It was clear that the older students in the group fit that pattern, it was also clear that, given encouragement, the younger students also exhibited self-directing characteristics.

Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Sessions

The seventh session was short. A few of the group members had written down some of the educational needs that were discussed at the last session. The group began to differentiate between goals that would fit into a senior field seminar and those that might be appropriate earlier in the curriculum. The group agreed that skills such as interviewing with clients and how to make ethical choices were important goals and decided that they were goals that are part of a number of courses throughout the social work curriculum. One of the students voiced the opinion that the study of ethics and values began in their liberal arts courses; the group agreed and another mentioned a Medical Ethics course that was very good. The facilitator asked if the activities carried out in the Fall semester - case discussions - had been helpful. Most of the group felt

that it was helpful, but they had also done it during their junior placements. They definitely needed something different for Spring semester.

One of the students stated that her part-time job and her field placement had given her a great deal of experience that she would share. Several of the students voiced the idea that, collectively, they had a great deal of experience and not only in the last four years, but some had adult life experiences and all have worked in the field. They began to look at what they could contribute to each other's learning; the seminar need not depend entirely on outside experts.

One of the students who had written some goals which she shared said she expected others to do that too. The session ended with everyone promising to bring in written goals next time.

In the next session, the group shared eudcational goals. As one student read from a list, others crossed off similar goals on their lists. One of the group had suggested that, as a way to have less redundancy. Two areas were consistently included in what they thought were appropriate for a Spring semester seminar. Job opportunities and interviewing skills seemed to be a priority with all of them. Several had included ethical issues as they related to practice also. One student remarked that she felt the group had done a good job and that the final list covered all of the issues they had discussed.

Several of the students asked about how they would be graded for the seminar. It was decided that each had earned an A for their participation in the planning sessions. The group then discussed the weight given to their field evaluations and competency exam. Seminar participation constitutes 10% of their grade.

They began to talk about ethical issues and several shared some of the decisions they had to make during their time in the agency. One described a session she had with a young client of seventeen who was pregnant and unmarried. Although the student did not condone abortion, she felt, ethically, she had to discuss that as an alternative with the client. Another student shared her experience as she began her placement in the Fall semester. The agency suggested she not tell her clients she was a student, while she felt telling them would be more honest. There was general discussion of those issues and the group decided that, since they were only students, they did not have much choice - they felt obliged to follow agency instructors. They felt it would continue to be an issue. The group agreed that discussions of those matters were helpful and that time should be set aside during seminar to air their views. Hearing other's experiences was helpful, seemed to be what they were saying.

The lists of goals were collected and the facilitator took on the task of collating them so that priorities could be set at the next session.

At the ninth session each student was given a list of the goals that had been compiled; the task was to prioritize the goals and decide which were most appropriate. This session was the last before the group met with the social work faculty. The group was informed that the faculty had also met to discuss what they thought students needed as a cap to their experience and that the next step was to bring the two groups together. The group expressed a great deal of interest in meeting with faculty and agreed that the next session would be a combined meeting.

The list of goals given to each student for discussion was as follows:

1. To help the student become aware of job opportunities for B.S.W. social workers.
2. Help students sharpen job interviewing skills and to understand obstacles and strengths in finding a job.
3. Help students become aware of both positive and negative aspects of social work practice.
4. Help students sharpen skills in communication.
5. Help students become aware of their own value system and how it impacts on one's own practice.
6. Help students establish a framework for analyzing and applying our code of ethics.
7. Allow students to discuss issues in practice.
8. Help students identify the means for professional growth after graduation.

After discussing the importance of the above goals, the students decided that, at this point in their education, it was now a little beyond the mid-term, information

about jobs and interviewing skills should have priority. Ethical issues, value clarification and communication skills should be part of the curriculum, probably as early as the sophomore year. The final goals as decided by students were:

1. To help students become aware of job opportunities for B.S.W. workers.
2. Help students sharpen job interviewing skills.
3. Help students discuss issues in practice that might be part of a job interview.

The session ended after the group made plans to meet with faculty at the next session.

Facilitator's Role

During the latter three sessions, the facilitator continued to be supportive and helpful to the group in a non-directive way. The group members had gradually taken on the task of initiating discussions and the facilitator waited for that to occur at the beginning of each session. Knowles proposed that the teacher/facilitator be accepting of the learner as worthy of respect for his/her ideas. Allowing group members to take leadership roles follows that idea. In addition, the facilitator encouraged the group to make decisions and supported those decisions by helping to carry them out. Listening carefully to each student as he/she shared ideas was also a conscious strategy by the facilitator. Knowles believes the facilitator contributes to the learning by sharing his/her own feelings and opinions about group decisions and by acting as a

resource.[21] During the sessions, the facilitator honestly shared her opinions and bowed to majority rule when they differed from that of the group. In a number of instances, the facilitator shared personal experiences that were similar to situations the students faced in the field. The group discussions that focused on ethical issues lent themselves to this type of sharing. The facilitator's goal was to continue to follow, as closely as possible, Knowles ideas.

Analysis

The students' abilities and desires to share their experiences was markedly apparent during the latter three sessions. This behavior conforms to the ideas of Knowles, Verner and others that participation and sharing experiences are characteristics of the adult learner and to Knowles' ideas in regard to the learning environment - "the learning process....makes use of the experience of the learner."[22] The students were also able to view themselves as resources. During discussions, they referred to experiences and the knowledge they had gained during the past three and one half years. Andragogical theory supports the idea of adult learners as resources due to the variety and quantity of their life experiences. The students in the group, both older and younger, perceived themselves as resources for one another. There was a continuous sharing of experiences and opinions as they developed what they considered were appropriate learning goals.

The formulation of learning goals and the decisions as to which were appropriate was an indication of their growing ability to take on responsibility for their own learning. This behavior conforms to one of Robinson's three R's of adult learning - Responsibility.[23] It was also apparent, from the discussions that took place, students expressed the need to link learning needs to their current experiences in the field and their soon-to-be status as job seekers. The final goals chosen were related to career needs; an indication that the senior students, as andragogical theory suggests, placed priority on goals that were clearly related to and relevant to current needs.

Faculty Sessions

One intended purpose of the preliminary study was to compare goals planned by students with those planned by faculty. In order to carry out that task, faculty (3 full-time social workers, one full-time psychologist) met for three one hour sessions, developed learning goals and then discussed them with students in two combined meetings. The purpose of the sessions was to discuss the design of the final field seminar and articulate what students needed at that point in their education. The focus for discussion was on the students themselves - what are the things they do well and what are their deficits. The last semester is viewed as a bridge between their educational experience and the beginning of their careers. It was thought important

that students learn to use themselves as a tool in the professional relationship and to use others, both supervisors and colleagues, as resources. As students prepare for careers, they should understand the importance of supervision - without supervision practice effectiveness diminishes.

At that point it was necessary for the students to be able to look at themselves as professionals and be able to assess their own strengths and weaknesses. The value of an exit interview and a number of ways to approach it were discussed. Also discussed was the importance of communication as a tool and ways students might be allowed to test their own ability. Discussion focused on the case conference as one vehicle in which effective communication is necessary and on ways it might be utilized in a conference format as an exercise for students. The use of the school's video equipment would enable students to see the extent and quality of their contributions in a case conference. As students presented their cases, their ability to act as resources for one another might also be indicated. Viewing the video after the presentation would give immediate feedback. The outcome of the discussions was to verbalize the goals and objectives for the seminar and design a format and strategies for evaluation. They are as follows:

Goals

Seminar is both integrative and transitional, there-

fore the seminar should:

1. Help to launch the student as a professional social worker who is able to function in a number of roles in an agency - broker, advocate and case manager.

2. Help the student tie together the knowledge and skills acquired during the course of their education.

The objectives of the course:

1. Help the student gain insight in regard to his/her professional self.

2. Help the student focus on his/her strengths and vulnerabilities.

3. Help the student utilize colleagues as resources and act as a resource in turn.

4. Help the student understand the dynamics of supervision and to view it as a professional resource.

Organization

A group format will be utilized in the seminar simulating as closely as possible an agency case conference. Students, in turn, will present their case assignments to the group who will discuss it in a constructive manner. Case assignments are those the student has chosen for his/her senior competency exam.

Evaluation

1. The Case presentation will be video-taped to allow the students and instructor to assess the presentation and discussion. The assessment sessions will also be taped as a further tool for evaluation. Not all sessions will be utilized in the second assessment - several can be chosen at random.

2. Students will write a brief evaluation of the seminar and the planning process.

3. Each student will have an "exit interview" with the seminar instructor in which students' strengths and vulnerabilities will be discussed.

Combined Faculty/Student Sessions

In preparation for the first meeting, the goals and objectives designed by each group were distributed to the students and faculty.

Discussion during the first session focused on the similarities between the goals articulated by faculty and those of students. In a step-by-step process, each goal was discussed and, where an explanation was necessary, the goal's originator was asked for clarification. In several instances, students shared experiences from their field placements as examples of several of the points brought up by faculty; supervision was one that initiated a good deal of comment. One of the students asked if the program had criteria for choosing supervisors. Several of the other students suggested that students' ideas be included in the criteria. Some of the examples discussed earlier by the student group were shared.

The information shared with faculty included the eight goals that students decided upon as priority items, as well as the three goals they felt were appropriate in the final semester. Their approach in discussing these with faculty was to show where in the curriculum the priority goals were either present or needed.

In discussing the exit interview students felt that kind of an evaluation had value, but it should begin as the

junior year ends. Their senior year would then give them time to work on their weaknesses. As the first session ended, the discussion began to focus on differences, a topic that continued for the next session.

The second and final meeting took place two days after the first session, which gave everyone time to pull his/her thoughts together without losing the threads of the previous session.

There was no mistaking the students' thrust for this meeting. One student spoke for all in summarizing their point of view, "We see faculty goals as having a different emphasis than ours, although there are common threads. Your goals and objectives are important, but you are forgetting that we are in a termination stage. One foot is still here, but what lies ahead is very important. We are having a hard time dealing with what we consider a new program in the last part of the last semester. We want to take four steps forward and you want us to take three steps backward."

Faculty conceded that their goals were related to the classroom while students were concerned with their careers, a reasonable and realistic concern. The group then began to negotiate and plan an experience that would be helpful at that point.

The final decision, that was mutually agreed upon, was to invite social workers from agencies in the community into the seminar to conduct job interviews. The interviews

would be video taped and then viewed as a way to assess students' abilities to communicate and present themselves in positive ways. Interviews would simulate as closely as possible real life situations. Interviewers would be chosen from the group of agency staff whose responsibilities included hiring new employees.

Summary Analysis

An assessment of the planning sessions indicates that the planning process was valuable in and of itself. It allowed the students an opportunity to view their educational experience in an holistic manner. They were able to clarify their status as beginning social workers and to acknowledge where they were in their professional development. The discussions and the debate that often ensued helped them to voice their concerns in a knowledgeable and mature manner. Their comments about the process were positive and they felt discussion and debate should be incorporated into the curriculum. All who participated learned from the dialogue that took place.

Their input was also valuable in terms of the program curriculum and several of their suggestions were incorporated into the program - Communication Skills was changed from an elective to a required course and the student's orientation to the field in their Sophomore year was expanded.

The students, by their active participation in planning, exemplified some of the characteristics found in the

adult learner. While planning, their ability to share experiences and be helpful to one another was apparent. The older students in the group fit well into the model of the adult learner espoused by Knowles and others. They were self-assured, able to initiate planning and utilized their experiences as examples often during discussions. The younger students took on those tasks and behaviors more slowly. The differences between the younger and older students relative to their participation in the seminar diminished as the seminar progressed over time.

The students were clear in stating their learning needs which were directly related to their current roles, also a characteristic of the adult learner. The planning process allowed them to build on their experiences in the classroom and the field. They did not hesitate to share their knowledge nor to accept the opinions of others in their group. A process of self-evaluation was also evident as they began to assess their own learning and their ability to integrate the practical with the theoretical. As planning progressed, they needed less direction from the group facilitator, and, therefore, the facilitator's role diminished as they assumed more responsibility for carrying out the planning task. Andragogical theorists suggest the need of structure at least in initial meetings and that appeared to be born out.

The students were very much involved in selecting learning goals and supporting their position with rational

argument. One might conclude that they were in the best position to know what they needed and they did not waver from either articulating those needs or defending them.

The preliminary study was undertaken to compare students' ideas about curriculum goals with those of faculty; to view senior students as educational planners relative to adult learning theory and to glean information about the utilization of an andragogical approach to instruction. The study indicated there were differences between student and faculty ideas, but the gap was not insurmountable. There were areas as indicated above in which goals were similar and faculty agreed that educational goals planned by students for a Spring field seminar were closely related to their status as graduating seniors. During the planning sessions, students' behaviors and ideas were representative of those described by adult learning theorists. Finally, the study was helpful in testing a central thesis of andragogy - that which maintains the importance of participation by adults in their own learning.

Field Seminar, Fall, 1985 Semester

The next step in the project was to introduce an andragogical approach in the field seminar in the Fall, 1985 Semester with the intent to carry on through the Spring, 1986 Semester.

The student group once again numbered twelve; a group

similar in character to previous groups. They shared certain characteristics such as, white, middle class culture and educational goals. In age, sex and life experience, they were a diverse group. Two were married with intact families; one, divorced and rearing a daughter alone and one was recently widowed with four adult children. Two were male and the ages ranged from 21 to 59 which suggested they brought a variety of life experiences to the seminar. Three of the students had part-time jobs and two were working full-time. The above description would fit with few changes the composition of the students for the past six years. The "older" student as well as the "working" student has been a visible number among social work majors and this has lent an interesting mixture to the classroom.

The plan for the Fall and Spring Semesters was to utilize the field seminar as the setting for testing several of the ideas that have been proposed by andragogical theorists. One of their major convictions is that participating in planning one's educational goals enhances a person's commitment to learning and, in fact, adult students prefer to have a hand in deciding what and how to learn. Knowles has emphasized the principle of mutuality in both planning learning activities and evaluating outcomes. Of special importance is the need to insure relevancy, the notion that learning must have meaning in relation to the learners' current needs and goals. Knowles and others have described the adult learner as a self-directed,

independent person capable of taking responsibility for his/her own learning.[24] Implementation of the project was based on those ideas. The senior students participated with the seminar instructor in planning educational goals, learning activities and evaluation strategies.

The goal planning sessions carried out during the Spring 1985 Semester provided a number of ideas that were utilized in the Fall. It was determined that students needed to be introduced to the concepts of self-directed learning and accept those ideas before attempting to plan educational goals and activities. A structure that would provide a framework for planning must also be provided. A loosely organized setting might cause anxiety among the students and tends to prolong the introductory phase of self-directed learning. Once structure and initial direction were provided, students became actively engaged in the planning tasks. It was found that students were able to view educational goals realistically and plan accordingly. For the Fall, 1985 Seminar the instructor assumed the role of facilitator to provide initial structure, help the group focus its tasks and act as a resource. The approach to instruction was to be non-directive to allow full development of the students' capacity to engage in the seminar's tasks.

Preparations for the seminar included giving students a tentative outline that incorporated the goals agreed upon by faculty and students during the Spring semester planning

sessions. The goals included the final career-oriented goals as well as those dealing with communication skills and ethical issues.

At the first session the facilitator explained the approach to learning that would be utilized and informed the students that several texts - Knowles' Self-Directed Learning and The Modern Practice of Adult Education and Robinson's An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change - had been placed on reserve for their use. Their role as well as the facilitator's was outlined and the idea of their participation in planning educational goals and activities was introduced. A tentative course outline had been prepared (see Appendix D) and this was passed to students with the idea that our planning would probably result in a new outline.

The first topic for discussion begun by the students was the competency exam. They had received outlines and instructions during the last few weeks of their junior year to give them a start on gathering information. The facilitator offered to act as a consultant to them as they researched and wrote their papers and said they could also count on some help in editing.

One of the students began to discuss evaluation. She said, "I know the seminar is just beginning, but I think we should talk about how we will be evaluated." The group agreed and another student suggested the need for something in addition to the evaluation they received from field

instructors. The group felt it was important to hear from program faculty as to their promise as social workers. They wanted to know how they have changed; what were their strengths and what aspects of their professional roles needed to be strengthened. The facilitator suggested that perhaps those ideas could be operationalized to fit into the seminar activities.

Several of the students spoke of the need to divide the group into two smaller groups so that everyone would have more opportunity for participating in the discussions. After some discussion about the seminar task, the group agreed to meet as one group for as long as needed to finish the planning task, but they reserved the right to decide to meet in smaller groups after that.

At the second meeting the facilitator suggested the group discuss professional goals. One of the students spoke up and asked if the facilitator had spoken to other faculty members in regard to the students' request for evaluations at the beginning of their senior year. This request had been passed to other faculty and they had agreed to participate. All of the group appeared interested in hearing the answer. One of the students stated, "We need to know if we will be heard, will our planning mean something." The facilitator responded by stressing again the purpose of attempting the new approach and that the seminar would be a product of shared planning.

The facilitator then re-introduced the topic of

professional goals and explained how they might differ from personal goals. The group discussed how group interaction might be utilized in an evaluation process. They were interested in how others see them and indicated they wanted the facilitator to participate in that process.

Several of the students began to expand on the goals that had been listed in the seminar outline. To the one - "Utilizing colleagues, both supervisors and seminar members as resources," they added, "the ability to understand and make use of the network of agencies and resources in the community." One of the students explained, "I am constantly referring clients to other agencies; they are the resources I use more than colleagues."

To another goal, "Articulating professional concerns related to client problems," they added, "articulation includes both written and verbal." When discussing another goal, "Understanding professional roles and ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice," several suggested that one must take into account the difficulties of working within a system when one's values might differ from agency regulations. There was good discussion about this point and several of the students gave examples from their field placements. One student told of a situation that occurred at a local MR facility in which a resident had been raped by another resident. The discussion focused on a number of issues such as the definition of rape in reference to the mentally retarded and the role of the worker.

Goal-setting worksheets (see Appendix E) were passed to students with the idea they might be useful in clarifying their own goals. The facilitator asked if one of the group wished to discuss a personal goal and one of the students offered to start. She said she often became flustered at agency staff meetings when asked to participate, and she added, "you probably can't believe that, since I never had a problem in class." The group was asked to give suggestions to the student to help her work on that goal. One of the students mentioned role playing in seminar and another suggested being well-prepared for the staff meetings as ways to overcome the problem. The facilitator mentioned it was a good example of a personal goal that also could be viewed as a professional goal.

Two of the students mentioned the difficulty of working within a bureaucracy. One said she had done all the paperwork for a program but that lack of funding had closed it. Another agreed and told of trying to obtain a wheelchair for a client who died before all the forms were processed. The facilitator asked if those problems could be stated in terms of a professional or personal goal - was it a need for more knowledge of organizational dynamics or a need to understand their own feelings better. The group decided to think about that for the next meeting.

The task for the next meeting was to have their personal goals and any modifications to professional goals ready so that the group can begin to work on learning

strategies and evaluation criteria.

As the third meeting began, students expressed the desire to move along so that "regular" seminar could begin. One of the students began the discussion by speaking about the need to understand current social policies and how they impact on practice. There seemed to be general agreement that this need could translate into a professional goal. Another student mentioned the need to know about current social work research such as, "What new treatment methods have been tried." The discussion moved around the table as another student added, "What is the latest thinking in regard to the mentally retarded client or about poverty." Another expressed the idea that they needed to know current ideas that would help them in their field placements.

Another student spoke about communicating with clients and that it might be helpful to introduce in the seminar a practice situation from the field placement for discussion. This might also include discussion of how concepts from theory are utilized in practice. One of the students felt it was a personal goal for her - better communication skills - that was also a professional goal. The group agreed it was something they all needed to carry-out professional practice. They began to discuss the curriculum in social work and one student suggested the elective course - Communication Skills - be changed to a required course and a prerequisite to their first field experience. The facilitator told the group that incoming freshmen would

be required to take Communication Skills and then suggested the group get back on target and discuss some learning strategies.

After some discussion that included presentations by students, bringing to seminar outside experts as ways to translate the goals into learning activities, the group decided that each member will "take charge" of a session and bring from his/her agency a new policy issue or new research finding for discussion. Initiating and leading the discussion would be helpful in exercising their communication skills. Further discussion about how to include practice issues brought forth the decision that students may choose to bring in a practice situation, either a problem or a success for discussion. The group's discussion of how to solve the problem would enable students to utilize each other as resources and that skill might be transferred to their placement in utilizing supervision in positive ways. Successful encounters in the field would also be looked at in order that others in the group might recognize what the presenter did and how others might use this idea or skill.

The group decided to divide into two smaller groups when the regular sessions began. This was a majority decision, most thought there would be more chance for everyone to participate in a smaller group. The task for the next session was to bring in personal goals and their ideas about learning formats to reach those goals. Discussion

would also focus on evaluation techniques. The facilitator passed out a sample worksheet (Appendix F) to use and informed the group that she would work on a form to be used for the regular seminar sessions to provide some structure.

As the fourth session began, the facilitator handed out a form to use during the regular seminar for discussion. It provided a structure for the students to use for their presentations and for evaluating the quality of the presentations. The group looked at the form and one student said, "This looks good, but I think it is threatening to be evaluated." The facilitator mentioned that evaluation is a useful learning tool and reminded the group of their desire to understand their own progress. Another student agreed and suggested the use of the word feedback as being less threatening. The group agreed that feedback was necessary and decided to amend the form (see Appendices G1 and G2). The facilitator mentioned that the group would not be graded on their presentations and that seemed to also ease their feelings.

The group then discussed personal goals and several students shared their goals. One student stated she wanted to be more assertive and to develop a better self-image. Another said he wanted to work on having a more positive outlook. This student was placed in a public child welfare agency. One of the other students who had a placement at the same agency supported him in that goal and suggested that he plan more realistic short-term goals with his

clients. The group discussed the problems one encounters when working in an agency such as that. Several of the students mentioned the importance of understanding one's own value system and not making judgements about client's values. The group looked again at the forms for self-monitoring (Appendix F) and decided to use those as an example of what might be useful but reserved the right to design individual forms.

The facilitator suggested that the next meeting's discussion should focus on evaluation and asked the group to think about that topic and bring ideas to the next meeting.

The fifth session dealt with evaluation. The group decided that part of the evaluation process would be to evaluate their own progress toward reaching individual professional and personal goals. They also decided that achieving those goals would take time, at least until the following semester. During Spring semester, they would share the strategies they used with the group.

The group's main interest was in discussing how they would be graded for field instruction and the seminar. The facilitator explained the criteria and weight that was used in the previous year - Competency Exam = 50%; Field Evaluation = 40%; Seminar = 10%. One of the students mentioned that 10% seemed too little for the seminar if students are expected to be present and to contribute. Several students agreed. Another student said, "I feel the field placement

should warrant more weight since more hours are spent in the agency." Others in the group suggested that 50% for the Competency was too much weight. One suggested that giving more weight to the seminar would act as an incentive since the students do not get academic credit for the seminar. The group continued to discuss the criteria and, after a short time, the facilitator asked if they were ready to agree on a position. Group members were asked to write down their own opinions and then to share them. The group agreed, after some debate, to rate the field placement 45%; the competency exam 40%; and the seminar 15%.

One of the students then asked how their participation in seminar was graded. We discussed the fact that it was a subjective evaluation and, therefore, their presence at each session was important. Several of the students reinforced the idea of attendance and one mentioned, "If someone is missing, we spend at least 5 minutes wondering where she is." The facilitator noted that everyone had been present at the sessions so far and participation had been very good. The group had accomplished the task of planning learning goals and activities and had been able to discuss both professional and personal goals. The work so far warranted an A. The students agreed that A for the seminar was justified. The group had already discussed their presentations as learning formats that would not be graded. On the whole, they felt they had done well in their planning sessions and had chosen goals that were attainable.

Several expressed the desire to get on with the regular sessions.

The facilitator mentioned that they would be asked to evaluate the planning sessions at the next meeting. The group would then divide into two groups for the presentations. The group's evaluations of the planning sessions are discussed in Chapter V.

Following the meeting in which student's evaluated the planning sessions, the group divided into two groups of six members. For the next six sessions, students led the discussions based on a presentation of a policy issue or a practice situation. Material for the presentations came from their field placements. A sampling of the topics included:

1. New proposal to place M/R clients in competitive employment positions.
2. Intervention with a client who had been sexually abused.
3. D.R.G.'s - one hospital's experience to date.
4. Senate Bill 873 - Community and Family Living Amendments.
5. Diagnosing Non-Verbal Communication.
6. Liability Insurance increases and the impact on the agency.
7. Dealing with the terminally ill patient.

During the presentation sessions, the students utilized the forms described above (G1 and G2). After several presentations, it appeared that students were very interested in the feedback from their peers.

At the final session of the Fall semester, students were asked to evaluate the seminar. They were asked to answer a questionnaire designed to elicit information that could be compared to andragogical assumptions about the adult learner. The results of that evaluation are described in Chapter V.

Facilitator's Role

In his writing, Knowles stressed the importance of the learning climate for adult students - it should be non-threatening and comfortable. "Cooperation rather than competition should be stressed."[25] There was conscious effort on the part of the facilitator to provide that kind of a setting. A clear explanation of the purpose of the seminar was given to participants during the initial session. The ideas relevant to self-directed learning were shared with the group as well as several texts. The facilitator stressed the students' part in planning not only for goals and learning activities but also for evaluation strategies.

Chene and others underscored the importance of structure to the learning environment.[26] The facilitator provided a tentative outline for students, as the sessions began, to help them focus their planning. Throughout the planning sessions, the group was provided with a number of forms as examples to help students carry out the planning task and as a way to initiate discussion.

Helping the group to engage in mutual sharing was

another task for the facilitator. Encouraging each student to give an opinion or comment during the discussion was one way the facilitator carried out that task. Allowing debate and then helping the group to make a decision were other strategies. During several of the sessions, the facilitator helped the group to "keep to their task" by asking them to operationalize their ideas. This was important since the group hoped to plan learning activities.

Andragogists also expect the facilitator to act as a resource. The focusing strategies and providing structure are part of that role. In addition, the facilitator provided information and gave opinions during the sessions. The facilitator also provided continuity to the planning task by summarizing the discussions and suggesting topics and/or tasks for subsequent meetings.

Analysis

Providing direction and structure to the planning sessions at the initial meeting appeared to be a positive step. Students did not hesitate to participate in discussions and air their opinions from the onset. Each session was a working session and the tasks planned were accomplished. During discussion in the last planning session, students, themselves, expressed satisfaction in their undertaking.

Both the professional and personal goals that students articulated were directly related to their major course - field instruction - and to the activities they would soon

be engaged in as practicing social workers. They were interested in honing their practice skills and in understanding the impact that policy decisions, whether at governmental or agency level, have on practice.

The experiences they shared were also related to their current situations, and they were relevant to the planning process. The formats they designed for giving feedback to each other also underlined their ability to be helpful. Throughout the discussions, an underlying theme, as expressed by students, was the need to plan goals that were realistic. They were able to say, "this is as much as we can accomplish given the time."

In their planning sessions students did exhibit the characteristics of the self-directed learner as described by Knowles - an individual with the ability and desire to participate in planning for his/her own learning; one who can share experiences and act as a resource to others; one who can accept responsibility. They also exhibited the three R's of adult learning as described by Robinson - relevancy, relationship and responsibility.[28] The goals and learning formats made sense to them, as well as being related to their current needs. They also readily assumed responsibility for their own learning. The planning sessions were marked with a great deal of sharing; students were also supportive of one another and willing to negotiate differences. They participated actively and clearly indicated a sense of progress in designing learning goals

and formats.

Spring Semester, 1986

Field Seminar

The first meeting of the Spring semester was held on January 15. All twelve students were present. The group had spoken briefly during the Fall semester's final meeting of plans for the Spring seminar. The group saw the need to evaluate their progress, to rediagnose their learning needs and to plan appropriate learning formats. The facilitator began the meeting by asking the group to think about learning goals that would be relevant for the Spring semester.

One of the students began the discussion by asking the group, "What did you think about the presentations of last semester?" Several students offered comments such as, "It seemed we talked a lot about policy;" "The feedback sessions were helpful;" "It helped me, I was stumped at one point, but J.'s suggestion worked." There was general agreement that last semester's learning goals had been carried out and that the presentations were helpful. One of the students suggested the group spend a little time on the learning effects of last semester's activities and mentioned the topic she had presented - DRG's. She asked the others what they thought they had learned from the discussion. She said, "I know you are not all in a hospital placement, and I wondered if the discussion helped others besides myself." One of the students answered by

saying, "Well, you know I am at Triple A and the elderly have been greatly affected by DRG's. I had two clients who were sent home and I had to find help for them. After our discussion, I was ready for the next one." Several others mentioned that it had been a new subject and felt they learned from the discussion. It helped them to understand the impact of policy. Another student, who is also in a hospital setting, said the DRG's have had an effect on jobs for social workers. Her supervisor is hiring another social worker.

Several other of the topics presented last semester were discussed and students shared what they had learned. The group was interested in follow-up information on several of the practice situations. One of the presentations concerned the sexual abuse of a 7 year old boy by an older boy. The presenter's placement was in a school setting. She explained the outcome of the case and the difficulty she had in getting the school authorities to "move". This led to a brief discussion about the problems students encounter within an organization. One of the students summarized by saying, "It is not only a system problem, it is a question of ethics."

Another of the students mentioned that the question of personal goals had not been fully discussed last semester - "there are still some loose ends." The group decided to meet again as one group the following week and begin to share each one's progress toward reaching his/her goals.

One of the students opened the second session by saying, "I would like to go first, because I don't think I have made much progress and I need some help." This student's goal was to try to become less anxious about her placement and her coursework, generally. This student's anxiety had helped her to finish papers and other course requirements in a timely fashion, often before due dates. The group asked her what kinds of things she had set for herself in order to reach her goal. She explained that one thing she did was to stop and think about her anxiety when she feels it welling up. One of the students asked her to give an example and she did. The discussion went on for several minutes, and several exercises were suggested. The student thanked everyone for listening.

One of the others mentioned that she found it difficult to relate to other professionals at her agency. She finds the role of student is often difficult. Several of the students shared this problem and two suggested confronting agency staff. One, an older student, said she spoke to a staff person and explained how she felt as a student and that seemed to help. Another said, "It is sometimes up to you to carve your own niche; it means being a little assertive."

Another of the students spoke up and related how she had reached her goal of being more comfortable in staff meetings. She said she wrote down the things she might have to say and did relaxing exercises before meetings.

She felt more comfortable now but was still working on it.

That led to a discussion of the methods students used to evaluate their progress. Some used a rating system similar to the sample they received in the previous semester and all kept a written record of one type or another. One of the seminar requirements was to keep a daily log of field activities, and several used that as a method of rating their progress. None felt they had reached their goals entirely, but most felt they would continue to make progress as the semester continued.

Several of the students asked if the facilitator had information about Civil Service Tests. She responded by promising to bring sample tests and information to the following week's meeting. The facilitator asked if the group wanted a session with a staff person from the Employment Security Office. The group agreed it would be helpful.

The facilitator asked if the group wished to continue the discussion in regard to personal goals. Several students suggested that peer evaluations might be more helpful and that they would encompass personal goals. One of the students said, "Yes, we can tell about the things we did in our agency, too." Everyone agreed that this needed to be done and it would finish the activities set down last semester. The group decided to meet the following week in smaller groups.

For the next three weeks, two groups of six students

each met separately and the discussions focused on peer evaluations. Students took turns to relate some of the things they had done in their field placements and about how their professional and personal goals were related to their work in their agencies. Several times during the discussions, students would help one another to remember the projects they had worked on. They saw each other in other classes, and their field experiences were often used to illustrate or operationalize a theoretical concept.

As a person finished a description or explanation of what had occurred in the placement, other seminar members commented on what the person had said and then each had an opportunity to tell that person how he/she had changed. Since some of the students had started as freshmen together, their evaluations consisted of observations during three and a half years in addition to the seminar sessions. Most of them described or commented on changes they had seen over the past two years. The person the group focused on was then asked to comment on what had been said. For the most part, the group's comments were positive, and, while none were negative per se, there were instances in which the comments offered suggestions for growth. It was generally agreed among the group that evaluations of that sort were helpful and several students suggested that the practice be implemented in the junior year as well.

As the peer evaluation sessions came to an end, the facilitator suggested that the next session be utilized as

a planning session and asked each group if they wanted to meet as one. The groups decided to continue to meet separately and the facilitator would act as a go-between keeping each group informed of what the other was planning.

As it transpired, both groups articulated similar goals. In the Monday group one of the students opened the discussion by saying, "We need to focus on what we will be doing when we get out of here, and that will entail our gaols as well. Where are we going and what will we be doing a few months from now." Another mentioned, "I hope I have a job, that is my goal right now." The others agreed that was the most important goal for them at that point in time. The facilitator asked the group how they might operationalize that goal as a seminar activity and explained what the previous year's seniors had planned. That had been to bring into the seminar agency people to discuss their view of the BSW worker and the simulated interviews. One of the students mentioned again the need to understand the Civil Service System. The group discussed the subject of jobs and the kinds of salaries they might expect. Finally, one of the students said, "I am only interested in a job, I think we have accomplished what we set out to do last semester; now we have to concentrate on our next steps - graduation and career." The others agreed. The facilitator took on the task of contacting someone from the Civil Service Office and of contacting agency supervisors who had responsibility for hiring staff.

The facilitator mentioned to the group the following week that they would be asked to evaluate the seminar one last time.

The Wednesday group stated their views in similar terms. One of the students asked the facilitator to look at her resume and then began discussing an interview that she had. This led to a discussion of how one presents oneself in an interview and what kinds of questions an interviewer might ask. The facilitator mentioned that the session was to be devoted to planning and, though interviews were important, the group should get on with their task. One of the students said, "It seems to me getting a job was the task we should be working on." The facilitator then shared the ideas the other group had decided on and asked what their opinions were. The group thought that information about jobs, interviewing and civil service tests were good and would be helpful. They then began to discuss the kinds of jobs that might be available. One of the students works full-time for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in an M/R facility and he talked about the job market and salaries in his field. One of the others who works part-time in a mental health facility said that she intended to keep that job on weekends, but would interview in other areas. The discussion focused on salaries and the facilitator mentioned the salaries of some of the previous year's graduates.

The facilitator mentioned that a meeting with a repre-

sentative from the Civil Service Office had been set up in two weeks time. It would be a meeting in lieu of the regular sessions and that meetings with agency supervisors would be next. The facilitator told the group that they would be asked to evaluate the seminar the following week.

At that point in time, the project ended. The intention was to continue the project until students began to articulate an interest in career related topics. That point had been reached. During the remainder of the semester, students met with representatives from the Bureau of Employment Security who discussed civil service opportunities for BSW graduates and information about the civil service tests. The instructor/facilitator also arranged several sessions with agency persons who conducted job interviews with the students. These were real life simulations that students felt were very helpful. The evaluations undertaken by students during and at the finish of the project are described in Chapter V.

Facilitator's Role

The importance of the facilitator's role in an andragogical instructional approach has been commented upon throughout the project. Theorists from Lindeman to Knowles have emphasized the integral part the facilitator plays in initiating self-directing behavior. It was apparent during the project that the tasks of the facilitator changed over the life of the group.

The facilitator's initial task was to provide a non-

threatening environment that encouraged mutual sharing and respect. As is described above, the facilitator introduced the students to the andragogical style of learning in the first session. The group was helped in their planning task by the facilitator's sharing of information and offering of suggestions. At later sessions, the facilitator encouraged group decision-making and ensured that each member's opinions were heard.

As the group moved on, the facilitator helped to focus the discussions and keep the group working toward completing their planning task. Throughout the first few sessions, those strategies provided the security of structure to the group.

As the group became comfortable in assuming more responsibility for their learning, the facilitator acted as a resource. Students initiated most of the discussion in later sessions and looked to the facilitator as an information giver. The focusing task continued to be important; an example of this was the facilitator's action in helping the group plan for subsequent meetings. The facilitator also helped students share their experiences in the group and, therefore, act as resources for one another. The facilitator's manner was to offer suggestions rather than to inform. It was important throughout the project to listen carefully to students' opinions and negotiate mutual decision making.

Analysis

The primary purpose of this part of the project was to utilize andragogical principles in the two semester field seminar and to evaluate that process at certain intervals. In addition to the final evaluation students carried out as the project ended, they evaluated the planning process at mid-term in the Fall semester and the seminar, itself, at the end of the Fall semester. The outcome of those evaluations and how the project compared to andragogical theory are described in Chapter V. The following analysis will focus on the students' behavior as it compares with the behavior of adult learners described by andragogical theorists.

The students viewed the Spring semester as a continuation of the Fall semester. During the first six sessions, they wrapped up the loose ends, a task they decided upon as they wanted to finish what was begun in the Fall. As the mid-term of the semester appraoched, both groups zeroed in on jobs and interviewing skills as their primary goals. For senior students about to graduate, those goals were certainly relevant and related to their current life situations. They are choices that are commensurate with andragogical theory.

The year long seminar carried out during the 1985-86 academic year benefitted from the experience in the preliminary planning phase of the Spring 1985 semester. The facilitator utilized that experience in shaping a non-

threatening environment that allowed students to plan and carry-out educational goals. They did, indeed, execute group tasks in ways characteristic of the adult learner. They willingly shared experiences that enhanced their planning, and it was clear they relied upon experiential activities as learning tools. They were pro-active, rather than passive learners, a mark of the adult learner according to Knowles.[29]

During the Spring semester, the students were able to share leadership roles as the less assertive students began to initiate discussions. That may be an indication of the students' sense of security - they were able to risk themselves. They also warmed to the idea of directing their own learning and were confident that the educational goals and learning formats they had chosen were appropriate.

During the peer evaluation sessions, students exhibited genuine concern for each other and an ability to be supportive in a positive way. Their manner during those sessions was serious and comments were thoughtful and reflective. They were, by that time, able to offer suggestions in regard to each member's performance in a constructive way. Their respect for each other and their willingness to share was evident; traits also attributed to adult learners. As the seminar progressed, the students were able to take a major share in planning their own learning, and they began the process of self-evaluation, an imperative for professional practice. As the above analysis

indicates, the students exhibited many of the characteristics of the self-directed learner.

Notes - Chapter IV

[1]Russell D. Robinson, An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change. (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Omnibook Co., 1979), p. 63.

[2]Ibid., pp. 63, 64.

[3]Paul Bergevin, A Philosophy for Adult Education. (New York: The Seabury Press, 1967), pp. 135-137.

[4]John R. Verdiun, Harry G. Miller and Charles E. Greer, Adults Teaching Adults: Principles and Strategies. (Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1977), pp. 10, 11, 51-53.

[5]Coolie Verner with Alan Booth, Adult Education. (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), pp. 54, tt. 89.

[6]Malcolm Knowles, The Adult Learner: A neglected Species, 3rd ed. (Houston: Gulf Puglishing Company, 1984), pp. 81-85.

[7]Malcolm Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980), pp. 40-45.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Ibid., pp. 57-58.

[10]Ibid., pp. 19, 44, 45, 57, 58.

[11]Ibid., p. 46.

[12]See Adele Chene, "The Concept of Autonomy in Adult Education: A Philosophical Discussion." (Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 34, No. 1, Fall 1983), pp. 38-46 and Rachal, John, "The Andragogy-Pedagogy Debate: Another Voice in the Fray". (Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, Vol. 6, No. 7, May 1983).

[13]Knowles, ibid., 1980.

[14]Knowles, ibid., 1980, p. 223.

[15]Knowles, ibid., 1980, p. 44.

[16]Knowles, ibid., 1984, p. 123.

[17]Knowles, ibid., 1984, pp. 122-123.

[18]Knowles, ibid., 1975, pp. 60-61.

[19]Knowles, ibid., 1980, pp. 55-59.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Knowles, 1980, p. 58. Also see Russell Robinson, An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change, (Wisconsin: Omnibook Co., 1979), pp. 1-6. Coolie Verner, Adult Education. (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), pp. 89-90.

[23]Robinson, ibid., 1979, Chapter 1.

[24]Knowles, ibid., 1984, pp. 10-18.

[25]Knowles, ibid., 1980, p. 47.

[26]Chene, ibid., 1983, pp. 38-46.

[27]Knowles, ibid., 1980.

[28]Robinson, ibid., pp. 63-65.

[29]Knowles, ibid., 1980, pp. 46-53.

CHAPTER V

EVALUATION

The intention of this project was to investigate the effectiveness of an andragogical approach to instruction as utilized in a senior field seminar. In keeping with the tenets and principles of andragogy, curriculum planning for the seminar was broadened to include students' input. Since the seminar is a major vehicle for helping the student make the transition to the world of work, its goals and objectives needed to conform to the primary goal of the social work program - to prepare responsible social work practitioners committed to the profession's ethical values. Within that broad goal, the following goals were articulated for the senior field seminar:

To help the student reach that stage whereby she/he

*is able to assess the social processes that have impact upon the lives of individuals and families;

*has acquired the professional skills necessary to help when help is needed;

*is able to evaluate herself/himself as a social work practitioner;

*is committed to professional ethics and continued professional growth.

The objectives, planned by faculty and students and viewed as steps to accomplish in reaching those goals, were:

Students will be expected to demonstrate skills in:

*describing the organizational and community context of their field agency;

*assessing existing social policies which provide the framework for their agency's programs;

*utilizing both formal and informal community resources to aid their clients;

*utilizing knowledge in an organized manner, by identifying clients' needs and strengths in order to select, implement and evaluate an intervention plan;

*utilizing colleagues, both supervisors and seminar members, as resources. To be able to relate to colleagues collaboratively;

*articulating, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems;

*understanding professional roles that might arise in the context of practice and ethical issues that might include a conflict of values between one's own values and that of the agency;

*assessing their own strengths and vulnerabilities;

*understanding the impact of current social policy and social research on practice;

*communicating in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.

Evaluative strategies were implemented during the life of the project and at its conclusion. Students participated in an evaluative process twice as the project developed and once again as it ended. Faculty were involved in a summative evaluation, carried out as the project was completed.

In the initial phase of the Fall (1985) Semester, students were involved in planning learning goals and activities. As that ended, they evaluated that planning process. Knowles suggests that, just as the adult learner needs to be involved in the planning phase, he needs also to be involved in the evaluative phase. For the adult, an

understanding of his progress is as important as understanding the processes involved in learning.[1] As the Fall Semester ended, students were asked to reflect upon the seminar and evaluate it as a learning experience and to evaluate their involvement as participants. The two evaluative procedures the students carried out may be viewed as interim or formative evaluations that function as feedback mechanisms. They were utilized to monitor the project as well as to provide information for re-diagnosing learning needs in the Spring 1986 Semester. Suchman writes that "evaluation is most productive when it can become a continuous process of program assessment and improvement" and that consideration of evaluation outcomes helps to make a program more effective.[2]

A final or summative evaluation was undertaken as the project came to an end during the Spring 1986 Semester. The evaluation included two perspectives - that of students and also of faculty. The concern of both groups was to evaluate the project's effects. In addition, faculty expected to utilize evaluative outcomes in planning for the field instruction component of the curriculum for the Fall, 1986 Semester. The evaluation was expected to provide new insights into educational programming and a foundation from which decisions concerning alternative program approaches could be made. The intention was to continue to utilize an andragogical instructional approach modified by the experiences of this project. That did occur and project exper-

ience was helpful in determining learning goals and expectations for the Fall 1986 field seminar. (Further discussions of this point later in this chapter.)

Knowles views evaluation as a way to stimulate improvement in most aspects of the learning environment. Further, evaluation is not the exclusive purview of the educator; rather every person involved in the learning process should be a part of the evaluative process. He places great importance on the input from the adult student - it is valuable in terms of program effectiveness, as well as for the students' sense of accomplishment.[3]

As stated above, the intention of this project was to investigate the utility of an andragogical approach to instruction. An additional expectation was to make comparisons between College Misericordia's senior social work students and the adult learners as described by andragogical theorists. Both students and faculty assessed the merits of this approach for the program and students; students by evaluating how closely they met educational goals and faculty by their assessment of student performance. Self-perceptions of students were gleaned from questionnaires and used as the basis for comparing them to the "ideal adult learner."

The first questionnaire (See Appendix A) designed to elicit information in regard to students' perception of the planning process, was administered during the seventh week of the seminar, prior to implementation of the learning

activities students had planned. Questions were related to Knowles' ideas about the adult learner and the learning environment. His description of the adult learner proposes certain characteristics:

a. the need to participate in planning one's own educational goals;

b. a serious commitment to learning;

c. an ability to share experiences;

d. the ability to plan educational goals that are relevant and useful for current life needs.[4]

The environment, according to Knowles, should be non-threatening and comfortable to allow the adult learner freedom to express educational needs. The questions were related to those ideas. Answers to this first questionnaire are depicted in Table 1 and Table 2. In the first 15 questions, which constitute Table 1, students chose yes, no or somewhat as answers. In questions 16, 17 and 18 they were asked to comment.

TABLE 1

Students' Perception of Planning Sessions
N = 12

Questions	Yes	No	Somewhat	Total
1. Did you find the atmosphere of the Seminar to be conducive to your participation?	9		3	12
2. Were the planning sessions conducted in an atmosphere of collaboration?	9		3	12

TABLE 1 con't

Students' Perception of Planning Sessions
N = 12

Questions	Yes	No	Somewhat	Total
3. Did you find the atmosphere of the planning sessions one of mutual respect?	10		2	12
4. Were your opinions taken into consideration during planning sessions?	11		1	12
5. Did you feel that you had a "stake" in the planning sessions?	9	1	2	12
6. Did you find the atmosphere of the sessions allowed for freedom of expression?	9		3	12
7. Did Seminar members share their opinions freely?	8		4	12
8. Did your participation in the planning process give you a sense of accomplishment?	7	1	4	12
9. Did your participation in planning learning goals and activities bolster your confidence in your ability to reach those goals?	7		5	12
10. Do you think that the group participation was helpful during the planning process?	10		2	12
11. Did all students participate during the planning sessions?	6	1	5	12
12. Did participation give you some control of your own learning?	11		1	12

TABLE 1 con't

Students' Perception of Planning Sessions
N = 12

Questions	Yes	No	Somewhat	Total
13. Do you think the planning sessions helped you to clarify some of your own learning goals?	10		2	12
14. Do you believe that the chosen goals were realistic?	11		1	12
15. Do you believe the chosen goals were relevant to your current needs?	12			12

Yes and no answers were clearly understood as positive and negative perceptions of the planning sessions. The answer - somewhat - was viewed as a partially positive response. The connotation that the condition asked about took place to some degree.

Climate of the Seminar

Several of the questions in Table 1 - nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 - referred to the climate of the Seminar. (1. Did you find the atmosphere of the Seminar to be conducive to your participation?; 2. Were the planning sessions conducted in an atmosphere of collaboration?; 3. Did you find the atmosphere of the planning sessions one of mutual respect?; 4. Were your opinions taken into consideration during planning sessions?; 6. Did you find the atmosphere of the sessions allowed for freedom of expression?; and 7. Did

seminar members share their opinions freely?) Andragogical theory suggests that the educational environment best suited to the adult learner needs to be one that is comfortable and non-threatening. Adult learners expect to freely exchange their ideas and knowledge with a feeling of mutual respect. Students were asked to judge if the seminar was, in fact, a comfortable milieu. As Table 1 indicates, students affirmed that those conditions existed in their answers to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. Seventy-five percent answered an unequivocable yes to questions 1, 2, 6 and 7, while the other twenty-five percent felt they existed to some degree. The percentage of affirmative answers was slightly higher for questions 4 and 6. Not all students commented on their answers, but some reinforced their positive attitude by the following statements, "I felt comfortable with the group," "I felt others listened to me with respect," "Some of my ideas on policy and current issues which I gave much thought to during the summer are now a major part of the seminar." One of the students who answered - Somewhat - commented, "The planning sessions were conducted in an atmosphere of collaboration, but the weight of the department had some effect."

Participation and Goal Commitment

Questions nos. 5, 8, 9 and 12 were related to Knowles' assumption that adult learners have a sense of commitment to learning goals when they have participated in planning those goals.[5] (5. Did you feel you had a "stake" in the

planning process?; 8. Did your participation in the planning process give you a sense of accomplishment?; 9. Did your participation in planning learning goals and activities bolster your confidence in your ability to reach those goals?; 12. Did participation give you some control of your own learning?) Answers to no. 12 indicated that planning did give students a sense of control for their own learning - 11 Yes and 1 Somewhat. Most students also felt they had a "stake" in the planning process - 9 Yes and 2 Somewhat. One student answered that question (no. 5) in the negative. That student did not comment. The percentage of positive answers was not quite as high for questions 8 and 9. Seven students answered Yes to both questions, the choice of Somewhat was marked by five to no. 9 and 4 to no. 8. One student chose No as an answer to no. 8. That student did not comment. Comments such as "I did not feel as strongly about the goals as perhaps I should," "I tried to be realistic" and "I always seem to have trouble 'bolstering' myself," tend to indicate students were not certain of reaching their goals at that point in the semester. One student in answering no. 8 commented "the closer we come to graduation, the surer I will feel."

Group Processes

Questions nos. 10 and 11 related to group processes. (10. Do you think that the group participation was helpful during the planning process?; 11. Did all students participate during the planning sessions?) The answers indicated

that students felt the group participation was helpful, but that not all students participated during the sessions. Answers to no. 10 were primarily affirmative as 10 students chose - Yes; and 2 - Somewhat. In reflecting about group participation only 6 students (50%) answered - Yes; 5 - Somewhat, and 1 - No. Comments such as "There are a couple who never do much;" "Some students held back" and "Some are always quiet" indicated that students recognized the diversity of personality types in the seminar. They were divided about equally between assertive and passive personalities. Experientially, it is known that providing the opportunity to participate is not the only factor - a person's motivation to assert himself/herself is also important.

Goal Selection

Questions nos. 13, 14, and 15 relate to the assumptions made by Knowles and others that adult learners choose goals that are relevant to current needs. (13. Do you think the planning sessions helped you to clarify some of your own learning goals?; 14. Do you believe that the chosen goals were realistic?; and 15. Do you believe the chosen goals were relevant to your current needs?)

Ten of the twelve students perceived the planning sessions as helpful in clarifying learning goals and two answered that it was somewhat helpful. Eleven of the twelve believed the goals were realistic and one answered somewhat realistic. The students were unanimous in viewing

goals they planned as relevant to their current needs. Their answers seemed to indicate that the planning process had positive outcomes for their learning. Some of the comments also suggested that the process was helpful in enabling them to clarify their learning goals. The following are examples of student comments, "It helped me to pick out goals that I may not consciously have thought about"; "I'm more aware of my weak points and what I need to work on"; "Yes, I noticed it helped others too."

Perception of Planning Process

Questions nos. 16, 17 and 18 asked students to comment on the planning process and on whether senior students had the ability to plan learning goals, activities and evaluation strategies. (16. Describe what for you was the most positive aspect/s of the planning sessions; 17. If you were involved in this process again, what improvements would you make?; 18. Do you think senior students have enough knowledge and experience to participate in planning learning activities and evaluation strategies?) Table 2 illustrates a composite of student opinions on these questions.

TABLE 2

Students' Perception of Planning con't
N = 12

Questions	Comments
16. Describe what for you was the most positive aspect/s of the planning sessions.	"The end result" "Being able to have a choice"

TABLE 2

Students' Perception of Planning con't
N = 12

Questions	Comments
	"The way in which I felt free to speak" "Having some responsibility" "We selected goals to fit our needs" "Working together and collaborating our ideas - It's important to know where we are going"
17. If you were involved in this process again, what improvements would you make?	"Two meetings for planning instead of six" "Smaller groups from day 1" "Condense the planning, it dragged a bit"
18. Do you think senior students have enough knowledge and experience to participate in planning learning activities and evaluation strategies?	"Yes definitely,...who knows better what students need and want than students" "Yes, to a degree, however I think there needs to be some structures within which to work" "Definitely, I know what I want" "With the guidance of an advisor and peers to provide structure I feel it is possible" "Yes, I feel it is more beneficial to tailor learning activities to fit these goals."

The comments students made suggest they favor having responsibility for their own learning, that having a choice enables them to select goals that are relevant. Collabor-

ating within a group and sharing their ideas was also a positive experience and one they deemed important. Some commented that they felt free to speak out and that was helpful. All of the students believed themselves capable of planning for their own educational needs. Most felt quite strongly about it while two of the students tempered their yes answers by stating that some structure needs to be provided in addition to guidance from an instructor.

As a whole, the results of the students' evaluation seem to suggest that planning for their own learning is a positive experience and one that can be helpful in linking learning goals to what is relevant to their current needs. Participation of the adult learner is viewed by andragogists as an important initial step in educating adults. The senior students viewed the atmosphere of the seminar as a non-threatening environment in which planning was carried out in a collaborative manner. Both participation and a non-threatening environment conform to the criteria espoused by Knowles as the ideal setting and process for learning to take place.[6] The seminar, in so far as the planning sessions were concerned, conformed, in the opinion of students and the facilitator, to that ideal. Seniors also viewed themselves as having the knowledge and experience necessary to plan for their own learning and in their comments indicated it was a skill that should be developed.

The above evaluation was conducted at about mid-semester. Students then carried out the learning activi-

ties they planned until the end of the Fall, 1985 semester. At that time, students were asked to evaluate the seminar as a learning experience. A questionnaire was administered to them to elicit judgements about the benefits, if any, of the learning activities they had planned (See Appendix B). Several questions also related to the setting; the intent to determine if the environment continued to be conducive to learning. In addition, the expectation was to learn something about the students' characteristics as learners, i.e., were they able to share their experiences and in that way act as resources for one another. The last question asked them to rate their progress toward reaching their educational goals. Table 3 presents a summary of the students' answers to the first 10 questions on the questionnaire and Table 4 to question 11.

TABLE 3

Students' Perceptions of the Fall Seminar
N = 12

Question	Positive Response	Negative Response
1. Was the physical environment of the Seminar conducive to group interaction?	12	
2. Do you feel you were able to express your opinions freely in the Seminar?	12	
3. Were Seminar members attentive when it was your turn to act as discussion leader?	12	

TABLE 3 con't

Students' Perceptions of the Fall Seminar
N = 12

Question	Positive Response	Negative Response
4. Were you able to share your knowledge/skills with others in the Seminar?	11	1
5. Were others able to share their knowledge/skills in the Seminar?	11	1
6. Were you able to utilize the instructor as a resource during the Seminar sessions?	12	
7. Were the Seminar discussions helpful to you as a student Social Work Practitioner?	12	
8. Were you able to relate the substance of the Seminar discussions to your own esperience in your field agency?	9	3
9. Was feedback from the group following our discussions helpful to you?	12	
10. Did participation in the Seminar help you to make progress toward meeting your personal goals?	11	1

Climate of the Seminar

Questions nos. 1, 2 and 3 in the above questionnaire referred to the climate of the seminar. (1. Was the physical environment of the seminar conducive to group interaction?; 2. Do you feel you were able to express your opinions freely in the seminar? and 3. Were seminar members attentive when it was your time to act as discussion leader?) As the table indicates, all twelve students gave

a positive response to those three questions. According to the students, the setting continued to be a comfortable environment in which students expressed opinions freely and responded to each other. These comments reinforce their positive attitudes:

> "Yes, the group was open, everyone had an opportunity to express what was on their mind."
>
> "Yes, they all seemed interested in my topic."
>
> "The group was small and informal - I said what I wanted to."
>
> "I felt others listened and actively participated in my discussion."

Participation and Mutual Sharing

Questions nos. 4, 5 and 6 (4. Were you able to share your knowledge/skills with others in the Seminar?; 5. Were others able to share their knowledge/skills in the Seminar? 6. Were you able to utilize the instructor as a resource during the Seminar sessions?) refer to the notion that an andragogical approach to instruction encourages the processes of participation and mutual sharing by learners. Students' answers indicate that those processes were evident during the seminar - eleven responded positively to nos. 4 and 5 and twelve to no. 6. The students perceived that mutual sharing did exist in the seminar and that the instructor took part in that process. The instructor also acted as a resource person, a role deemed important by Knowles and others.[7] Their comments again reinforce their attitudes:

"Yes, I felt no difficulty in sharing."

"Yes, members offered their knowledgd and skills throughout the seminar."

"Inside and out of seminar sessions, I personally felt the instructor was available and attentive to our needs."

"The instructor made herself available as a resource person at all times. I felt I could utilize her skills and knowledge at any time."

"Yes, the instructor was a very important part of the seminar."

"Yes, I do. When we as students were hot, bothered and out of control, Mrs. Lewis brought us back and allowed us ... to focus on the reality of the situation."

Relevancy

Questions nos. 7 and 8 (7. Were the seminar discussions helpful to you as a student social work practitioner?; 8. Were you able to relate the substance of the seminar discussions to your experience in your field agency?) referred to a concept significant to andragogy - that adult learners, when encouraged to participate in planning educational needs, will plan goals that are relevant to current life needs.[8] The students were unanimous in thinking the seminar discussions were helpful. Several commented and reinforced their opinion:

"Yes, it brought out important issues."

"It was good to hear about other agencies and their policies and practices."

"Yes, I found the discussions very helpful especially the one about DRG's."

There were three negative comments to question no. 8 -

nine were positive. One student who responded negatively said, "All placements are diverse" another "I really haven't had the chance to relate seminar discussions in my placement." Several of the students who responded positively indicated that they could see the basic similarities in one's experience in an agency no matter that agencies are diverse. Some examples of positive comments were:

> "Yes, some topics were directly related and others were indirectly related to my placement."
>
> "Yes, I found that, overall, I was able to relate most material in seminar to my own experience. I found it extremely interesting and very informative and helpful."

Group Processes

Question no. 9 (Was feedback from the group following our discussions helpful to you?) referred to the idea that mutual sharing within the learning environment can encourage learners to act as resources for one another. After a presentation and discussion, students shared their views about the quality of the presentation with the presenter who then was able to respond or comment on those views. As the table indicates, all twelve students thought that technique was helpful. Some of the students gave reasons why they felt feedback was helpful. The following comments are illustrative:

> "Yes, I was able to listen to others and learn from their feedback."
>
> "Feedback was extremely appreciated after our discussions, at least by me. I found many of the comments very helpful to my increasing self-image as a social work professional."

"Yes, it let me know how others perceived me and what adjustments I should make."

Goal Attainment

Question no. 10 (Did participation in the seminar help you to make progress toward meeting your personal goals?) asked students to determine if carrying out the learning strategies they planned was helpful in reaching personal goals. Andragogists suggest that this occurs where the learner has had a hand in designing the goals and learning strategies. According to Knowles, "learners have a sense of progress toward their goals" when they are involved in the planning process.[9] There was only one negative response to this question, that student commented, "As far as my personal goals, the seminar was unable to help meet them; my field was helpful though." Students who responded positively also cited their agency experiences as being helpful. Some of the comments follow:

"Yes, I am comfortable in what I am doing - I feel real good about the progress I have made. My agency makes me feel that what I do is also important to them."

"Yes, I can speak in front of others with more confidence and ease."

"Yes, seminar did. Sharing views openly is important even when we disagree."

Students saw themselves and others in the seminar as resources and as individuals willing to share experiences. The environment of the seminar was such that students felt a freedom to express themselves without fearing destructive criticism. They viewed the seminar as a safe place to take

risks. They felt they could be frank in expressing their ideas and that others listened, with respect, to their views.

In question no. 11 students were asked to indicate on a scale from one to ten, with one being low and ten high, to what degree the seminar had helped them to reach their professional goals. The responses were grouped into three categories - one, two, three were considered low; four, five, six and seven - moderate; and eight, nine and ten - high. Student answers are tabulated in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Students' Perceptions of Their Progress
N = 12*

11. The following are the professional goals we developed during the planning sessions. Please use the rating scale following each to evaluate your progress toward meeting them.

Goals:	Students' Rating Scale		
	Low	Moderate	High
1. Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and Seminar members, as resources and be able to relate to colleagues collaboratively.		4	8
2. Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.		3	9
3. Understand his/her professional role as a social worker.		3	9

Goals:		Students' Rating Scale	
		Low Moderate	High
4.	Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice. (ex. Conflict of values between one's own values and those of the agency.	2	10
5.	Assess his/her own strengths and vulnerabilities.	4	8
6.	Understand the impact of current social policy decisions and social research on practice.	6	6
7.	Communicate in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.	2	10

The goals listed in Table 4 are those decided upon by the students during the planning sessions. They have been categorized as goals relating to Role - Skills - and Professional Growth. The categories are not mutually exclusive; since those chosen as skills might also be considered as pertaining to role behavior; they were chosen as a means to describe student perceptions.

Role

Goals nos. 1 and 3 (1. Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and seminar members, as resources and be able to relate to colleagues collaboratively; 3. Understand his/her professional role as a social worker) refer to the role behavior expected of professional social workers. The response pattern of students for those goals was similar.

Four students felt they had been moderately successful in attaining goal one and eight students felt they had a high degree of goal attainment. As the table indicates, three students chose moderate and nine high for their choice in goal no. 3.

Skills

Three of the goals, nos. 2, 4 and 7 (2. Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems; 4. Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice (ex. Conflict of values between one's own values and those of the agency); 7. Communicate in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.) refer to skills that become part of the social worker's techniques and strategies that improve through practice. Three students felt they had moderate success in reaching goal no. 2 and nine a high degree of success. The choices were clustered around the high moderate and low high ratings; those students who perceived a high success rate left room for improvement. The responses to goal no. 4 indicate that two students felt they had moderate success and 10 a high degree of success in reaching that goal. Again, the responses were clustered near the low end of the high category. Students responded to no. 7 goal in much the same way - two chose moderate - and ten a high rating.

Professional Growth

Goals nos. 5 and 6 (5. Assess his/her own strengths and vulnerabilities; 6. Understand the impact of current

social policy decisions and social research on practice.) were subsumed under professional growth since the ability to make self-assessments is a prerequisite to growth while goal six implies a continuing search for knowledge. Four students perceived their progress as moderate in reaching goal 5 and eight rated their progress as high. Six of the eight were closer to the low end of the high category, implying more room for improvement. The students were evenly divided in their responses to goal no. 6. Six felt their progress was moderate and six perceived a high degree of progress. Again, the responses were clustered around high moderate and low high ratings.

As Table 4 indicates, all of the students thought they had made progress in reaching their goals. Their ratings differed somewhat, but all were in the moderate to high range. The goals and learning tasks chosen for the seminar were outcomes of the students' participation with the instructor during the planning sessions. Their ideas were incorporated into the design of the seminar and constituted a major part of the activities throughout the seminar. The responses to the questionnaire appear to confirm, from the students' point of view, that learning is enhanced when learners share the responsibility for planning educational goals and tasks. During the seminar, they shared experiences and acted as resources for one another; their goals and the learning tasks they planned were seen as relevant to their current activities in the field. The comments, as

listed above, also indicate that students were beginning to monitor their progress in becoming professional social workers. In carrying out goal planning, seminar tasks and self-evaluations, the students appear to share some of the characteristics of the adult learner (listed above).

Final Evaluations

The project continued during the Spring 1986 semester. In the first session of the seminar students reviewed the educational goals they had chosen during the previous semester and their rate of progress in meeting them. This exercise helped them to develop learning tasks relevant for the current semester. They decided to discuss their placements and to carry out peer evaluations. They wanted feedback from one another and the facilitator on the progress they had made in becoming more professional. During the following six weeks, students, in turn, asked seminar members to help them evaluate their progress in reaching both personal and professional goals. During the seventh seek, students decided they had reached the goals they had set for the seminar and then articulated the need for information about careers. The project ended at that point and the following week students were asked, once again, to evaluate the seminar.

A questionnaire was administered (see Appendix C) that asked students to evaluate and comment on their learning as an outcome of the seminar. There were a total of 16 questions. Questions one through eight were related to parti-

cipation, mutual sharing, relevancy and group processes. Questions nine through sixteen referred to students' learning goals and their progress in meeting them. Following are the first eight questions:

1. Please explain how participation in planning the seminar affected your motivation to learn.

2. To what degree did sharing in planning and designing the seminar make learning a positive experience?

3. How were the learning goals we formulated relevant to your current learning needs?

4. How were learning activities we engaged in during seminar related to your experiences in your agency?

5. To what degree was feedback from other seminar members helpful to you?

6. What impact did sharing your experiences have on the learning of other seminar members?

7. To what degree did sharing the responsibility for seminar learning activities make learning more purposeful for you?

8. One of our learning strategies involved the assessment of personal goals. How was that helpful in terms of your own professional growth?

There were eight students who were consistently positive in their comments to the questionnaire. With the exception of question no. 5 to which all students commented in positive terms, three students commented both positively and negatively and one student was consistently negative. The questionnaires, throughout the project, were anonymous. Therefore, it is not possible to make assessments in regard to differences between the students who viewed the learning

experience in positive terms and the student who had negative views.

Participation and Mutual Sharing

Questions nos. 1, 2, 6 and 7 (1. Please explain how participation in planning the seminar affected your motivation to learn.' 2. To what degree did sharing in planning and designing the seminar make learning a positive experience?; 6. What impact did sharing your experiences have on the learning of other seminar members?; 7. To what degree did sharing the responsibility for seminar learning make learning more purposeful to you?) asked the students to assess how participation in planning for their own learning and how sharing experiences and knowledge affected their learning. The majority of students described the seminar as a good learning experience - 8 positive and 4 negative comments. Some of the comments suggested that students felt more involved in the seminar and also surprised at being involved at the planning level. One student commenting on question no. 1 said she was more willing to learn something all had agreed upon. Other positive comments were:

> "I thought participating in what I was to be involved with and what I wanted to do was very beneficial."
>
> "By planning the seminar everyone was able to have more input ... I felt this helped interest the group more."
>
> "My participation in planning seminar objectives intensified my motivation to learn. I felt I was more involved in the whole project and not

> just as a student performing required tasks from someone else."

There were four negative replies to the first question. Two stated they felt the seminar should have had more structure, commenting, "I feel you should have planned it and handed out a set syllabus - we could have altered it but it would have given us direction" and "I felt we should have had more structure along with flexibility to explore issues when they arise." In every other social work course students are handed a syllabus on the first day. These two obviously needed that structure although their comments hinted at the need to have some input. The two other negative comments referred to the experience as being frustrating, "Well it really didn't motivate me as much as frustrate me. I would rather have had it planned with some time left for extra options" and "It didn't, I became more frustrated.

In question no. 2 the students were asked directly if the seminar was a positive experience; there were eleven positive comments and one negative. The following are characteristic of the positive comments:

> "I felt this experience to be highly positive in nature. I was really comfortable with the process and I felt my confidence build throughout the experience."

> "Each week I gained a bit more courage to discuss my assignments and found out what I did was what other social workers had done."

> "It wasn't like anyone was being forced to do something. People had a chance to plan what they wanted - very positive."

The student who answered negatively referred again to what she describes in question no. 1 as lack of structure; "I think it should have had more direction from the beginning." The majority of comments to this question indicate that sharing the responsibility for learning enhances one's ability to learn.

Most comments in answer to question no. 6 were positive. The majority of students (ten to two) felt they had helped others in the seminar by participating and sharing experiences. The following are examples that indicate positive feelings:

> "I think some of the information I shared helped others to realize other systems and what to expect when they go out to work. I was able to share my negative experiences; this might have helped others to be aware of agency policy and the need for good supervision."
>
> "They were always willing to listen, very accepting ... So they must have learned in a positive way."
>
> "They were able to relate with the positive experiences and the failures of each other and discuss what others may have done in similar situations."

The two who responded negatively to that question commented that they had no way to judge others' learning. The positive comments indicated that students were interested and attentive during discussions and they conveyed the impression of learning from them.

Question no. 7 related sharing of responsibility for learning to the purpose of their education. Eight students listed positive comments; three were negative and one did

not comment. A sample of the positive comments follow:

> "I feel that if you share in the ideas of a learning activity the person is more likely to participate ... it made me more active."
>
> "I wanted others to hear what I had to offer - what my expertise was in. For that reason I also listened to what others said more intently."
>
> "It had more purpose because the learning activities were all agreed upon."

The students, according to their comments, agreed with Knowles and others that participating in the design of learning helps learning to become more purposeful. One student who responded negatively referred again to "needing more direction;" and another commented, "I'm not really sure."

Relevancy

Questions nos. 3 and 4 (3. How were the learning goals we formulated relevant to your current learning needs?; 4. How were learning activities we engaged in during seminar related to your experiences in your agency?) referred to Robinson's ideas that adults must be able to "make sense" of their learning and be able to relate learning to current life needs.[10] In responding to question no. 3 most students (ten of twelve) felt their learning goals were relevant and related to their experiences in their agencies. One of the students commented, "Planning made me feel more comfortable in my agency;" another "I learned how to relate to colleagues in a professional manner." One of the students who replied negatively said, "There was no connection

between the two." The other said, "Some of them were relevant, but sometimes I felt like I was wasting my breath."

Question no. 4 asked about the link, if any, between learning activities and the tasks students carried out during field placement. The answers were primarily positive (ten positive; two negative). Some comments were:

> "I had a chance to see how others were coping with problem situations and apply them myself."
>
> "I learned how to relate with other colleagues in a more professional manner."
>
> "Activities were generally helpful and provided me with new ideas or perspectives."

Students who responded negatively seemed to want more structure. The comment of one, "More formal presentations are needed" bears that out. The other said, "Some were, but not all, it was sometimes difficult to connect what we did in seminar to my field placement."

Group Processes

Questions nos. 5 and 8 (5. To what degree was feedback from other seminar members helpful to you?; 8. One of our learning strategies involved the assessment of personal goals. How was that helpful in terms of your own growth?) referred to two of the activities that were carried out as learning strategies and that involved a major part of the seminar time. Question no. 5 related specifically to the process of feedback that became part of every task-oriented session and was the learning activity in the last three sessions. The comments were all positive and several

stated they found this to be the most helpful activity. The following are examples of the comments:

> "Feedback helped because others let me know what I was doing well or poorly and how I was coming across to others."
>
> "It was helpful because it's always good to have others tell you something you might not be able to see in yourself."
>
> "A high degree - I feel more like a fellow student, more at ease to talk about my learning experiences."
>
> "Very helpful - this is a critical task."
>
> "I felt this was the most rewarding aspect of the seminar. I picked up useful information from the other members."

The students, as indicated by their comments, lend support to Verner's ideas that "learning is facilitated where the learner is aware of his progress."[11]

Eleven of the students responded positively to question no. 8 that asked students to comment on the link between one of the learning formats and their growth as professionals. Students felt this activity helped them in reaching professional goals as well as personal goals. Personal goals tended to be related to their field experiences, such as the need to participate in staff meetings without becoming anxious. The student who responded negatively said she was "turned-off by the use of the word - goal." But, positive comments were in the majority; the following are examples:

> "It made me take a look at where I was and where I was headed."

"This was the most helpful to me. I could see where I stand and how much I gained."

"It helped me to find the most successful way to achieve my goals."

"I felt that identifying my personal goals made me more aware of my limitations, and made me work at correcting them more easily."

As the comments indicate, most students found the learning formats to be helpful and one activity, that of feedback, very helpful. Feedback came primarily from group members, although the facilitator also participated in that exercise. It focused on how the group viewed each person's improvement over time. They evaluated each other on the quality of their presentations during both semesters and on how they performed their roles and tasks in their agencies. This latter activity was judged second-hand by listening to a student's discussion of how he/she had handled a particular practice situation or incident. Their comments suggest they valued their peers' input and found it helpful in promoting their own learning. This supports the contention of Knowles and others that adults prefer to share experiences and knowledge and that they are capable of doing so in a helpful manner.

In questions nine through sixteen students were asked to indicate on a scale from one to ten - one being low and ten high - their progress in reaching professional goals. They were also asked to give examples from their practice experience. Their responses were grouped into three categories: 1-2-3 were Low; 4-5-6-7 were Moderate; and

8-9-10 were High. Student answers were tabulated in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Students' Perception of Their Progress in Reaching Learning Goals
N = 12

Please rate the progress you made in reaching the following goals and give an example of how it was reflected in your practice.

GOALS:	Students Rating Scale		
	Low	Moderate	High
9. Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and seminar members, as resources.		3	9
10. The ability to relate to colleagues collaboratively.		1	11
11. Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.		2	10
12. Understand your professional role as a social worker.		1	11
13. Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice. (ex. Conflict of values between one's own values and those of the agency.)			12
14. Assess your own strengths and vulnerabilities.		4	8
15. Understand the impact of current social policy decisions and social research on practice.			
16. Communicate in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.		1	11

The students rated the above goals at the end of the

Fall semester and they have been categorized again as goals relating to - Role, Skills and Professional Growth. Those categories were not intended to be mutually exclusive since several would fit into all three categories. They were chosen as a way to clarify students' ratings.

Role

Goals nos. 9, 10 and 12 (9. Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and seminar members, as resources.; 10. The ability to relate to colleagues collaboratively.; 12. Understand your professional role as a social worker.) refer to role behavior that students must assume in their agencies now and later in careers. Their responses had changed slightly from the last questionnaire, ratings to all three goals had moved closer to the high end. In reference to goal no. 9, three students indicated moderate success and nine felt highly successful. The following comments are from students who rated their progress as high:

> "I was able to gather input from my supervisor which was very helpful in dealing with clients. Seminar members shared experiences and ideas. I valued the seminar experience...."

> "I was able to go to anyone in my practicum, I also had several nursing students and social work students use me as a resource."

The following comments are from students who felt they had made progress but had not quite met their goals:

> "I was more assertive in seeking help from colleagues when needed, but I still find, at times, I have to make a definite effort."

> "I was able to share experiences with some, but not all of my colleagues yet."

Eleven students rated their progress high in reference to goal 10; one chose moderate at the high end of that category. Some of their comments illustrate that progress:

> "I now have no problem. I am comfortable with my colleagues."

> "I have been very comfortable, especially this second semester."

The student who rated her progress as moderate commented that, "Collaborative teamwork was not one of the positive characteristics of my agency" implying, perhaps, that in a different agency she might have made more progress. The responses to goal number 12 indicated that students had made progress; 11 rated their progress as high and one, moderate. The student who rated her progress as moderate commented, "Sometimes I do, but sometimes I question my motives as well as my role." Some comments from those who felt they made greater progress are as follows:

> "I have really come to understand my role within the agency...I had very good role models to emulate."

> "The code of ethics is now embedded in my head. I think I have progressed in this area tremendously."

Skills

Goals numbered 11, 13 and 16 (11. Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.; 13. Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice.; 16. Communicate in a responsive

and concerned manner with clients.) refer to some of the social work skills necessary for professional practice. Students' ratings to no. 11 indicate that they improved over the life of the seminar - ten rated their progress as high and two as moderate. The examples they gave reinforce those ratings. Some examples from the high ratings:

> "I am very aware of the problems my clients face and I think I do a good job of 'getting that across' to people."
>
> "I have been able to speak more professionally in staff meetings."

The two students who perceived a moderate success commented that they had made progress, but, as one stated, "I still have a way to go."

All twelve students felt they had reached a high degree of progress in understanding the ethical concerns they face in their agencies (no. 13). Their comments reinforced the ratings. Some examples:

> "I readily identify ethical issues and discuss them with colleagues. I hope I shall never accept those I see as unjust or rectifiable."
>
> "I'm placed at an agency that is for community living for MR clients and would like state institutions closed. I work at a state institution. I try not to let my values interfere with my work at the agency."
>
> "I have really become more aware of my own values and that has helped me understand differences."

The ratings for goal number 16 also improved from those of the Fall semester indicating that students continued to make progress. One student was at the high end of

the moderate category and the other eleven were in the high end of the high category. Their comments are indicative of their progress:

> "I have a good rapport with my clients and I think they are comfortable with me."
>
> "I have been working with several hard to reach clients and they seem to be responding to me - at least they show up each week."

The student who rated her progress as moderate felt she would continue to improve in practice since, as she stated, "I see this as my most important goal."

Professional Growth

Goals numbered 14 and 15 (14. Assess your own strengths and vulnerabilities.; 15. Understand the impact of current social policy decisions and social research on practice.) are related to a practitioner's commitment to continued growth and development. No. 14 refers also to a person's ability to make self-assessments. In their ratings, students did not indicate as much progress in reaching that goal although the ratings in both the moderate and high categories were at the high end of each. In this final questionnaire as in the Fall four students chose moderate and eight high as their ratings. Those choosing the moderate rating commented as follows:

> "I have a hard time looking at what I'm good at - I know my weaknesses."
>
> "I feel I have many strengths but I also get frustrated at the system."
>
> "I see my strengths and weaknesses more clearly now than last year."

Those who felt they had made more progress commented as follows:

> "From the feedback at seminar and my placement, I have been able to do this."
>
> "I am more assertive."
>
> "I have made more progress in this area at least as much as I can in seminar. I don't think I will ever be perfect though."

The ratings for goal no. 15 were higher on this final evaluation than they were in the Fall. Ten students rated their progress as high as compared to six in the Fall and two chose moderate as compared to six in the Fall. Students felt that seminar discussions helped them as well as their agency experience. Some of their comments are as follows:

> "All activity is goverened by policy, that was clear at Bureau of Aging."
>
> "I'm more aware of the policies affecting my agency now - our discussions helped."
>
> "I was able to discuss the impact of funding cuts in a professional manner."

The two students who viewed their progress as moderate cited less understanding of the impact of research as their reason. One commented, "I am always aware of social policy decisions, but not always certain of the social research impact."

As Table 5 indicates, most students felt they had made good progress and, in fact, had reached the goals they set for themselves earlier in the Seminar. Their comments were also indicative of personal and professional growth. In a

number of ways students expressed positive views of the seminar and their participation in its design. Their diligence in planning and carrying out learning tasks is an indication of their commitment to the seminar. They commented many times during the peer evaluation sessions that it was an important and beneficial learning activity. They have, several times during the semester, expressed the idea that the learning strategies they utilized should be incorporated in subsequent seminars. They also filled out the questionnaires by giving a good deal of thought to their answers and did not balk at the number of times they were asked to evaluate. In the final questionnaire the students were able to assess their potential as social workers and rate their progress toward their goals. Their ratings seemed realistic and several of them expressed the idea that self-assessment was a continuing need.

Faculty Evaluation

The faculty, seminar facilitator and two other full-time social workers also contributed to a final evaluation. During the first meeting, faculty decided to utilize some of Knowles' ideas as a basis for describing a model of the "good student" that would be utilized in rating the students. Discussed were ideas that refer to the adult's sense of responsibility, the ability to be autonomous and self-directing and the ability to make decisions independently. Qualities it was hoped students would have developed by the end of their senior year. High grades were

not included as a characteristic since faculty felt that, for the student who had reached the senior year, intellectual ability was a given. The following is the model designed as characteristic of the "good student":

The good student is -

*One who is responsible; who hands in work on time; is prompt with agency assignments and is not absent from the agency without serious reason.

*One who is aware of appropriate ways to relate to faculty and peers. One who has an awareness of social roles and how they impact on one's behavior. One who is able to relate appropriately to those in authority.

*One who others can rely upon; this implies a consistency in the way one behaves.

*One who is open to learning, who has the ability to challenge one's own biases; to be flexible; who goes beyond the minimal. One who has vision.

*One who does not put the locus of responsibility outside of oneself; is able to say "I am wrong" or "I can grow."

*One who has the ability to be supportive of peers; to share and be considerate of others.

*One who has initiative who can commit time, energy and resources to reach a goal.

*One who has the ability to be non-judgemental in the classroom, as well as the field.

*One who has the ability to deal with conflict constructively so that relationships are not severed.

At the second meeting the model was utilized as a standard to assess the senior students. Since two of the faculty had not been involved with the seminar, the question of whether we could validly link their perceptions of student behavior to what happened in the seminar arose.

They were involved in the Pilot Study that was carried out in the Spring 1985 Semester, and they also had an interest in viewing the andragogical model for use in other courses. There is a great deal of interaction, generally, among the faculty and senior students and one of the faculty teaches a senior required course. The program is relatively small so that faculty and students also interact frequently over time. The two faculty not involved in the seminar had examined the questionnaire results and had followed the progress of students' planning efforts. They felt they were close to the project and very interested in its outcome and also wanted to share their assessments of students. Program faculty all view the field practicum and the field seminar as the most significant course in the senior curriculum and one that would have a greater impact on students' professional growth.

The Students

Eight of the twelve students exhibited responsible behavior relative to completing field tasks and other course requirements. They had few absences and where an absence occurred, informed their agency supervisor in a timely manner. Four of the students had some problems in the field - one of those had problems we deemed serious. They had too many absences, were slow to complete field tasks and lacked a sense of responsibility in informing their field supervisors when it was appropriate. It was felt that their activities and performance in the field

seminar had some bearing on their behavior, since content in the field seminar is directly related to their work in the agency. The student who had serious problems failed the field instruction at the end of the first semester; the other three improved sufficiently during the second semester to pass.

As a group, the students demonstrated initiative and the ability to be self-assertive. During the past two years, there had developed a sense of dissatisfaction among the students in regard to some curriculum requirements, field policies and one of the faculty who taught supportive courses. Rather than continue to complain among themselves, the seniors organized a town meeting and invited the faculty to discuss the problems in a collaborative, non-hostile manner. The outcome of that meeting was positive as some of the difficulties students cited were ironed out. When asked how the meeting developed, several of the students commented, "You want us to take more responsibility here - the classroom is not the only place it is needed." Faculty agreed that the planning and implementation of the meeting exhibited their ability to deal with conflict constructively and also to share responsibility.

In a number of instances, a sub-group of the student organization - all seniors - approached the program director to speak for other students who were having difficulties. One of the students was having severe family problems and her academic work was suffering. Faculty felt

that this was an indication of their ability to be supportive and considerate of each other.

One of the learning activities in the seminar was to choose professional and personal goals, plan activities to meet those goals and evaluate progress in reaching them. The students worked actively to pursue their goals and were serious in their intentions throughout the seminar. The faculty felt this was an indication of their ability to commit time, energy and resources to reach a goal and to be able to say "I can grow." During the feedback sessions in seminar, students were able to view themselves in a number of social roles including the role of helper. They were also able to discuss knowledgeably the impact of those roles on others. The seminar facilitator suggested to the other faculty members that this was an indication of growth on the part of students and that they met the second criteria that was described for the "good" student.

The seminar was the arena where students could and did discuss their competency papers. They were often able to help each other in regard to resources and in their own words, "did a lot of sharing" outside of the seminar. This behavior was another indication of their ability to be supportive of one another, to share and be considerate of others. Their attitudes and skills in making realistic self-assessments and being open to feedback from their peers indicates that they did meet the fourth and fifth criteria in the above model. Faculty decided that students

had also made progress in their ability to be non-judgemental. Information was gleaned from the qeustionnaires students answered and from their behavior in other courses. To the extent that they took responsibility in planning goals and learning experiences, shared their experiences with others in the seminar, and geared their goals to their current needs, they did exhibit the characteristics of the adult learner. From the faculty's point of view, they also compared favorably to the model of the "good student." It appeared from faculty discussions that students had benefitted from an andragogical approach to learning.

Notes, Chapter V

[1]Malcolm Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species, 3rd ed. (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1984), pp. 204, 205.

[2]Edward A. Suchman, "Action for What: A Critique of Evaluation Research" in Carol Weiss, Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), p. 56.

[3]Malcolm Knowles, The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy, revised. (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980), pp. 202, 203, 204.

[4]Ibid., p. 57.

[5]Ibid., pp. 55-60. See also Knowles, 1984, pp. 130, 131.

[6]Knowles, ibid., 1980, p. 58.

[7]Ibid., pp. 47, 48.

[8]Ibid., p. 19.

[9]Knowles, ibid., 1984, p. 85.

[10]Russel D. Robinson, An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change. (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Omnibook Co., 1989), p. 63.

[11]Quoted by Davenport and Davenport in "The Letter to the Editor: An Application of Verner's Principles of Adult Learning." Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research (September, 1984):12.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

The evaluation procedures undertaken by faculty and students focused on answering the question - Does an andragogical approach to instruction enhance the learning of traditional age college students? The evaluation of the project by students and faculty supports the conclusion that the approach, as carried out in this project, did enhance their learning. The senior students were able to take on a large share of the planning for their own learning. They were also able to act independently in their own best interests outside of the classroom where, for example, they planned and carried out a "Town Meeting" to discuss problems in the program. Throughout the seminar, their interest was high, their presentations relevant and professional, and their grasp of theoretical concepts knowledgeable enough to explain and utilize them in their field placements.

The students, in their final questionnaire, also expressed positive views of the seminar and their participation in its design. They were serious in their commitment to the learning and in choosing personal and professional goals suited to their current needs in their field placements. The survey results also indicated that they were able to reach their goals through their own efforts and were able to design monitoring strategies that helped in that effort. They felt the sharing aspect of the seminar was extremely helpful and that it was an activity

they could utilize with colleagues in an agency setting. Perhaps the best argument in favor of an andragogical approach was that the students felt they had benefitted through increased knowledge and in their professional roles. In their comments the students attributed those outcomes to the seminar and its unique design.

In keepint with andragogical principles, the facilitator attempted to structure the seminar so that a warm, non-threatening enviornment existed. Answers that students gave to the first two questionnaires indicated that did occur. Students felt they were able to plan and share their needs without fear of destructive criticism. They also felt competent to share responsibility for their own learning and pleased they had choices of their own to contribute. For most of them, this meant they had a sense of "ownership" in what went on in the seminar. They also felt the seminar addressed learning needs that were relevant and realistic. The students' perception of an andragogical approach was clearly a positive one. This opinion is reinforced by the results of the questionnaire and students' own comments.

The students exhibited many of the characteristics Knowles attributes to the adult learner. A comparison of the seniors with Knowles' description of the adult learner (see p. 12) indicates they had a serious commitment to learning. They rarely missed the seminar and they participated willingly in the planning, learning and evaluation

processes. It is difficult to state that they had a need to participate in planning their own educational goals. But, they certainly participated wholeheartedly when given the opportunity. Sharing their experiences and showing concern for others' learning was also evident in the seminar. And, as mentioned above, this was a most enjoyable aspect of their learning. The students also felt capable of planning and were able to articulate learning goals relevant and useful for their current life needs. As the semester drew to a close, they became actively interested in career options - also a realistic and relevant goal.

Instructor's Role

Andragogical theory states clearly that the instructor's role is crucial in the learning situation. Therefore, a description of that role during this project is included here. The instructor attempted to act as both a facilitator and a resource person. In the initial meetings, a structure was provided to set the stage for student participation. This was done by introducing the objectives planned by the previous year's seniors and suggesting that the gorup modify or change them to fit their needs. The goal in the beginning sessions was to provide a non-threatening environment that allowed students a measure of autonomy. An environment in which students felt safe to risk discussing their own ideas and needs. An environment that was flexible to enable goals and learning activities

to change as students' needs changed. Some of the students were timid and often quiet in beginning sessions; the task of the facilitator was to ensure their opportunity to discuss their point of view.

As a way to help them assess their needs, they were asked what activity they favored in their agency and then asked if there were ways they could improve on carrying out that task. When discussions reached a point where a decision had to be made, the facilitator's task was to ensure that it was a collaborative decision. It was important that each student felt he/she had a stake in what the group was doing. Another role of the facilitator was that of the "good listener" - a role that should be conveyed to the students. Listening gave the students a sense that their opinions were worthwhile and it helped to keep the discussion and tasks in the seminar focused on goals. As the seminar progressed, students emulated the facilitator's manner and techniques. In the role of resource person, the facilitator placed texts on reserve in the library, shared experiences and suggested places to find information.

When the group began to plan evaluation strategies, the facilitator provided some examples to get them started. The group was also encouraged to help each other in that process. During the feedback processes in seminar, the facilitator started the group discussion when a student finished his/her presentation. If a student tended to look at the facilitator rather than at the person being evalua-

ted, he/she was asked to face the evaluatee. This seemed difficult for the students in early sessions, but they were gradually able to face the person being given feedback without help.

As the seminar continued, students looked less often to the facilitator to initiate discussions, and they began to use each other as resources. There were a number of students in the group who were assertive, and they took on leadership roles. By the second semester, both groups were working well and making progress toward reaching their goals. They had reached a point where sharing had become "institutionalized" and they looked to each other as significant to their learning. The facilitator's prominence in the group had diminished, while still remaining a working member of the group. The non-directive approach appeared to be successful in helping students take on a large share of their own learning.

The non-directive role the facilitator assumed did not eliminate the need for structure in the learning environment. Indeed, Knowles describes a number of tasks the facilitator attends to such as: helping students organize themselves, share responsibility and utilize their life experiences. An initial task, according to Knowles, is to shape a non-threatening environment in which mutual trust can grow and develop.[1] The facilitator's tasks parallel group development tasks described by Northen and others. The use of relationship in a group, whether students or

clients, to motivate members to help themselves is a primary skill of the groupworker; a skill that is also mentioned by Knowles. Northen describes group development as stages in a group's life, within which there are certain tasks. A group's initial motivation is enhanced by the group facilitator's skills during the Orientation Stage in a group or during the first few meetings of a student group. Subsequent stages of a group's development are initiated through the groupworker's skills in helping the group to coalesce and in enhancing a group's ability to help each other. The sense of mutual sharing and the ability of learners to act as resources for each other are also present in the learning environment that is patterned on andragogical theory.[2] The facilitator who plans to utilize an andragogical approach to instruction would find groupwork theory and the attendant skills extremely useful resources.

Another task of the facilitator that bears consideration is the preplanning task. Kurland cited the need for preplanning in group development and suggested the correlation to a classroom environment. Kurland described a preplanning model that included the following components: - Need; Purpose; Composition; Structure; Content and Pre-Group Contact. That model provides a useful mechanism for the educator contemplating andragogy as an alternative learning approach. A group's chance of success is greatly enhanced by careful preplanning by the group leader.[3]

Careful planning for the organization and presentation of learning activities has been an integral part of the learning-teaching environment. It is no less important for the organization of an andragogical approach to learning. The utilization of andragogy supports the notion of non-directive learning; it does not belie the need for preplanning nor the need for structure.

Considerations For Further Use Of An Andragogical Approach

In programs where students are accustomed to a pedagogical approach to learning, utilization of andragogical principles might be more beneficial if introduced gradually. If begun at the junior level, senior students would not be confronted with a totally new approach. They may become acclimated to accepting more responsibility for their own learning over a reasonable amount of time. Some of the seniors commented that the planning process took too long; introducing an andragogical approach in the junior year might shorten the process for seniors accustomed to planning goals and objectives. Initially, as that approach is introduced, students should be given a thorough explanation of self-directed learning to ensure their understanding of that instructional method and the importance of their role. Other faculty should also have an understanding of the theory and the probable outcomes of its utilization. They need to be aware that students expect more when they share in planning their own learning, and they might (as occurred) carry over that responsibility to other

courses or areas of a program. It helped the students involved in this program to be more assertive and other faculty should be aware of those outcomes.

The course within which one expects to utilize andragogical principles should be chosen with care. This project utilized the senior field seminar as the setting, and it is a course that has had to contend with students' opposition to the competency exam as a program requirement. Also, they were not given course credit for the seminar and that has always rankled. Those conditions and others like them might be stressful to students and interfere with their learning. (Note - Social Work Majors at College Misericordia will receive one credit for the field seminar beginning with 1986-87 freshmen, an outcome of student planning and decisions during the project.) At College Misericordia, the practice courses are generally thought to be more interesting than other courses by students. A first attempt of an andragogical instructional approach might benefit from using a course that has high student interest as a way to introduce it to a program.

Not all traditional age college students benefit from an andragogical approach. Some seem to need more structure than others. A selection process that assesses students' ability to be self-directed learners may be helpful. Providing somewhat more structure than was evident in this project might be another strategy. Some of the students who took part in this project needed more structure,

particularly in understanding that certain requirements were non-negotiable.

This project did not attempt to assess, in any great detail, the differences that exist between the older student and the student of eighteen to twenty-one years of age. Some of the differences were apparent as there were both younger and older students participating in the preliminary study and the project. More research needs to be done in this area.

In conclusion, the student accustomed to pedagogy should have a thorough grounding in the assumptions and principles of self-directed learning. The setting should be free of controversy and interesting to students, as well as faculty. The introduction of andragogy should be a gradual process, one that is begun earlier than the senior year. The faculty and students who participated in this project felt their efforts were successful; that an andragogical approach to instruction benefits students who expect to practice social work. It will be utilized in other areas of the social work program on a continuing basis.

Notes - Chapter VI

[1]Malcolm Knowles, The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species (Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Co., 1984) p. 83-85.

[2]Helen Northen, Social Work With Groups (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969) pp. 59-65, 118-122.

[3]Roselle Kurland, "Planning: The Neglected Component of Group Development." Social Work With Groups Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer, 1978):173-178.

Appendix A

EVALUATION OF PLANNING SESSIONS

Please fill out the following form and return it to your seminar leader. There is space following each question for your comments - please comment - use back if necessary. Circle the answer that comes closest to your opinion.

1.	Did you find the atmosphere of the Seminar to be conducive to your participation?	Yes	No	Somewhat
2.	Were the planning sessions conducted in an atmosphere of collaboration?	Yes	No	Somewhat
3.	Did you find the atmosphere of the planning sessions one of mutual respect?	Yes	No	Somewhat
4.	Were your opinions taken into consideration during planning sessions?	Yes	No	Somewhat
5.	Did you feel that you had a "stake" in the planning process?	Yes	No	Somewhat
6.	Did you find the atmosphere of the sessions allowed for freedom of expression?	Yes	No	Somewhat
7.	Did Seminar members share their opinions freely?	Yes	No	Somewhat

EVALUATION OF PLANNING SESSIONS (con't)

8.	Did your participation in the planning process give you a sense of accomplishment?	Yes	No	Somewhat
9.	Did your participation in planning learning goals and activities bolster your confidence in your ability to reach those goals?	Yes	No	Somewhat
10.	Do you think that the group participation was helpful during the planning process?	Yes	No	Somewhat
11.	Did all students participate during the planning sessions?	Yes	No	Somewhat
12.	Did participation give you some control of your own learning?	Yes	No	Somewhat
13.	Do you think the planning sessions helped you to clarify some of your own learning goals?	Yes	No	Somewhat
14.	Do you believe that the chosen goals were realistic?	Yes	No	Somewhat
15.	Do you believe the chosen goals were relevant to your current needs?	Yes	No	Somewhat

EVALUATION OF PLANNING SESSIONS (con't)

16. Describe what, for you, was the most positive aspect/s of the planning session.

17. If you were involved in this process again, what improvements would you make?

18. Do you think senior students have enough knowledge and experience to participate in planning learning activities and evaluation strategies? Please comment on your answer.

Appendix B

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SEMINAR

Please reflect upon the Seminar, to date, and answer the following questions by commenting in narrative form.

1. Was the physical environment of the Seminar conducive to group interaction?

2. Do you feel you were able to express your opinions freely in the Seminar?

3. Were Seminar members attentive when it was your turn to act as discussion leader?

4. Were you able to share your knowledge/skills with others in the Seminar?

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SEMINAR (con't)

5. Were others able to share their knowledge/skills in the Seminar?

6. Were you able to utilize the instructor as a resource during the Seminar sessions?

7. Were the Seminar discussions helpful to you as a Student Social Work Practitioner?

8. Were you able to relate the substance of the Seminar discussions to your own experience in your field agency?

9. Was feedback from the group following our discussions helpful to you?

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SEMINAR (con't)

10. Did participation in the Seminar help you to make progress toward meeting your personal goals?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. The following are the professional goals we developed during the planning sessions. Please use the rating scale following each to evaluate your progress toward meeting them.

*The student should be able to:

*Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and Seminar members, as resources and be able to relate to colleagues collaboratively.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Understand his/her professional role as a social worker.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice. (ex. Conflict of values between one's own values and those of the agency.)

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Assess his/her own strengths and vulnerabilities.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Understand the impact of current social policy decisions and social research on practice.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SEMINAR (con't)

*Communicate in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.

Low									High
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Appendix C

FINAL STUDENT EVALUATION

During both the Fall and Spring Semesters, you were asked to participate in planning learning objectives and learning activities. Please think carefully and respond as fully as you can to the following questions. Comment and give examples to support your position. Thank you for participating in this evaluation.

1. Please explain how participation in planning the seminar affected your motivation to learn.

2. To what degree did sharing in planning and designing the seminar make learning a positive experience?

3. How were the learning goals we formulated relevant to your current learning needs?

4. How were learning activities we engaged in during seminar related to your experiences in your agency?

FINAL STUDENT EVALUATION (con't)

5. To what degree was feedback from other seminar members helpful to you?

6. What impact did sharing your experiences have on the learning of other seminar members?

7. To what degree did sharing the responsibility for seminar learning activities make learning more purposeful for you?

8. One of our learning strategies involved the assessment of personal goals. How was that helpful in terms of your own professional growth?

FINAL STUDENT EVALUATION (con't)

Please rate the progress you made in reaching the following goals and give an example of how it was reflected in your practice.

9. Utilize colleagues, both agency supervisors and seminar members, as resources.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

10. The ability to relate to colleagues collaboratively.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

11. Articulate, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

12. Understand your professional role as a social worker.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

FINAL STUDENT EVALUATION (con't)

13. Identify ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice. (ex. Conflict of values between one's own values and those of the agency.)

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

14. Assess your own strengths and vulnerabilities.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

15. Understand the impact of current social policy decisions and social research on practice.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

16. Communicate in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.

Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High

Appendix D

COURSE OUTLINE

College Misericordia

SWK. 475, 477: Field Instruction and Seminar
2 Semesters, 6 Credits

The field seminar is designed to help the student integrate curriculum course work with his/her experiential learning in the field agency. It is expected that academic content will be deepened and enriched through student participation at various practice levels in a social service agency and that the seminar will provide the environment to further this process. In addition to its integrative function, the seminar will act as a capstone to students' educational experience and to help launch them as professional social workers able to practice at the B.S.W. level.

The ultimate goals of field instruction are to prepare students for practice who have acquired the knowledge to understand and assess social processes that have impact upon the lives of individuals and families; the professional skills to help when help is needed; the ability to assess oneself as a social work practitioner; the commitment to professional ethics and continued professional growth.

Students in this course will utilize the principles of andragogy to plan with the instructor learning goals, learning formats and evaluative strategies.

Students will be expected to demonstrate skills in:

*Describing the organizational and community context of their field agency;

*Assessing existing social policies which provide the framework for their agency's programs;

*Utilizing both formal and informal community resources to aid their clients;

*Utilizing knowledge in an organized manner by identifying client's needs and strengths in order to select, implement and evaluate an intervention plan;

*Utilizing colleagues, both supervisors and seminar members, as resources;

COURSE OUTLINE (con't)

*Articulating professional concerns related to client problems;

*Understanding professional roles and ethical issues that might arise in the context of practice;

*Assessing their own strengths and vulnerabilities.

Acquisition of these skills will be demonstrated by:

*Successful performance in the field agency (See Appendix A - field evaluation form);

*Successful completion of the social work competency exam (See Appendix B);

*Active participation in field seminar and completion of all seminar assignments.

Objectives of the course include:

1. The preparation of eight 5-10 page papers that comprise the competency exam. The purpose of which is to demonstrate acquisition of the first four goals cited above. The student is expected to utilize and integrate knowledge gained from prior course work and his/her field experience in this assignment.

2. Participation by students in discussion and modification, if necessary, of the last four goals cited above. Students will share in the task of designing and implementing learning strategies and the evaluative processes that give evidence of their accomplishment that will meet the goals as stated or agreed upon. It is expected that during the discussion and implementation of these processes that knowledge from prior course work and current field instruction will be utilized.

The grading system and the weight given to each component of the field instruction sequence - field evaluation - competency papers and the seminar - will be decided by consensus as part of the participative decision-making process. The course instructor will act as a resource and facilitator.

COURSE OUTLINE (con't)

Seminar Agenda

The first meeting will introduce the students to the participative format to be utilized in the seminar. By the 4th week a plan to follow for the remainder of the semester should be in place. An evaluation of the seminar will take place in the 13th and 14th weeks and plans will be discussed for the second semester.

Competency Paper Due Dates - Fall Semester

Comp I: Social Policy Assessment - September 13

Comp II: Organizational Context of Practice - October 4

Comp III: Community Context of Practice - October 25

Comp IV: Professional Context of Practice - November 22

Resouces on Reserve

Knowles, Malcolm S. The Self-Directed Learner: A Guide for Learners and Teachers. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1975.

_____. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980.

Robinson, Russel D. An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn. Wisconsin: Omnibook Company, 1979.

Appendix E

GOAL SETTING WORKSHEET

Professional Goals	Learning Activities and Strategies	Means of Evaluation
Personal Goals		

Appendix F

Personal Goals	Learning Activities
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

To monitor your own learning/progress, design a self-rating scale that will indicate, on a continuum, where you are and where you would like to be.

ex.: G1: Be more confident.

1	2	3	4	5	6
I can't seem to speak-up in class or in the agency without high anxiety.					Speak in class/ agency without becoming flustered.

Appendix G-1

POLICY/ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: _____

DISCUSSION LEADER: _____

TOPIC: _____

Brief description of implications in own agency. Questions for Seminar Discussion:

Feedback

1. Did discussion leader communicate his/her ideas clearly?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Helpful suggestions:

2. Did discussion move along?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

3. Was the discussion focused on topic?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

4. Was the discussion a good learning experience for you?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

POLICY/ISSUE DISCUSSION (con't)

5. What did you learn that was new?

   What was reinforced?

6. Did you find the topic was relevant to your needs?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

7. Did the discussion leader present a well-thought out topic?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

8. Did everyone participate?

Yes	Some participated
[ ]	[ ]

Appendix G-2

PRACTICE INCIDENT

DATE: _____

DISCUSSION LEADER: _____

Practice Incident or Situation: Give a brief description and focus for discussion.

Feedback

1. Did discussion leader articulate the incident in a clear, well-thought out manner?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comment:

2. What did you learn from the discussion?

3. How might you utilize that learning in your practice?

4. Were potential problems that might arise from this situation discussed:

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

5. Did all members participate?

Yes	Some did
[ ]	[ ]

Appendix H

COURSE OUTLINE

College Misericordia

Field Instruction and Seminar - SWK. 474, 475, 476, 477

One or Two Semesters, 8 Credits

Prerequisite: SWK. 371 and 473

The senior social work practice requirement is met by spending two days per week in a field agency for two semesters or a block placement of twelve weeks for one semester. Field instruction is viewed as the principle means for reinforcing and integrating the entire academic curriculum. It is expected that academic content will be deepened and enriched by having students participate at various practice levels in a social welfare agency.

The field seminar is designed to help the student integrate curriculum course work with his/her experiential learning in the field agency. It is expected that academic content will be deepened and enriched through student participation at various practice levels in a social service agency and that seminar participation will further this process. In addition to its integrative function, the seminar will act as a capstone to students' educational experience and help to launch them as professional social workers able to practice at the first professional level.

The ultimate goal of field instruction is to enable students to acquire the knowledge to understand and assess social processes that have impact upon the lives of individuals and families. We also expect them to gain the professional skills to help when help is needed; the ability to evaluate oneself as a social work practitioner; the commitment to professional ethics and continued professional growth.

IMPLEMENTATION TECHNIQUES

Seminar will utilize the principles of self-directed learning through the formats of planning and discussion. Students will share in the tasks of designing and implementing learning strategies and the evaluative processes that give evidence of their accomplishment. Selecting both professional and personal goals will be one of the tasks for seminar members. Since participation is an integral part of the learning process, consistent attendance in seminar is a requirement.

COURSE OUTLINE (con't)

GRADING

The college grading system will be used. The formula, determined by faculty and students, by which a student's final grade is computed is as follows:

REQUIREMENTS

Activity	Value
Seminar Participation	15%
Competency Exam	40%
Field Evaluation	45%

REQUIRED TEXT

Wilson, Suzanna, Recording Guidelines for Social Workers.

COMPETENCY EXAM

The competency exam is a social work program requirement for all students who wish to graduate with a Bachelor of Social Work degree. It consists of a series of eight papers; two written during the Junior and six completed during the Senior year.

Its purpose is to help the student integrate theory with practice, a process that also takes place during field work in an agency. The papers must indicate the students knowledge of:

1. The social policies that have primary impact on the student's agency;
2. The organization of the agency and the social welfare system in the community;
3. The profession of social work and the social worker's role/s;
4. The skills necessary to deal appropriately with clients.

COURSE OUTLINE (con't)

LOGS AND PROCESS RECORDINGS

Each student will keep a brief log of hours and activities in the field on a daily basis. A diary/appointment book may be used for this purpose. Students may also be asked to submit several process recordings during the semester. The process recordings should indicate a student's performance over time in his/her field setting.

COURSE_____

GOAL: Develop the skills necessary for professional practice.

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES	MEANS OF EVALUATION
Students will be expected to demonstrate skills in: 1. Describing the organizational and community context of their field agency. 2. Assessing existing social policies which provide framework for their agency's programs. 3. Utilizing both formal and informal community resources to aid their clients. 4. Utilizing knowledge in an organized manner by identifying clients' needs and strengths in order to select, implement and evaluate an intervention plan.	1. Written assignments. 2. Students will participate in planning learning goals, learning activities and evaluative strategies. 3. Case discussions. 4. Certain specific learning activities will be determined by students and faculty.	1. Students must successfully complete the eight papers that comprise the Competency Exam. See Appendix A. 2. Students must successfully complete the field practicum requirement of two days per week for two semesters. 3. Students will plan and carry out a series of learning activities throughout the Fall and Spring Semesters. See Appendices B, C, D, E.

COURSE OUTLINE (con't)

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES	MEANS OF EVALUATION
5. Utilizing colleagues, both supervisors and seminar members, as resources. To be able to relate to colleagues collaboratively.		
6. Articulating, verbally and in writing, professional concerns related to client problems.		
7. Understanding professional roles that might arise in the context of practice and ethical issues that might include a conflict of values between one's own values and that of the agency.		
8. Assessing their own strengths and vulnerabilities.		
9. Understanding the impact of current social policy and social research on practice.		
10. Communicating in a responsive and concerned manner with clients.		

FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL POLICY ANALYSIS

I. Identification of the Problem or Need Dealt with by the Policy

A. Causes:

(1) To what extent are they known?
(2) How were relevant groups informed (the public, planners, etc.)?

B. What specific population groups are affected (identify special characteristics such as age, race, income class, special needs group, geographical location.)

C. How was the problem/need conceptualized by planners? What underlying theories or assumptions were stated?

II. Objectives of Policy

A. Identify the intended policy objectives and/or goals.

B. How does the policy address the values of equity, adequacy and equality?

C. What assumptions underlie policy objectives?

III. Eligibility Criteria

A. On what basis are recipients chosen (Means test, attributed need, compensation, diagnostic differentiation)?

B. Who, if anyone, is excluded? Why?

IV. Nature of Social Provisions

A. What are the services or benefits provided by the policy? (cash, in-kind, services, opportunity, power, etc.)

B. Are benefits adequate to meet the identified social need or problem?

C. Do provisions contain controls (latent or manifest) on recipient?

FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL POLICY ANALYSIS (con't)

V. Structure of the Delivery System

What organizational arrangements for delivering services or benefits are provided by policy?

VI. Mode of Finance

A. What funding provisions does the policy include?

B. What form does the funding take (grants, user-charge, private, public, types of taxation involved)? Describe this fully.

VII. Evaluation

A. Does the policy provide for monitoring and evaluation?

B. What mechanisms are utilized in the evaluation process?

C. How are results of evaluation utilized?

D. Does public monitor the program?

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT OF PRACTICE

A. Knowledge of the agency:

1. Explain the purpose of the agency.

2. Describe administrative policies and procedures of your agency/office and how these are incorporated into the service delivery network.

3. Identify services provided, and state limitations of service. Describe how these limitations should/or will be addressed.

B. The agency as an organization:

1. Specify how the organizational goals, structures, technology, and environment of the agency condition and shape the service provided.

2. Understand the effect of hierarchical structure, task distribution, and staff contingencies upon the functioning of the agency.

3. Identify and evaluate both formal and informal channels of communication within the agency.

C. Representing the agency:

1. Generally describe eligibility requirements for clients, if applicable.

2. Show how the agency/office functions as a channel through which services reach the client.

3. Show how the student serves as a link between service providers within the system.

4. Demonstrate congruence between one's own activities and overall agency purpose.

COMMUNITY CONTEXT OF PRACTICE

A. Characteristics of the community:

1. Demonstrate awareness of the unique social characteristics of the community and the region.

2. Identify the sociocultural, economic, and political influences upon social structure within the community.

B. Awareness of community needs and concerns:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the effects of socio-economic, cultural, ethnic, sex, and age differences upon the concerns of individuals within the community.

2. Assess the social needs of the portion of the community which is of direct concern to the wroker.

3. Given specific problems, identify the relationship between private troubles and broader community issues.

C. Knowledge of formal and informal resource networks:

1. Identify formal social services resources that are relevant to the worker's practice.

2. Identify those resources used most often by the segment of the community of direct concern to the worker.

3. Locate individuals, groups, and organizations that can serve as resources, yet lie outside the formal social service network.

4. Provide information concerning availability of services provided by these agencies.

PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT OF PRACTICE

A. Knowledge of the profession:

1. Provide a working definition of social work as a profession.

2. Relate one's own activities to the profession of social work.

3. Discriminate the orientation, role, and activities of social workers from those of other professionals.

B. Handling of work expectations:

1. Meet agency standards with regard to absences, appointments, meetings, deadlines and so on.

2. Organize and use time productively.

3. Set appropriate priorities in the face of conflicting demands.

C. Use of supervision:

1. Describe the responsibilities and duties the student held during the practicum experience.

2. Demonstrate how supervision was used in the examination of one's practice.

3. Identify those areas where supervisory help was especially needed and show how supervision was applied to these areas.

4. Demonstrate an increasing capacity for independent practice as skills improve.

D. Integration of the professional role:

1. Convey a sense of reliability and responsibility in dealings with service directors and colleagues.

2. Formulate a statement of one's own personal and role limits in the practice of social work.

3. Demonstrate persistence, flexibility and creativeness in responding to the difficulties and frustrations of practice.

4. Demonstrate an awareness and understanding of one's own characteristic patterns of behavior.

PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT OF PRACTICE (con't)

5. Demonstrate a commitment to the value and ethics of social work.

E. Commitment to continued professional growth:

1. Use available resources to improve knowledge and skills.

2. Show capacity for and interest in keeping abreast of current literature and developments within the field.

CASE ASSIGNMENT

1. Problem identification and assessment. Describe the episode of service - who? what? when? How did you become involved? Who requested service? Who was the target of the desired service? What exactly was the presenting problem, and who perceived the situation as a problem? What additional information did you seek, and how did you go about obtaining it? What was your conceptualization of the problem, and did it differ in any way from the conceptualization of others involved?

2. Selection of an intervention plan. How did you synthesize the information you obtained into a coherent intervention plan? Outline your plan explicitly. What were the objectives of your intervention, and how were they determined? Identify the model (or theory) that underlies your plan. Provide a brief outline of the major concepts and methods espoused by the model. Explain why you chose this model rather than others.

3. Implementation of the plan. What exactly did you do in carrying out your plan? What efforts were required to engage and maintain the active participation of those involved? What was the explicit or implicit contact that determined the respective expectations and responsibilities of everyone involved in the change effort? What specific techniques did you employ to facilitate constructive change? What difficulties arose, and how did you deal with them? How was disengagement handled?

4. Evaluation and feedback. Evaluate the effectiveness of your intervention with regard to immediate and long-term effects. To what extent were your objectives accomplished? What procedures did you employ to assess the overall effectiveness of your efforts? How can you use this experience to strengthen or weaken in any way your appreciation of the model on which you based your intervention?

Personal Goals	Learning Activities
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

To monitor your own learning/progress design, a self-rating scale that will indicate, on a continuum, where you are and where you would like to be.

ex.: G1: Be more confident.

1	2	3	4	5	6
I can't seem to speak-up in class or in the agency without high anxiety.					Speak in class/ agency without becoming flustered.

GOAL SETTING WORKSHEET

Where I am: Where I want to be:

Professional Goals:

Personal Goals:

POLICY/ISSUE DISCUSSION

DATE: _____

DISCUSSION LEADER: _____

TOPIC: _____

Brief description of implications in own agency. Questions for Seminar Discussion:

Feedback

1. Did discussion leader communicate his/her ideas clearly?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Helpful suggestions:

2. Did discussion move along?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

3. Was the discussion focused on topic?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

4. Was the discussion a good learning experience for you?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

5. What did you learn that was new?

What was reinforced?

POLICY/ISSUE DISCUSSION

6. Did you find the topic was relevant to your needs?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

7. Did the discussion leader present a well-thought out topic?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

8. Did everyone participate?

Yes	Some participated
[ ]	[ ]

DATE: _____

DISCUSSION LEADER: _____

Practice Indicent or Situation: Give a brief description and focus for discussion.

Feedback

1. Did discussion leader articulate the incident in a clear, well-thought out manner?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Comment:

2. What did you learn from the discussion?

3. How might you utilize that learning in your practice?

4. Were potential problems that might arise from this situation discussed?

Yes		Somewhat		No
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

5. Did all members participate?

Yes	Some did
[ ]	[ ]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Joseph D. "Generic and Generalist Practice and the B.S.W. Curriculum." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Fall, 1982):39, 40-44.

_____. "BSW Programs and the Continuum in Social Work." Journal of Social Work Education, No. 3 (Fall, 1985): 63-70.

Arkara, Morton and Brennen, E. Clifford. Competency-Based Education for Social Work: Evaluation and Curriculum Issues. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976.

Baer, Betty L. and Federico, Ronald. Educating the Baccalaureate Social Worker: Report of the Undergraduate Curriculum Project, 1978.

Bergevin, Paul. A Philosophy for Adult Education. New York: The Seabury Press, 1967.

Bisno, Herbert. The Place of Undergraduate Curriculum in Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, Vol. II, 1959.

Brookfield, Stephen. "The Contribution of Edward Lindeman to the Development of Theory and Philosophy in Adult Education." Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 23, No 4 (Summer, 1984):185-191.

Caffarella, Rosemary and Caffarella, Edward. "Self-Directedness and Learning Contracts in Adult Education." Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Summer, 1986):226-234.

Chene, Adele. "The Concept of Autonomy in Adult Education: A Philosophical Discussion." Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Fall, 1983):38-46.

Clark, Thomas F. Workshop on Alternative Learning Strategies, College Misericordia, November 7, 1986.

Constable, Robert. "New Directions in Social Work Education: The Task Force Reports." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Winter, 1978):23-28.

Conti, Gary L. and Welborn, Ruth B. "Teaching-Learning Styles and the Adult Learner." Lifelong Learning (June, 1986):20-23, 24.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (con't)

Davenport, Joseph III and Davenport, Judith. "The Letter to the Editor: An Application of Verner's Principles of Adult Learning." Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research (September, 1984):11, 12.

Dinerman, Miriam. "A Study of Baccalaureate and Master's Curricula in Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Spring, 1982):84-91.

Elias, John L. and Merriam, Sharon. Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education. Huntington, New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1980.

Farquharson, Andy. "Learning Through Teaching Among Undergraduate Social Work Students" in Malcolm Knowles', Andragogy in Action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Gelfand, Bernard and Sandy Rohrich, Pat Nevidore, Igor Starak. "An Andragogical Application to the Training of Social Workers." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Fall, 1975):55-61.

Gelman, Sheldon and Patrick Wardell. "Exit Competencies: The Assessment of Baccalaureate Social Work Students' Professional Development." Paper presented at Annual Program Meeting of Council on Social Work Education, March, 1982.

Given, Andrew. "Doing Concepts: Thoughts Toward Resolutions of the Continuum Dilemma." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Winter, 1976):3-9.

Glick, Lester. ed. Undergraduate Social Work Education for Practice: Report of the Curriculum Building Project Conducted by Syracuse University School of Social Work. Wash., D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Griffen, Jerry and Eure, Gerald. "Defining the Professional Foundation in Social Work Education." Journal of Social Work Education, No. 3 (Fall, 1985):73-79.

Guidry, Rosalind. "A Design for Teaching Human Behavior in a Generalist Undergraduate Program." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Spring, 1979):47, 48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (con't)

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

Hollis, Ernest V. and Taylor, Alice. Social Work Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Kidd, J.R. How Adults Learn. New York: Association Press, 1973.

Kilpatrick, Allie C. et. al, "Social Work Education at the University of Georgia," Andragogy in Action, by Malcolm Knowles. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Knowles, Malcolm S. Self-Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1975.

_____. The Modern Practice of Adult Education: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1980.

_____. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston: Gref Publishing Company, 1984.

_____. Andragogy in Action. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

_____. Using Learning Contracts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1986.

Knox, Alan B. Adult Development and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Kolevzon, Michael. "Conflict and Change Along the Continuum in Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Spring, 1984): 51-57.

Kurland, Roselle. "Planning: The Neglected Component of Group Development." Social Work With Groups, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Summer, 1978):173-178.

Lindeman, Eduard C. The Meaning of Adult Education. New York: New Republic, Inc., 1926.

Magee, James J. "Linkage and Progression of Associate-Baccalaureate-Graduate Students in Field Instruction: Report From a Pilot Project." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter, 1979):59-64.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (con't)

Martinez-Brawley, Emilia. "Interdisciplinary Aspects of the Baccalaureate Curriculum in Rural Social Work." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Fall, 1983):29-35.

Mezirow, Jack. "A Critical Theory of Adult Learning and Education." Adult Education, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Fall, 1981):3-22.

Monette, Duane R., Sullivan, Thomas and Dejong, Cornell. Applied Social Research: Tool for the Human Services. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986.

Northen, Helen. Social Work With Groups. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Pincus, Allen and Minahan, Anne. Social Work Practice Model and Method. Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1973.

Policy Statement on Social Work Practice and Education and Structure and Quality in Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976.

Rachal, John. "The Andragogy-Pedagogy Debate: Another Voice in the Fray." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, Vol. 6, No. 7 (May, 1983):

Robinson, Russell D. An Introduction to Helping Adults Learn and Change. Wisconsin: Omnibook Company, 1979.

Rogers, Jenniver. Adult Learning. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971.

Rosenblum, Sandra and Gordon Darkenwald. "Effects of Adult Learner Participation in Course Planning on Achievement and Satisfaction." Adult Education Quarterly, Vol. 33, No. 3 (Spring, 1983):147-153.

Sample, John and Kaufman, Roger. "A Holistic Program Development Model for Adult Educators." Lifelong Learning. (January-February, 1986):18-23.

Scriven, Michael. "The Methodology of Evaluation" in Weiss, Carol H. Evaluating Action Programs: Reading in Social Action and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacom, INc., 1972.

Seipel, Michael M.A. "Content Analysis of Social Welfare Curriculum." Journal of Social Work Education, No. 2 (Spring/Summer, 1986):53-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (con't)

Seltig, Claire; Wrightsman, Lawrence and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Suchman, Edward A. "Action for What: A Critique of Evaluation Research." Weiss, Carol. Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Tripodi, Tony; Fellin, Phillip and Epstein, Irwin. Differential Social Program Evaluation. Hosca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Verdiun, John R.; Miller, Harry G. and Greer, Charles E. Adults Teaching Adults. Texas: Learning Concepts, 1977.

Vermilye, Dyckman W. ed. Lifelong Learners - A New Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

_____. ed. Relating Work and Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Verner, Coolie with Alan Booth. Adult Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Weiss, Carol. Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Workshop, College Misericordia, January 22, 1986.

Wright, James. "Retraining the Adult Workforce." Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research, Vol. 7, No. 2 (October, 1983):