

11-16-1995

Factors associated with social work student satisfaction with field placements in child welfare by Diane Elias Alperin.

Diane Elias Alperin
Florida International University

DOI: 10.25148/etd.FI13101609

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alperin, Diane Elias, "Factors associated with social work student satisfaction with field placements in child welfare by Diane Elias Alperin." (1995). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1227.
<https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/1227>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL WORK STUDENT SATISFACTION
WITH FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

SOCIAL WELFARE

by

Diane Elias Alperin

1995

To: Dean Mark Rosenberg
College of Urban & Public Affairs

This dissertation, written by Diane Elias Alperin, and entitled Factors Associated With Social Work Student Satisfaction With Field Placements In Child Welfare, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgement.

We have read this dissertation and recommend that it be approved.

~~_____~~
Tony Tripodi,

~~_____~~
Mary Helen Hayden

~~_____~~
Susan Gray

~~_____~~
Karen Sowers-Hoag, Major Professor

Date of Defense: November 16, 1995

The dissertation of Diane Elias Alperin is approved.

~~_____~~
Dean Mark Rosenberg
College of Urban & Public Affairs

~~_____~~
Dr. Richard L. Campbell
Dean of Graduate Studies

Florida International University, 1995

COPYRIGHT 1995 by Diane Elias Alperin

All rights reserved

I dedicate this dissertation to my social work students and their field instructors. Both bring inordinate levels of enthusiasm, hope and dedication to the social work workplace. It is through them that the mission of social work education is accomplished.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my committee for their assistance and patience. I also want to thank the members of the Florida Field Consortium, for without them this project would not have been possible.

A special thanks must go to my major professor, Dr. Karen Sowers-Hoag, for her support and encouragement during a year which was both exhilarating and exhausting for both of us. And finally, eternal thanks must go to those special people in my life--my husband Jay, my daughters April and Alyson, and my colleague Dr. Nicholas Richie--for their help, support and encouragement through the years.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION
FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL WORK STUDENT SATISFACTION
WITH FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

by

Diane Elias Alperin

Florida International University, 1995

Professor Karen Sowers-Hoag, Major Professor

This study was conducted during the 1994-1995 academic year. Seven social work education programs in the state of Florida, all accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, participated in this study. Graduate and undergraduate social work students in child welfare field placements, and their field instructors, were surveyed during the Spring 1995 semester to assess their satisfaction with field placements in this area and the relationship of this satisfaction to employment interests and field placement recommendations.

The majority of social work students responding to this survey were generally satisfied with several aspects of their field placements--the learning, field work program, field instructor, child welfare agency, and overall field experience. The field instructors were generally more satisfied than the students, but only statistically different from the students in the areas of satisfaction with the field work program and the child welfare agency.

Multiple regression analysis revealed that learning assignment opportunities, field instructor relationship characteristics, placement preference, and pre-placement interview contributed to the prediction of student satisfaction.

Student satisfaction in field placement was significantly related to the acceptance of employment, if offered, and the recommendation of the field placement to other students. Logistic regression analysis revealed that satisfaction with the child welfare agency was the greatest contributor to the prediction of acceptance of employment, and satisfaction with the field work program was the greatest contributor to the prediction of field placement recommendation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Professional Social Workers in Child Welfare..... | 1 |
| II. LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 11 |
| Social Work Field Education..... | 11 |
| Social Work Student Satisfaction..... | 19 |
| Questions For The Study..... | 23 |
| III. METHODOLOGY..... | 26 |
| The Setting..... | 26 |
| The Preliminary Study..... | 27 |
| The Study Instruments..... | 28 |
| The Study Sample..... | 32 |
| Implementation..... | 33 |
| Data Analysis..... | 39 |
| IV. FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION PROGRAMS..... | 41 |
| BSW Program Characteristics..... | 41 |
| MSW Program Characteristics..... | 42 |
| Field Faculty..... | 43 |
| Field Placements In Child Welfare..... | 43 |

| | |
|---|----|
| V. FINDINGS RELATED TO STUDENTS..... | 46 |
| Student Demographics..... | 46 |
| Personal Characteristics..... | 46 |
| Educational Characteristics..... | 48 |
| Student Satisfaction With Field Work..... | 55 |
| Satisfaction Scale Items..... | 55 |
| Non-Scale Satisfaction Items..... | 57 |
| Association Between Student Demographics And Satisfaction With Field Work..... | 61 |
| Extent Explaining Satisfaction..... | 65 |
| VI. FINDINGS RELATED TO PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS..... | 74 |
| Program Dimensions Related To Learning Opportunities..... | 74 |
| Organizational Factors..... | 74 |
| Field Instructor Demographics..... | 77 |
| Field Education Variables..... | 80 |
| Characteristics Of Supervision..... | 83 |
| Outcome Measures..... | 84 |
| Association Between Program Characteristics And Satisfaction With Field Work..... | 86 |
| VII. FINDINGS RELATED TO DIFFERENCES IN STUDENTS AND FIELD INSTRUCTOR RESPONSES..... | 90 |
| A Comparison Of Responses On Satisfaction Scale Items..... | 90 |
| A Comparison Of Field Work Characteristics..... | 94 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| VIII. FINDINGS RELATED TO PREDICTION OF STUDENT | |
| SATISFACTION WITH FIELD WORK..... | 98 |
| Prediction Of Student Satisfaction..... | 98 |
| Prediction Of Employment..... | 104 |
| IX. A COMPARISON OF FINDINGS ABOUT CHILD WELFARE AND | |
| HEALTH CARE STUDENTS IN FIELD WORK..... | 107 |
| A Comparison Of Methodology..... | 107 |
| A Comparison Of Respondents..... | 109 |
| The Students..... | 109 |
| Educational Characteristics..... | 111 |
| A Comparison Of Student Satisfaction..... | 114 |
| Satisfaction Scale Items..... | 114 |
| Non-Scale Items..... | 115 |
| Independent Variables..... | 117 |
| Extent Explaining Satisfaction Items..... | 117 |
| Predictors Of Student Satisfaction..... | 118 |
| A Comparison Of Differences With | |
| Field Instructors..... | 119 |
| X. DISCUSSION..... | 121 |
| Child Welfare Field Placements In Florida..... | 122 |
| Levels Of Social Work Student Satisfaction..... | 125 |
| Predictors Of Student Satisfaction..... | 126 |
| Student Satisfaction And Employment..... | 129 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| REFERENCES..... | 131 |
| APPENDIXES..... | 143 |
| Field Placements In Child Welfare..... | 144 |
| Social Work Program Questionnaire..... | 148 |
| Field Instructors In Child Welfare..... | 159 |
| Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire..... | 165 |
| Social Work Student Questionnaire..... | 185 |
| Tables..... | 206 |
| VITA..... | 215 |

LIST OF TABLES

1. Mean Satisfaction Levels Of Directors Of Field
Education With Child Welfare Field Placements.....44

2. Student Demographics: Personal Characteristics....47

3. Student Demographics: Educational Characteristics.50

4. Student Demographics: Field Placement
Characteristics.....52

5. Student Demographics: Child Welfare Education.....54

6. Numbers And Percentages Of Students At Five Levels
Of Satisfaction On Five Satisfaction Scale Items..56

7. Correlation Coefficients For Satisfaction Scale
Items.....57

8. Distribution For Three Non-Scale Satisfaction
Items.....58

9. T-Tests For Three Non-Scale Satisfaction Items,
With Student Satisfaction Scale Items.....59

10. T-Tests For Select Field Placement Characteristics
By Satisfaction Scale Items.....63

11. Factor Analysis Of Extent Explaining
Satisfaction Items.....68

12. Correlations Between Extent Explaining Satisfaction
Factors And Student Satisfaction Scale Items.....71

13. Program Characteristics: Organizational Factors...76

14. Program Characteristics: Field Instructor
Demographics.....78

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 15. | Program Characteristics: Social Work Practice Activities Of Social Work Students..... | 81 |
| 16. | Program Characteristics: Group Seminar Topics..... | 84 |
| 17. | Program Characteristics: Student Outcomes..... | 86 |
| 18. | Comparison Of Student And Field Instructor Responses On Five Satisfaction Scale Items..... | 91 |
| 19. | Correlation Coefficients For Satisfaction Scale Items..... | 93 |
| 20. | Stepwise Multiple Regressions In Analysis With Five Student Satisfaction Items As Dependent Variables And Ten Independent Variables..... | 100 |
| 21. | A Comparison Of Student Demographics: Personal Characteristics..... | 110 |
| 22. | A Comparison Of Student Demographics: Educational Characteristics..... | 112 |
| 23. | A Comparison Of Hospital And Child Welfare Student Satisfaction Items..... | 114 |
| 24. | A Comparison Of Hospital And Child Welfare Student Responses On Three Non-Scale Items..... | 116 |
| 25. | T-Tests Of Select Independent Variables And Student Satisfaction Items For Student Respondents..... | 206 |
| 26. | Independent Sample And Paired T-Tests Of Select Satisfaction Items For Student And Field Instructor Respondents..... | 209 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 27. | Extent Explaining Satisfaction Factor Items: | |
| | Agreement Between Students And Field | |
| | Instructors..... | 210 |
| 28. | Extent Explaining Satisfaction Factor Items: | |
| | Differences Between Students And Field | |
| | Instructors..... | 212 |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Professional Social Workers In Child Welfare

An editorial by Shirley Buttrick in a recent issue of Social Work Research & Abstracts asked professional social workers to focus their attention on the current "crisis in child welfare" (Buttrick, 1992, p.3). In recent years the news media has called the public's attention to this "crisis" as well, by reporting on the tragic deaths of children in their own homes or in substitute care, while being under the supervision of a public child welfare agency. This has led both the public and the profession to look more closely at the delivery of services to children and their families and at the workers responsible for delivering these services.

The Child Welfare League of America (1984), the American Humane Association (1986), and the National Association of Social Workers (1991) all have recommended that child welfare administrators, supervisors and direct service workers have degrees in social work, at the baccalaureate or graduate level. In addition, recent research studies have provided some evidence that professionally educated social workers are an important component of effective service delivery in child welfare (Albers, Reilly & Rittner, 1993; Booz-Allen & Hamilton,

1987; Dhooper, Royse & Wolfe, 1990; Lieberman, Hornby & Russell, 1988; Olsen & Holmes, 1982).

Examining the ability of five different educational levels to deliver prescribed services, Olsen & Holmes (1982) reported on their analysis drawn from the 1977 National Study of Social Services to Children and Their Families. Matching the educational background of workers with 16 dichotomous variables of service delivery, they concluded that MSWs were the most successful in delivering substitute services; BSWs were more successful in providing children with recommended supportive services; and that "nonprofessionally trained staff did not perform as effectively as trained staff in several areas of service" (p.101). Similarly focused on effective service delivery, a study of children in foster care in Clark County Nevada found that "workers with a degree in social work were more likely to effect a permanent plan within three years than those without a social work degree" (Albers, Reilly & Rittner, 1993, p.337).

Lieberman, Hornby and Russell (1988) were interested in assessing the relationship between educational background and preparedness for child welfare work. Their survey asked 5000 child welfare personnel in 16 states to evaluate how well or how poorly their educational experiences had prepared them for 32 skill areas and knowledge bases. In

general, MSWs reported being the best prepared and the most knowledgeable; and, in all but two areas, BSWs perceived their educations "as better preparation for their work than those with other bachelor degrees" (p.487).

Another study was initiated by the Maryland Department Of Human Resources because of the difficulties they were experiencing in recruiting social service workers. Between October 1986 and January 1987 the research team of Booz-Allen and Hamilton used multiple sources of data and research approaches to review a variety of social service jobs and determine the minimum qualifications needed to perform the jobs effectively. Results from the performance evaluation analyses indicated that the overall performance of MSWs was significantly higher than non-MSWs. The researchers concluded that "education, specifically holding an MSW, appears to be the best predictor of overall performance in social service work" (Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1987, p.iii).

In an attempt to further test the hypothesis that employees with social work education were better prepared than their colleagues without such education, Dhooper, Royse and Wolfe (1990) evaluated employees in the Kentucky Department of Social Services with five different measures-- departmental quality assurance ratings, state merit examinations, supervisors' assessments, social work values

and self-ratings. While this study evaluated all state employees, not just those in child welfare, 76% of the final sample were employed in child welfare areas--adoptions, foster care, child protective services and juvenile services. Overall, the state employees with social work education ranked higher than their colleagues without social work degrees in all five measurements. The researchers' concluded that "social work education does make a difference" (p.60).

The results of these studies seem to indicate that social work education has been somewhat successful in graduating professionally trained social workers, who then deliver more effective child welfare services. Yet evidence from other studies has indicated that the proportion of professionally educated social workers in public sector child welfare remains low (Lieberman, Hornby & Russell, 1988; Shyne & Schroeder, 1978; Vinokur-Kaplan & Hartman, 1986).

Surveying a representative sample of 315 public social service departments throughout the United States, Shyne and Schroeder (1978) looked at the cases of 9,597 children and found that "...25% of the children were assigned to caseworkers with a social work degree, 9% at the graduate level and 16% at the baccalaureate level" (p.25). Vinokur-Kaplan and Hartman (1986) sent a survey instrument directly

to a national sample of child welfare supervisors and workers and concluded that their "distribution of workers' levels of education was quite similar [to Shyne and Schroeder's data] with [their] respondents slightly more likely to hold an advanced degree and a social work degree" (p.326). Another more recent survey was distributed by staff development directors in 16 states to public child welfare personnel. Comparing data to Shyne and Schroeder's data, this group of researchers found a slight loss in the proportion of BSW social workers (15%) and an increase in the proportion of MSWs (13%) (Lieberman, Hornby & Russell, 1988).

Based on these studies, it appears that less than 30% of public child welfare workers have professional social work degrees. The evidence also suggests that state human service administrators do not see the benefit of social work degrees for their employees, with only 25% of states requiring a college degree for direct service workers and only 9% requiring a master's degree for supervisory positions (National Commission on Child Welfare and Family Preservation, 1990).

Part of this is said to be due to the attitude of agencies as they moved toward declassification in the 1970s. Citing an increased demand for workers and escalating personnel costs coupled with budgetary restraints, public

agencies lowered educational requirements and shortened the length of professional training required (Esposito & Fine, 1985; Hopps & Pinderhughes, 1987). Other factors affecting declassification were said to be the antiprofessional attitude of public child welfare administrators, the misinterpretation of equal employment opportunity legislation, the mobility of paraprofessional staff, the creation of large human service bureaucracies, and the growth of competing human service disciplines (Millar, 1986; Pecora & Austin, 1983).

Another factor that is said to have affected the presence of professional social workers in public child welfare is the increasing activity of state legislatures in the 1980s focused on regulating the practice of social work (Hopps & Pinderhughes, 1987). Some believe that licensure has impacted those attracted to the field, the practice of those in the field, as well as those interested in public sector child welfare (Land, 1987, 1988; Lieberman, Hornby & Russell, 1988). In addition, the exemptions many states give to practitioners employed by local, state and federal government agencies may create a second-class delivery system within public agencies (Thyer & Biggerstaff, 1989).

Certain organizational issues that relate to problems with effective service delivery have also been reported to contribute to the decline of professionals in public child

welfare. Surveys of workers and administrators have identified the following issues:

- low minimal qualifications for child welfare workers
- high worker caseloads
- poor working conditions
- low worker salaries
- decreased opportunities for education and training
- poor or controversial public image
- liability issues

(Helfgott, 1991; Pecora, Briar & Zlotnik, 1989)

While the administrators of public child welfare agencies agree that the quality of staff is a major factor affecting the effectiveness of services, they do not believe that schools of social work are adequately preparing graduates for these roles. A survey conducted by the National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators revealed that most state administrators were dissatisfied with the child welfare curriculum offered by schools of social work and identified the absence of a shared philosophy and a shared agenda between these two institutions to be the biggest barrier to collaboration. They indicated that the schools' emphasis on private practice posed a serious obstacle to joint endeavors (Murphy, 1992).

There is also evidence that, at the same time, social

work education has been retreating from public child welfare. Sanford Kravitz (1992), in a sabbatical visit to 24 graduate and two undergraduate social work programs, found that many schools had trouble identifying a faculty member with a strong background in public child welfare. A curriculum survey of Council on Social Work Education accredited schools found 72% of BSW programs offered at least one elective in public child welfare, and 20% of MSW programs offered this as a specialization track (Gomez & Harris, 1992). And while many schools offer field placements in public child welfare as an option, it appears that only a small percentage of students pursue this option (Baer & McLean, 1994; Briar, Harris & Alperin, 1993; Rome, 1994). Some school administrators believe that this declining interest of social work education in public child welfare practice can be attributed to student interest and the marketplace; absence of MSW supervision in public child welfare agencies; and lack of new PhDs with public child welfare experience (Kravitz, 1992).

Dorothy Harris (1988), past president of the National Association of Social Workers, has called on social workers to renew their commitment to child welfare by being active in the development of policy and the delivery of services to families and children. David Liederman (1991), Executive Director of the Child Welfare League of America, has

indicated that "recruiting and retaining competent child welfare staff members" (p.v) is one of the major challenges currently facing child welfare agencies. The National Commission on Family and Primary Associations has recommended that "schools and programs of social work play major roles in addressing the personnel crisis...in the public child welfare system" (Pecora, Briar & Zlotnik, 1989, p.7).

In 1986 the Administration for Children, Youth and Families and the National Association of Social Workers invited educators, administrators, policy-makers and caseworkers from across the country to a conference on Professional Social Work in Public Child Welfare. The goal of the conference was related to the preparation, employment and retention of social workers in public child welfare agencies, and to develop an agenda for action in response to these problems. The final Agenda for Action included recommendations in four areas:

- Professional Leadership
- Agency Working Environment
- Public Relations
- Directions for Professional Social Work Education.

(University of Southern Maine, 1987, p.3)

Included among the recommendations in this latter category was the proposal to assure field placements in public child

welfare settings as a way to stimulate interest in employment in this area.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Work Field Education

According to the Curriculum Policy Statement of the Council on Social Work Education (Commission on Accreditation, 1991), the field practicum, an integral part of the social work education curriculum, engages the student in supervised direct service activities, providing practical experiences in the application of theory and skills acquired in all the foundation areas. While different schools may organize their practicum in different ways, practicums must be educationally directed, coordinated and monitored. Each educational program must establish standards for their practicum settings, with an instructional focus consistent with the professional foundation curriculum or the advanced social work curriculum. To accomplish these objectives, undergraduate programs should provide each student with a minimum of 400 hours of practicum experience, and graduate programs a minimum of 900 hours.

This concept of learning "through doing in the field under the direction of others" (George, 1982) actually pre-dates formal social work education. Education for social work began with the apprenticeship training of "paid agents" and "friendly visitors" in Charity Organization Societies and Associated Charities. Social work skills were taught

through the actual delivery of services, with direction for the trainees provided through individual and group conferences (George, 1982).

While apprenticeship training was the genesis of much professional education (Hughes, et al., 1973), it was after its evolution that others attempted to explain how learning actually occurred in the field setting. Gordon and Gordon (1982) proposed a "knowing-understanding-doing" frame of reference for learning, referring respectively to the conceptual mastery of knowledge, the mapping of this knowledge, and field performance directed toward intervention. They suggested this learning frame of reference as "a blueprint for how the educational bridge will be anchored and built between classroom and the field" (p. 35).

Today, most schools of social work follow one of three approaches to experiential learning, each based on a different emphasis within Gordon and Gordon's knowing-understanding-doing paradigm (Jenkins & Sheafor, 1982). In the apprenticeship model, the trainee observes an experienced worker and then emulates this practice with clients. In this model the emphasis is based on doing, with knowing and understanding derived from practice. In the academic model, the student spends a certain amount of time in the classroom before entering the field. The emphasis is

on knowing and understanding in the classroom setting, and then deducing practice in the field setting. The articulated model, where students are in class and field settings at the same time, places equal emphasis on all three parts of the paradigm, with skill development occurring at the same time basic theories are being introduced.

Depending on the structure of the social work program, students spend one-third (Maier, 1981) to one-half (Rodgers & Williams, 1977) of their educational experience in a field practicum setting. Prominent social work educators have underscored the essential nature of the field practicum in professional education (Jenkins & Sheafor, 1982; Kadushin, 1991; Raskin, 1989) and stated that social work students consider the field practicum to be "the most influential component of their education" (Briar, 1990, p.1). Students consistently rank field education as the most important (Roberts, 1973), most valuable (Mahler, 1982), most useful (Brennen & Arkava, 1974), and most relevant (Meenaghan & Molnar, 1982) component of the social work curricula.

Despite these accolades, the ability of field education to influence social work students has attracted limited direct research attention. Empirical studies focused on the overall impact of social work education have, however, revealed the ability of field education to influence the values (Judah, 1976, 1979; Neikrug, 1978), practice (Brennen

& Arkava, 1974; Goldberg & Lamont, 1989; Mahler, 1982; Meenaghan & Molnar, 1982; Rubin, Johnson & DeWeaver, 1986; Schlesinger, 1986; Tolson & Kopp, 1988; Wagner, 1989), and employment (Attinson & Glassberg, 1983; Johnson, 1980; Radin, 1976; Richman & Rosenfeld, 1988; Siegel, 1978; Vinokur-Kaplan, 1987; York, Denton & Moran, 1990) of social work students.

Judah (1976) surveyed 147 undergraduate programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education as to their opinion on the processes of acculturation into the profession. These respondents indicated that the most important location in the acculturation process was the field instruction agency and that the most important role enacted by students in the acculturation process was as field learners. In a later study by this same author (Judah, 1979), graduate students were surveyed as to their values at the time of admission to and graduation from the program. While the values remained practically unchanged, a pattern emerged of consistent similarity "...between MSWs and their field instructors and BSWs and campus faculty" (p.84).

Neikrug (1978) presented 16 vignettes to the students, faculty and field advisors at one undergraduate social work program. The results indicated that while the values of beginning students fell somewhere between those of the faculty and field advisors, the values of advanced students

more closely resembled their field advisors. Neikrug (1978) explained this influence of the field instructor on student values:

Field advisors and other agency personnel are in more frequent and perhaps more intimate contact with students. The dominant values in the field represent the reality in which the student will practice professionally. More important, it is these values that affect the nature of service that clients will receive.

(p.42)

This explanation could also be applied to the findings of other studies focused on the practice orientation of students. Tolson and Kopp (1988), in their study of first year field work students, found that "the orientation of the practicum instructor affects the practice behaviors of students more than do any of the other sources examined" (p.131)--client characteristics, type of agency, or orientation of the classroom instructor. Interviews with a small population defined as radical social workers (Wagner, 1989), revealed that a number of them felt that their field placements were one of the elements of social work education that radicalized them. Similarly, Schlesinger (1976) found that a movement to greater identification with a social change orientation, as opposed to a behavioral science

orientation, was partially attributable to the field experiences of the students.

Two studies have speculated on the possible influence of field experiences to explain the findings of their studies. Goldberg and Lamont (1989) found that the practice interests of their graduate students did not change, despite a change of the curriculum from a methods sequence to an integrated approach. They speculated that this may be due to the limited change in the field work course and "...the difficulties in implementing a field curriculum that is taught by over two hundred different people in social agencies scattered over five or six counties" (p.159). Similarly, Rubin, Johnson and DeWeaver (1986) have speculated that the decline in appeal of sixteen client groups or case situations among graduate students from admission to graduation, may be partially due to their exposure to "...the complexities and 'real world' facets of case situations" (p.103) in their field practicum experiences.

Another focus of the social work literature has been on the ability of social work education to adequately prepare its graduates for practice. In follow-up studies of graduates of two BSW and one MSW program, the field practicum was evaluated as the most useful part of the curriculum in preparing students for social work practice

(Brennen & Arkava, 1974; Mahler, 1982; Meenaghan & Molnar, 1982). Reports from surveys of child welfare workers also have indicated that field practicums in public child welfare were particularly helpful in preparing them for public child welfare practice (Kaplan-Vinokur, Gray & Saalberg, 1981; Samantrai, 1992).

The influence of field placement on employment after graduation has not been the subject of study, but can sometimes be extrapolated from the results of studies designed for other purposes. In tracking the first five graduating classes of students from a newly developed social policy specialization at one graduate school of social work, Siegel (1978) found that 49% acquired jobs as a result of their field practicum experiences. In contrast, Atkinson and Glassberg's (1983) study of graduates of twenty-one BSW programs in Pennsylvania over a four year period, found that only 10% indicated that they found employment through their senior field agency. Johnson's (1980) survey of twenty-six baccalaureate social work programs in Iowa, revealed that public family and children's services were "...both the most frequent employer and the most common placement for field experience, suggesting a relatively high congruence between the field experience portion of the curriculum and social work practice after graduation" (p.134).

Other researchers have surveyed social work graduates

to assess if those who followed a specialized curriculum did indeed practice in this specialty upon graduation. While Radin (1976) found that one-third of University of Michigan graduates were practicing a method for which they were not fully prepared, Richman and Rosenfeld's (1988) survey of University of North Carolina graduates found some congruence between school and job specialization. A follow-up study of social work graduates who had received child welfare traineeships found 59% employed in child welfare agencies one year later (Vinokur-Kaplan, 1987). A more recent study of a random sample of NASW members in North Carolina indicated 51% were employed in the field of their graduate training and that "...of those employed in the family and child arena, 80% had specialized in this field in graduate school" (York, Denton & Moran, 1990, p.8-9).

There therefore appears to be some evidence that field education has the potential for influencing the values, practice and employment of social work students. The Children's Bureau is currently funding 50 social work education programs to develop curricula and field placements in public child welfare (Alperin & Griffith, 1995; Briar, Harris & Alperin, 1992-1994), in the belief that this will attract professionally trained social workers to the field.

The need to provide incentives for child welfare field placements is underscored by the currently reported low

proportion of social work students in such placements (Baer & McLean, 1994; Harris, 1991-1993; Rome, 1994) and the possible advantage of such placements for the reprofessionalization effort. A survey of 4000 student members of the National Association of Social Workers indicated that those students currently in child welfare field placements were more likely to pursue the field after graduation than those who were not so involved (Rome, 1994). Little is known empirically about the student, school and agency variables that influence placements in public child welfare, as well as contribute to satisfaction with these placements.

Social Work Student Satisfaction

While researchers have not focused on variables that influence satisfaction with field placements in child welfare, field placements in general have been studied in an attempt to discern those variables that most positively correlate with student satisfaction (Cimino et al., 1982; Fortune & Abramson, 1993; Fortune et al., 1985; Kissman & Van Tran, 1990; Raskin, 1982). It has been hypothesized that student satisfaction is a measure of program effectiveness (Raskin, 1982) and a predictor of employment (Showers, 1990).

Cimino et al. (1982) sent a questionnaire focused on student satisfaction to 180 graduate students in field

placement during the Spring semester at one school of social work. Factor analysis produced five independent factors indicating different types of satisfaction with field work:

- global satisfaction
- satisfaction with the relationship with the field instructor
- sense of belonging in the agency
- satisfaction with the quality of the agency
- satisfaction with the quality of supervision

The authors concluded that "...student satisfaction cannot be treated as one unified concept...satisfaction can be based on several aspects of field experience" (p.73).

Fortune and Abramson (1993) also sent a questionnaire focused on student satisfaction to graduate students in their last week of field placement at one school of social work. While 16 potential predictors of satisfaction were identified, using multiple regression, only three were found to be significant. Student satisfaction with field experience was greater if:

- the quality of field instruction was better
- agency desirability and inclusion was greater
- the field instructor provided explanations

Kissman and Van Tran (1990) used a cross sectional survey design to measure satisfaction in field placements at two graduate schools of social work. These authors

identified nine variables relating to field placement satisfaction. Using stepwise regression, they found that student's goal attainment, performance feedback, adequacy of case assignments, work autonomy and perceived application of field experience to future social work practice were important factors in overall satisfaction with field placement.

Raskin (1982) studied student satisfaction with field placements at 11 baccalaureate programs in one state. Using factor analysis, seven factors were identified as contributing to student satisfaction. One of these variables, however, contributed to almost 60% of the variance in the dependent variable. The variable identified as "new learning"--the actual achievement of field work objectives--was strongly and positively associated with student satisfaction. Factors related to supervision and agency climate also affected student satisfaction.

Fortune et al. (1985) sent a questionnaire to students in Spring practica at one school of social work. Six factors affecting satisfaction were identified through the use of factor analysis. The two factors most highly correlated with satisfaction in field placement were "relevant learning" and "supervision". These researchers were the only ones to look at field of practice specialization as a variable affecting satisfaction. They found that while the field instructor was

a key link to student satisfaction in field, students with a health specialization were less satisfied with their field instructor and slightly less satisfied with other aspects of field education than students with other specializations.

In light of this finding, and during a time when hospital social work departments were concerned about their continuing ability to attract competent social work professionals because of a restructured health care delivery system, Nancy Showers (1988) undertook a study of satisfaction with field placements in hospital settings. Showers speculated that high satisfaction levels would make it more likely that students would remain as employees.

Based on previous research in this area, Showers developed two questionnaires to gather data about student and program demographic variables, satisfaction variables, and criticisms of program characteristics. A list of health care field work settings used by seven schools of social work were provided by the New York Area Consortium of Directors of Field Work to the New York Coalition of Hospital Field Work Coordinators, of which Showers was a member. Twenty hospitals were selected for study, with 20 Hospital Field Work Coordinators and 238 graduate students completing survey instruments. One of the author's hypotheses was confirmed:

Satisfied students were significantly more apt to

accept a job at the host hospital, to believe that a job would be offered, and to recommend the field placement to other students.

(Showers, 1988, p.125)

Questions For The Study

During the 1994-1995 academic year, this author adapted Showers' survey instruments to conduct a study of child welfare field placements in the nine schools of social work accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in the state of Florida. The purposes of this study were: 1) to develop a framework for categorizing child welfare field work characteristics; 2) to generate data describing the state of child welfare field experiences at the baccalaureate and graduate level; 3) to examine associations between program characteristics and levels of satisfaction with field work as reported by students and field instructors; and 4) to suggest factors that influence child welfare field work design, to aid in the continuing reprofessionalization effort. The specific questions addressed in this study were:

1. What was the structure of field education provided by the nine schools of social work in Florida accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, and what was their involvement in the reprofessionalization effort?

2. What were the satisfaction levels of BSW and MSW students in child welfare field placements during the Spring 1995 semester, and how did these satisfaction levels relate to future employment?
3. What were the demographic characteristics of BSW and MSW students in child welfare field placements during the Spring 1995 semester, and how did these characteristics relate to satisfaction?
4. What were the characteristics of the child welfare agencies providing field placements during the Spring 1995 semester and how were these characteristics related to satisfaction?
5. What are the characteristics of the field instructors providing child welfare field experiences during the Spring 1995 semester and how did these characteristics relate to satisfaction?
6. What differences existed between student and field instructor evaluations of field experiences?
7. What factors made the greatest contribution to explaining student satisfaction with field work in child welfare settings?
8. What factors made the greatest contribution to predicting interest in employment in child welfare?

9. How did these results, related to satisfaction with field placements in child welfare, contrast with the results of Nancy Showers' study focused on satisfaction with field placements in health care settings?

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The Setting

The Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services is the primary public agency responsible for the delivery of child welfare services in the state of Florida (Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 1994). As in other states, child welfare services are also provided through an array of other public, voluntary, and proprietary agencies (Costin, Bell & Downs, 1991). The tragic deaths of children in the care of public agencies, as well as in custody of their own parents, and the "A-F Lawsuit" on behalf of children in foster care (Cenziper, 1995), has focussed the public's attention on the effective delivery of child welfare services in this state.

There are nine social work education programs in Florida that are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (Lennon, 1994). The main campuses are in seven cities, geographically located in the southeast, southwest, central, north, and northwest portions of the state. In 1991 a partnership agreement focused on the need to reprofessionalize public social services was signed by the Deans/Directors of these nine schools, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and the Director of the Florida Chapter of the National Association

of Social Workers (Greenfield, Gilman, & Kazmerski, 1992). At the time of this study, H.R.S. had a new Secretary, and the leadership in seven of these schools had changed.

The Preliminary Study

The Florida Field Consortium is composed of field faculty from all the social work programs in the state. The Consortium have been meeting regularly since 1992, and the author has been a member since that time.

At the October 1994 meeting of the Consortium, a proposal for the research project was presented to the representatives of the seven schools in attendance. Those present agreed to participate and offered ideas on how to best reach the targeted population of child welfare field instructors and students. Each representative was given a packet of materials, which included a draft of the three proposed survey instruments, as well as a brief questionnaire (Appendix) focused on the manner in which their program was interested in participating. Two schools, not present at the Consortium meeting, were subsequently sent a packet of materials and a letter describing the study proposal.

During the next two months, numerous contacts were made with the field education representatives of the nine schools, by phone and by mail. Eight of the schools made recommendations about the questionnaires themselves, which

were incorporated into the final instruments. All of the schools responding at this stage of the project indicated that they would provide information about child welfare field instructors so that they could be sent survey materials directly through the mail. Different schools had different preferences, however, for the manner in which the researcher could access their students. Five schools indicated their preference for distributing the student questionnaires through the integrative field seminar; while one school wanted to distribute them through the student mail boxes on campus. Two schools requested that the student questionnaires accompany the field instructor questionnaires, and be sent directly to the agency. One school, with an interim field director, was unsure of their ability to participate in this study.

The Study Instruments

Three survey instruments were developed for this research project. The Social Work Program Questionnaire (Appendix) was developed to gather basic demographic information on the nine schools who were providing the child welfare field instructor/student lists. Each questionnaire consisted of two parts: Part I asked 11 eleven questions about social work program characteristics; Part II asked 13 questions about field placements in child welfare. Of the latter, two were open-ended questions about special

activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare. As this questionnaire was intended to gather basic information from the nine schools, it was not pre-tested but was previewed by the schools before finalization.

A Field Instructors In Child Welfare (Appendix) form was developed to gather the name, address and phone number of the Spring 1995 child welfare field instructors, as well as the number of students they were supervising. Directors of Field Education could either complete the forms provided, or send their own field listings with the same information. In the preliminary study, the definition of child welfare was drawn from the Encyclopedia of Social Work:

...a specialized field of social work practice
...to help in the prevention, amelioration, or
maintenance without further deterioration of
the social situations affecting children.

(Kadushin, 1987, p. 265-266)

Several field directors expressed concern that this definition was too broad, and could, perhaps, include almost all field placements. The following addition to the definition was added in response to this concern:

Such child welfare services may be provided in
public, voluntary/not-for-profit or private/
for-profit agencies where the primary focus is
on clients under the age of 18 and where the

child is the primary focus of services.

The Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire (Appendix) was developed to gather demographic and satisfaction data from child welfare field instructors. It was modeled on Showers' (1988) Hospital Field Work Coordinator Questionnaire, and adapted accordingly for child welfare and field instructors. In addition, questionnaire items related to organizational turmoil, political climate and organizational environmental factors were added based on the comments of Showers' respondents.

The Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire was an 8 1/2" by 11" pamphlet and consisted of two parts: Part I consisted of 32 questions on agency characteristics; Part II consisted of 69 questions on field placements in child welfare. The latter included an eight item Satisfaction Scale, a 57 item Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scale, one item related to recommendation for employment, and three open-ended questions about activities to enhance field placements in child welfare.

This questionnaire was pre-tested by eleven field instructors who had supervised students in the past and who would not be included in the final sample. Their recommendations were included in the final survey instrument. Of particular importance was the feedback that while field instructors may be actively engaged in one area

of child welfare service, they may be supervising students in a variety of child welfare service areas.

The Social Work Student Questionnaire (Appendix) was developed to gather demographic and satisfaction data from students in child welfare field placements. It was modeled on Showers' (1988) Graduate Social Work Student Satisfaction Questionnaire, and adapted accordingly for child welfare and the inclusion of both baccalaureate and master's level social work students. Items related to certain organizational issues were added, as they were for the field instructor's questionnaire.

The Social Work Student Questionnaire was an 8 1/2" by 11" pamphlet and consisted of two parts: Part I included 38 items related to student characteristics; Part II included 71 items related to field placements in child welfare. Among the latter was a five item Satisfaction Scale, a 59 item Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scale, three questions related to future employment and field placement preferences, and three open-ended questions about activities to enhance field placements in child welfare.

This questionnaire was pre-tested by 10 baccalaureate and 10 graduate students who were in child welfare field placements during the Fall 1994 semester. The BSW students were due to graduate and would not be included in the final sample; the MSW students were at the beginning of their

field placements and may or may not have been included in the final sample. Their recommendations were included in the final survey instrument. Of particular importance was the feedback from master's students that specialization and concentration needed to be more clearly defined.

The questionnaire took approximately 20 minutes to complete and both the graduate students and the Field Directors expressed concern about the length of the survey instruments. Concerns in this area focussed on asking enough questions to accurately replicate Showers' (1988) study, yet achieve an acceptable response rate. In an effort to address both of these issues, an incentive was added. Child welfare field instructors and social work students who completed a questionnaire would be eligible to participate in separate raffles for \$200.00 each.

The Study Sample

All of the social work education programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in Florida were selected for inclusion in the study. While the different programs may vary somewhat in structure, all must meet the standards for social work education programs established by this national accrediting body. Therefore, all field instructor respondents met certain criteria to be field instructors, and all student respondents were exposed to a somewhat standardized curriculum. At one school, the

master's program was in candidacy status, and therefore this part of the program was not included in the study sample.

These programs offered diversity on a number of social work education dimensions. Five of the programs offered only the BSW degree, one program offered only the MSW degree, and three were joint programs offering both degrees. Based on past enrollment data reported to the Council on Social Work Education (Lennon, 1994), one of these schools could be classified as small with less than 25 students, four could be classified as medium with less than 100 students, and four could be classified as large with more than 100 full-time students.

Demographic data reported previously on students indicated that the gender of social work students in Florida was similar to proportions reported nationwide, with each school reporting that 79% or more of their students were female (Lennon, 1994). Similarly, the distribution of ethnic and racial groups was roughly similar to those reported nationwide (Lennon, 1994) for seven of the schools. One school reported that slightly more than 50% of their students were of a minority status, and another, the traditional African-American school in the state university system, reported 98% minority status.

Implementation

During the second week of January 1995, the Social Work

Program Questionnaire and a previously selected Field Instructors In Child Welfare form was mailed to the nine Field Education Directors representing the nine social work education programs in the state. A personal letter accompanied each form, detailing the manner in which they had previously indicated they wished to participate in this study. One school had area field coordinators in several parts of the state, in addition to the Field Education Director. In this instance, the nine area field coordinators were also sent Field Instructors In Child Welfare forms to complete.

Three schools returned their completed Social Work Program Questionnaire and Field Instructors In Child Welfare forms within the next few weeks. After telephone follow-up, four other schools were also able to provide the information requested. One school's material was lost in the mail, and replacement materials were not completed. And one school, with a new Field Director, was unable to participate.

These seven schools initially provided the names of 230 child welfare field instructors. Of these, 18 were field instructors for more than one school; reducing the list to 211 field instructors. Four child welfare field instructors were subsequently added to the list; three at the request of the agency and one at the request of the integrative seminar instructor. The final child welfare field instructor listing

included 215 names.

Each child welfare field instructor was sent a packet of materials during the first week of March 1995. For 127 field instructors, this packet included a letter describing the study, a Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire, a flyer describing the raffle, a security envelope for return of the raffle ticket, and a prepaid, addressed envelope for return of all the materials. Eighty-eight field instructors received this same packet, as well as materials for distribution to their students, with a letter explaining this process.

As part of their Field Instructors In Child Welfare forms, the seven schools indicated that these 215 field instructors were supervising 367 social work students. During the month of March, each student received a packet of materials which included a letter describing the study, a Social Work Student Questionnaire, a flyer describing the raffle, a security envelope for return of the raffle ticket, and a prepaid, addressed envelope for return of all the materials. Five schools were responsible for the distribution of the student questionnaires and received their pre-assembled packets through the mail or by personal delivery. Two schools requested that the student questionnaires be distributed through the agency-based field instructors.

At one of the schools responsible for the distribution of the student packets, nine students received their questionnaires through the integrative field seminar and returned them through the mail. At three schools, another 156 students received their questionnaires in a similar manner, but the majority of these students returned them in sealed envelopes to their integrative seminar instructor. At one school, 76 students received their questionnaires in their campus mail boxes. In an effort to encourage students to pick up the questionnaires, signs were posted around the school informing them of the survey and memorandums were sent to all the social work faculty asking them to encourage the students to participate in the project. And 126 students from two schools had their packets distributed to them through their agency-based field instructors, and returned through the mail.

Each questionnaire had a code number on the first page to enable the researcher to pair students and field instructors, but not to identify them. In the information provided by the schools, some students were identified by name, but others were identified only by the name of their field instructor. For the purposes of distribution, therefore, each student packet had a post-it note identifying the student by their name or the name of their field instructor. These post-it notes were removed before

the questionnaires were returned.

After the initial mailing, more than a dozen field instructors called to provide additional information. Four field instructors indicated that they did not perceive themselves to be a child welfare placement; and therefore neither they nor their student would be returning completed questionnaires. Two field instructors indicated that they did not currently have students in placement, and therefore survey forms would not be returned by them or the students. Phone calls from other field instructors revealed that they had students in placement, but five less than had been indicated. Six field instructors indicated that they had received more than one questionnaire. In all instances, this was because they were listed as providing field instruction at more than one agency. They clarified that while they worked at more than one agency, they were only providing student supervision at one location.

In addition, two field instructor questionnaires and three student questionnaires were returned by mail, with a note indicating that they were not known at the agency. From this information, it would appear that 200 field instructors and 353 students actually received questionnaire packets for completion.

Completed questionnaires were initially returned by 65 field instructors and 123 students. Because of the manner of

distribution, follow-up was only possible through the agency-based field instructors. Three weeks after the initial mailing, the field instructors were called thanking them for completing the survey if they had already done so, and encouraging them and their students to complete the survey now if they had not yet done so. Nine of the field instructors indicated they had never received the initial mailing, and were sent replacement packets. Six agencies indicated that the field instructor was no longer employed there, and at two agencies the field instructor was not known.

During the fourth week, a postcard was sent to those who still had not responded, reminding them and their students that this was their last chance to enter the raffle. An additional 53 Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaires and 84 Social Work Student Questionnaires were received after these two follow-up procedures.

During the Florida Field Consortium meeting of April 7, 1995, the field instructor and student raffle winners were selected by members of the field consortium. The winners were sent congratulatory letters and checks for \$200.00 each. In addition, the members of the Florida Field Consortium in attendance were treated to lunch in gratitude for all their efforts on behalf of the project.

Data Analysis

Data from the Social Work Program Questionnaires were coded manually. Frequencies, percentages and means were calculated to provide a descriptive analysis of these social work education programs. Means were calculated to assess satisfaction with field placements in child welfare. Content analysis was conducted on the open-ended questions focused on field placements in child welfare.

Data from the Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaires were coded for computerized analysis using the SPSS for Windows statistical package. Frequencies, percentages and means were used for descriptive analysis of the agencies, field instructors, learning opportunities and teaching structure. T-tests and ANOVAs were used to test association between these variables and student satisfaction.

Data from the Social Work Student Questionnaires were coded for computerized analysis using the SPSS for Windows statistical package. Frequencies, percentages and means were used for descriptive analysis of the students. T-tests, ANOVAs and Pearson's r were used to test associations between these variables and student satisfaction. Factor analysis was conducted on the Extent Explaining Satisfaction items to reduce the number of variables and to assess their correlation with student satisfaction scores.

Frequencies, percentages, t-tests and chi squares were calculated to compare field instructor and student group responses in terms of satisfaction with field placements. Paired samples t-tests were used to compare responses of field instructors matched with the students they were supervising. Multiple regression analysis was employed to determine the amount of variance in satisfaction explained by study variables, and to examine the relative contributions of these variables to outcome measures. Logistic regression analysis was used to determine the contribution of the different satisfaction items to the acceptance of employment, if offered, and the recommendation of the field placement to others.

Cronbach's alpha was obtained to assess the reliability of the two instrument scales. In Showers' study (1988) the alpha coefficients for the Satisfaction and Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scales were .85 and .75 respectively. For this study, the alpha coefficients for the Social Work Student Questionnaire were .91 for the Satisfaction Scale and .92 for the Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scale. For the Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire, the alpha coefficients were .74 for the Satisfaction Scale and .86 for the Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scale.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS RELATED TO THE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A total of seven social work education programs participated in this study of child welfare field placements in Florida. This chapter presents descriptive data about the social work education programs themselves, and about Field Director's opinions of field placements in child welfare at the baccalaureate and graduate level.

BSW Program Characteristics

Six baccalaureate social work education programs participated in this study. Three were free-standing programs and three were part of schools that also offered graduate education. All of the BSW programs were in public institutions, as part of the State University System.

During the Spring 1995 semester, these schools had a total of 209 baccalaureate social work students in field placement, ranging from a low of 16 students at one school to a high of 55 students at another school. The average number of agency-based hours required for field placement was 500; for five of these programs this was completed at one agency over the course of one semester. All of the baccalaureate students at these schools are involved in the selection of their field placement, participate in pre-placement interviews with their field instructors, and attend a school-based integrative field seminar while in

placement.

MSW Program Characteristics

Four graduate social work education programs participated in this study. All were part of social work education programs offering more than one degree. One was part of a program that also offered a baccalaureate degree and one was part of a program that also offered a doctoral degree. Two of the master's programs were part of schools that offered a full continuum of social work degrees--BSW, MSW and PhD. Three of these programs were in public institutions, and one was part of a private institution.

During the Spring 1995 semester, these schools had a total of 546 master's social work students in field placement, ranging from a low of 106 students at one school to a high of 179 students at another school. The average number of agency-based hours required for field placement was 1051, being completed at one or two different agencies over the course of one, two, three or four semesters. All of the graduate students at these schools are involved in the selection of their field placement and participate in pre-placement interviews with their field instructors. Three of these graduate programs also require their students to attend a school-based integrative field seminar while in placement.

Only two of these graduate programs indicated that they

require students to select a methods concentration, with the choices being direct practice, administration or management, and advanced generalist practice. Similarly, only two schools require students to select a field of practice specialization. The choices in this area included aging, child welfare, families and children, family services, health, and mental health and substance abuse.

Field Faculty

At six of these schools, at least one faculty member was assigned with full-time responsibilities to field education. Five of these schools indicated that they also had part-time faculty assigned to the field program. All of the schools indicated that they visited the field agencies during the course of the student's placement. A minimum of one visit per semester was made by the full-time field faculty, part-time field faculty, or the faculty field liaisons. The field faculty at six of these schools provide training for new field instructors; with four programs also providing advanced training for experienced field instructors.

Field Placements In Child Welfare

The percentage of BSW and MSW students in child welfare field placements varied widely for these respondents, from a low of 20.7% at one school to a high of 71.5% at another school. The Director of Field Education at each school was

asked to rate, on a five-point Likert scale, their level of satisfaction with child welfare field placements for their BSW and MSW students. As indicated in Table 1, these respondents appear to be somewhat more satisfied with child welfare field placements for baccalaureate students.

Table 1

Mean Satisfaction Levels Of Directors Of Field Education With Child Welfare Field Placements

| | For BSW Students (N=6) | For MSW Students (N=4) |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <u>Satisfaction With The...</u> | | |
| Learning Opportunities Provided | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| Agency Field Work Programs | 4.17 | 3.50 |
| Child Welfare Agencies | 4.17 | 3.50 |
| Field Instructors | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Overall Child Welfare Field Experience | 4.00 | 3.80 |

Note: 1=Very Dissatisfied; 5=Very Satisfied

In an open-ended question, these field directors were asked if their social work program was engaged in any special activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare. Four of the schools responded positively, listing a variety of activities. Two schools indicated that students received special funding for child welfare field placements, through federal grants or Title IV-E monies. One school sponsored a special field unit within H.R.S. . Several schools reported on special activities, such as class speakers, agency visits, and special volunteer opportunities, intended to expose students to this field of practice.

Five field directors responded to an open-ended question relating to what could be done by the schools or the agencies to further enhance field placements in child welfare. Five respondents focused on the need for more agency personnel to have social work degrees, who could then serve as field instructors. Three respondents focused on the need for agencies to provide more support to their employees who were serving as field instructors, in terms of release time or reduced caseloads. Other comments related to the development of more field units and the development of more assignments appropriate for MSW students. One respondent indicated that the social work curriculum needed to focus more on agency-based public sector social work practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS RELATED TO STUDENTS

A total of 206 undergraduate and graduate social work students participated in this study of child welfare field placements in the state of Florida during the Spring 1995 semester. This chapter presents descriptive data about the student respondents, findings about levels of student satisfaction with field work and its relationship to future employment, and findings regarding associations between personal and educational variables and student satisfaction with field work.

Student Demographics

Personal Characteristics

The social work students in this sample ranged in age from 21 - 53, with a mean age of 31.56. A majority of the respondents were both female (86.3%) and Caucasian (70.0%).

Two-thirds (66.9%) of these respondents reported that they had some volunteer experience in child welfare. Less than half (46.4%) of these respondents had paid employment experience in child welfare, while slightly more than half (51.7%) were employed while completing their field education requirement. Table 2 contrasts these personal characteristics for BSW and MSW students.

Table 2

Student Demographics: Personal Characteristics

| <u>Personal Characteristic</u> | | <u>BSW</u> (n=71) | <u>MSW</u> (n=134) |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Age | Mean | 28.8 years | 33.02 years |
| | Range | 21-53 years | 22-52 years |
| Gender | Male | 12 (16.9%) | 15 (11.2%) |
| | Female | 59 (83.1%) | 117 (87.3%) |
| | No Response | | 2 (1.5%) |
| Ethnicity | African-American/ Black | 16 (22.5%) | 13 (9.7%) |
| | American Indian | 1 (1.4%) | 1 (.7%) |
| | Asian | | 2 (1.5%) |
| | Caucasian | 46 (64.8%) | 96 (71.6%) |
| | Hispanic/ Latino | 5 (7.0%) | 16 (11.9%) |
| | Other | 2 (2.8%) | 4 (3.1%) |
| | No Response | 1 (1.4%) | 2 (1.5%) |
| | Child Welfare Volunteer Experience | | |
| None | 19 (26.8%) | 49 (36.6%) | |
| Less than 1 year | 31 (43.7%) | 45 (33.6%) | |
| 1 to 3 years | 16 (22.5%) | 26 (19.4%) | |
| More than 3 years | 5 (7.0%) | 13 (9.7%) | |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) | |

Table 2 (continued)

| Personal Characteristic | BSW (n=71) | MSW (n=134) |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Child Welfare Employment Experience | | |
| None | 50 (70.4%) | 60 (44.8%) |
| Less than 1 year | 4 (5.6%) | 13 (9.7%) |
| 1 to 3 years | 11 (15.5%) | 23 (17.2%) |
| More than 3 years | 6 (8.5%) | 37 (27.6%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) |
| Employment While In Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 45 (63.4%) | 60 (44.8%) |
| No | 26 (36.6%) | 73 (54.5%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) |
| Number Of Hours Of Employment While In Field Placement | | |
| Mean | 23.41 | 27.50 |
| Range | 5-48 | 2-48 |

Educational Characteristics

Of the 206 students who responded to this survey, 34.6% were baccalaureate students and 65.4% were master's students. Of the latter, the majority (88.4%) listed "direct practice" as their methods concentration, and "child welfare" (56.1%) as their field of practice specialization.

More than three-fourths (82.1%) of these students

indicated that they had had some personal contact with some field placement agency staff member prior to the day placement began. Almost two-thirds (63.9%) of these respondents indicated that this placement was their first choice. Only a small percentage of students (26.7%) indicated that they were receiving funding for their field placement activities.

The social work students in this sample were spending an average of 28.27 hours a week at their field placement agency. In addition, a majority (89.2%) of these respondents were concurrently enrolled in at least one academic course with field education, as well as being required to attend a school-based integrative field education seminar (84.4%).

Three-fourths (75.8%) of these social work students had taken at least one course with child welfare content before beginning field placement, and 46.7% had taken such a course since beginning their current field placement. Less than half (48.5%) of these students had taken a course that specifically focused on children and child welfare. Less than half (48.3%) of these students had had a prior field placement, but for those who had, 53.8% of these placements were in child welfare. A summary of these educational and field placement characteristics are reported in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Table 3

Student Demographics: Educational Characteristics

| Educational Characteristic | BSW (n=71) | MSW (n=134) |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| Educational Level | | |
| Senior | 71 (100%) | |
| First year | | 42 (31.3%) |
| Second year | | 57 (42.5%) |
| Advanced standing | | 33 (24.6%) |
| Other | | 2 (1.5%) |
| Methods Concentration | | |
| Yes | | 86 (64.2%) |
| No | | 48 (35.8%) |
| Direct practice | | 76 (88.4%) |
| Community organization/ planning | | 1 (1.2%) |
| Direct practice with community organization | | 8 (9.3%) |
| Community organization/ administration | | 1 (1.2%) |
| Practice Specialization | | |
| Yes | | 100 (74.6%) |
| No | | 34 (25.4%) |
| Child Welfare | | 55 (55.1%) |

Table 3 (continued)

| Educational Characteristic | BSW (n=71) | MSW (n=134) |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Family Services | | 30 (30.0%) |
| Mental Health | | 6 (6.0%) |
| School Social Work | | 4 (4.0%) |
| Health | | 2 (2.0%) |
| Gerontology | | 1 (1.0%) |
| No Response | | 2 (2.0%) |

Concurrent Enrollment In Field Education And At Least One Academic Course

| | | |
|-----|------------|-------------|
| Yes | 60 (84.5%) | 123 (91.7%) |
| No | 11 (15.5%) | 11 (8.3%) |

Table 4

Student Demographics: Field Placement Characteristics

| | BSW | MSW |
|---|------------|-------------|
| Field Placement Characteristic | (n=71) | (n=134) |
| Contact With Agency Staff Prior To Field Placement | | |
| None | 16 (22.5%) | 13 (9.7%) |
| Written Material | 8 (11.3%) | 8 (6.0%) |
| Telephone Contact | 23 (32.4%) | 32 (23.9%) |
| Individual Meeting | 46 (64.8%) | 105 (78.4%) |
| Group Meeting | 5 (7.0%) | 13 (9.7%) |
| Other | | 6 (4.5%) |
| Field Placement Preference | | |
| First Choice | 49 (69.0%) | 82 (61.2%) |
| Second Choice | 15 (21.1%) | 14 (10.4%) |
| Third Choice | 3 (4.2%) | 5 (3.7%) |
| Not One of Top Three Choices | 1 (1.4%) | 17 (12.7%) |
| No Choice | 3 (4.2%) | 15 (11.2%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) |
| Funding For Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 15 (21.1%) | 39 (29.1%) |
| No | 56 (78.9%) | 95 (70.9%) |

Table 4 (continued)

| | BSW | MSW |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Field Placement | | |
| <u>Characteristic</u> | <u>(n=71)</u> | <u>(n=134)</u> |
| Weekly Field Work Hours | | |
| Mean | 29.79 | 27.47 |
| Range | 13-45 | 10-40 |
| Integrative Field Education Seminar | | |
| Yes | 67 (94.4%) | 105 (78.4%) |
| No | 4 (5.6%) | 28 (20.9%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) |

:

Table 5

Student Demographics: Child Welfare Education

| | BSW (n=71) | MSW (n=134) |
|--|---------------|----------------|
| <u>Child Welfare Education</u> | | |
| Took Course With Child Welfare Content Prior To Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 57 (80.3%) | 98 (72.9%) |
| No | 14 (19.7%) | 36 (27.1%) |
| Took Course With Child Welfare Content Since Beginning Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 15 (20%) | 82 (60.9%) |
| No | 56 (80%) | 52 (39.1%) |
| Took Social Work Course With Specific Child Welfare Focus | | |
| Yes | 32 (45.1%) | 68 (50.7%) |
| No | 39 (54.9%) | 66 (49.3%) |
| Prior Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 4 (5.6%) | 94 (70.1%) |
| No | 67 (94.4%) | 39 (29.1%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.7%) |
| In Child Welfare | 1 (33.3%) | 47 (54.0%) |

Student Satisfaction With Field Work

A total of eight satisfaction items were included in the student questionnaire. Five items were Likert-scale items that comprised the student satisfaction scale. Three additional non-scale items, focused on employment and recommendation of the field placement, were included at the end of the questionnaire.

Satisfaction Scale Items

The distribution of responses to the five scale items is presented in Table 6. The rates of satisfaction for the five items are: satisfaction with learning, 81.6%; satisfaction with the overall field work experience, 80.3%; satisfaction with field instructors, 79.6%; satisfaction with the field work program, 75.3%; and satisfaction with the child welfare agency, 72.3%. An overall satisfaction index was computed by combining the satisfaction scores for each of these five items. With a range of 5-25, these students had an overall satisfaction index of 20.04.

Table 6

Numbers And Percentages Of Students At Five Levels Of Satisfaction On Five Satisfaction Scale Items (N=206)

| Satisfaction With Field... | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|---------|------------|--------|------------|--|
| Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| Level | Learning | Program | Instructor | Agency | Experience | |
| Very | 3 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 4 | |
| Dissatisfied | 1.5% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 4.4% | 1.9% | |
| Dissatisfied | 22 | 20 | 16 | 16 | 16 | |
| | 10.7% | 9.7% | 7.8% | 7.8% | 7.8% | |
| Neither | 12 | 22 | 19 | 30 | 19 | |
| Satisfied Nor | | | | | | |
| Dissatisfied | 5.8% | 10.7% | 9.2% | 14.6% | 9.2% | |
| Satisfied | 85 | 98 | 70 | 81 | 87 | |
| | 41.3% | 47.6% | 34.0% | 39.3% | 42.2% | |
| Very | 83 | 57 | 94 | 68 | 79 | |
| Satisfied | 40.3% | 27.7% | 45.6% | 33.0% | 38.3% | |
| No Response | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | .5% | 1.5% | .5% | 1.0% | .5% | |

Correlation analysis was performed in order to examine the relationships among the five satisfaction scale items. As shown in Table 7, all items were correlated at the .000 level of significance, with correlation coefficients ranging from a high of .8671 (satisfaction with learning and the overall field work experience) to a low of .4509 (satisfaction with field instructors and the child welfare agency).

Table 7

Correlation Coefficients For Satisfaction Scale Items

Student Satisfaction With Field...

| | <u>Learning</u> | <u>Program</u> | <u>Instructor</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Experience</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Learning</u> | 1.000 | .7413 | .6414 | .6295 | .8671 |
| <u>Program</u> | | 1.000 | .5339 | .7275 | .7472 |
| <u>Instructor</u> | | | 1.000 | .4509 | .6330 |
| <u>Agency</u> | | | | 1.000 | .6977 |
| <u>Experience</u> | | | | | 1.000 |

p < .00 for all correlations

Non-Scale Satisfaction Items

Three additional satisfaction items appeared at the end of the questionnaire. The first item asked students if they would accept a social work job at the agency if it were offered. A second item asked them if they thought their

field placement agency would offer them a position if they had graduated and wanted a job. A final question asked these students if they would recommend this child welfare agency as a field placement to other social work students who had similar interests. Distributions for these non-scale items are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Distribution For Three Non-Scale Satisfaction Items (N=206)

| <u>Satisfaction Item</u> | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Would you accept a social work job at the agency...if it were offered? | | |
| Yes | 103 | 50.0 |
| No | 51 | 24.8 |
| Don't Know | 29 | 14.1 |
| Only If Desperate | 12 | 5.8 |
| Already Employed By | 10 | 4.9 |
| No Response | 1 | .5 |
| Do you think this child welfare agency would offer you a position...? | | |
| Yes | 160 | 77.7 |
| No | 42 | 20.4 |
| Don't Know | 3 | 1.5 |
| No Response | 1 | .5 |
| Would you recommend your ...agency as a field placement to other ...students...? | | |
| Yes | 143 | 69.4 |
| No | 42 | 20.4 |
| Don't Know | 19 | 9.2 |
| No Response | 2 | 1.0 |

The relationships between these three non-scale items and the five satisfaction scale items, as well as the overall satisfaction index, were examined through ANOVAs and t-tests. As can be seen in Table 9, there was a consistently positive and statistically significant relationship between all areas of student satisfaction and their interest in accepting a job at the agency, if it were offered, and the potential for the agency to be recommended as a field placement to other students. The relationship between student satisfaction and the belief that they would be offered a job was not, however, found to be statistically significant.

Table 9

T-Tests For Three Non-Scale Satisfaction Items, With Student Satisfaction Scale Items

| | Mean Score | Mean Score | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------|---------|------|
| | Yes Group | No/Don't Know | t Score | p |
| <u>Satisfaction With Learning</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job</u> | | | | |
| <u>If Offered...</u> | 4.4118 | 3.7647 | 4.80 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would</u> | | | | |
| <u>Be Offered...</u> | 4.1761 | 3.7778 | 2.35 | .020 |
| <u>Would Recommend</u> | | | | |
| <u>Placement</u> | 4.5070 | 3.1429 | 11.38 | .000 |

Table 9 (continued)

| | Mean Score Yes Group | Mean Score No/Don't Know | t score | p |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job</u> | | | | |
| <u>If Offered...</u> | 4.2970 | 3.4752 | 6.22 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would</u> | | | | |
| <u>Be Offered...</u> | 3.9172 | 3.7778 | .81 | .422 |
| <u>Would Recommend</u> | | | | |
| <u>Placement</u> | 4.3191 | 2.9032 | 11.83 | .000 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Instructors</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job</u> | | | | |
| <u>If Offered</u> | 4.3922 | 3.8529 | 3.75 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would</u> | | | | |
| <u>Be Offered</u> | 4.1635 | 3.9778 | 1.04 | .300 |
| <u>Would Recommend</u> | | | | |
| <u>Placement</u> | 4.4577 | 3.3651 | 7.76 | .000 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job</u> | | | | |
| <u>If Offered</u> | 4.3922 | 3.3960 | 7.29 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would</u> | | | | |
| <u>Be Offered</u> | 3.9057 | 3.8636 | .23 | .822 |
| <u>Would Recommend</u> | | | | |
| <u>Placement</u> | 4.3099 | 2.9516 | 9.99 | .000 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Experience</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job</u> | | | | |
| <u>If Offered</u> | 4.4902 | 3.667 | 6.56 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would</u> | | | | |
| <u>Be Offered</u> | 4.1384 | 3.8667 | 1.64 | .102 |
| <u>Would Recommend</u> | | | | |
| <u>Placement</u> | 4.4930 | 3.1429 | 11.74 | .000 |

Table 9 (continued)

| | Mean Score Yes Group | Mean Score No/Don't Know | t Score | p |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|------|
| <u>Satisfaction Index</u> | | | | |
| <u>Would Accept Job If Offered</u> | 21.9604 | 18.1100 | 6.84 | .000 |
| <u>Think Job Would Be Offered</u> | 20.2930 | 19.1591 | 1.51 | .133 |
| <u>Would Recommend Placement</u> | 22.0709 | 15.3607 | 13.86 | .000 |

Association Between Student Demographics
And Satisfaction With Field Work

Relationships among student demographic characteristics and the five satisfaction scale items were examined through t-tests and ANOVAs, as appropriate. Most personal and educational variables had no statistically significant relationship; while three variables appeared to have a relationship to some aspect of satisfaction. Only two variables had a statistically significant relationship to all satisfaction scale items.

The personal characteristics of age, gender, child welfare volunteer and employment experience, employment while in field, and the number of hours of employment, were not found to be significantly related to the measures of student satisfaction. Only the variable of race/ethnicity had a significant relationship with satisfaction with the field work program ($t=2.68$, $p<.008$), with Caucasian students

(mean=4.00) more satisfied than students who identified themselves with another group (mean=3.58).

None of the educational characteristics related to educational level, methods concentration, field of practice specialization, and concurrent enrollment in field education and academic courses was significantly related to any of the measures of student satisfaction. Similarly having completed a course with child welfare content prior to field placement, having taken a course with a specific child welfare focus, nor having had a prior field placement were found to be related to student satisfaction. Only enrolling in a course with child welfare content after beginning field placement was significantly related to satisfaction with the child welfare agency. Students who had enrolled in such a course were more satisfied with their agency (mean=4.08) than students who had not enrolled (mean=3.68) in such a course ($t=2.66$, $p<.009$).

In the area of field placement characteristics, neither the number of agency-based hours required weekly nor the requirement of a school-based integrative field education seminar were related to student satisfaction. Funding for field placement was found to have a negative relationship to student satisfaction with the child welfare agency. Students who were not receiving any funding specifically for field education were more satisfied with their agency (mean=4.05)

than students who were receiving some sort of funding (mean=3.49) ($t=3.31$, $p<.001$). Students who were without funding were also more satisfied (mean=4.19) than funded students (mean=3.78) with the overall field experience ($t=2.65$, $p<.009$).

Two field placement variables, however, were found to have a significant relationship to all facets of student satisfaction. As shown in Table 10, having had an individual interview with an agency staff member prior to field placement and being in a field placement that was one's first preference, were statistically significantly related to all satisfaction scale items.

Table 10

T-Tests For Select Field Placement Characteristics By Satisfaction Scale Items

| | Mean Score | t-Score | df | p |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|-----|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Learning</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 4.54 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.58 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 4.36 | 5.46 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.61 | | | |

Table 10 (continued)

| | Mean Score | t-Score | df | p |
|---|------------|---------|-----|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.06 | 3.97 | 201 | .000 |
| No | 3.44 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 4.15 | 5.30 | 201 | .000 |
| No | 3.41 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Instructor</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 3.48 | 203 | .001 |
| No | 3.71 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 4.34 | 4.15 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.73 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.08 | 4.28 | 202 | .000 |
| No | 3.38 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 4.11 | 3.96 | 202 | .000 |
| No | 3.51 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Experience</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 4.78 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.56 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 4.33 | 5.15 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.64 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction Index</u> | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 20.93 | 4.94 | 200 | .000 |
| No | 17.93 | | | |
| Placement First Choice | | | | |
| Yes | 21.32 | 5.99 | 200 | .000 |
| No | 17.74 | | | |

Correlation analysis was performed in order to further examine the relationship between these statistically significant student demographics and the satisfaction scale items. Only the latter two variables--having had a pre-placement interview at the agency and having a placement that was their first choice--were significantly correlated with all measures of student satisfaction ($p < .000$).

Extent Explaining Satisfaction

Fifty-nine items thought to be related to field work satisfaction were included in the Extent Explaining Satisfaction scale. This scale, an adaptation of a scale developed by Showers (1988), was designed to measure student perceptions about field work characteristics.

For 51 of the 59 items on this scale, the majority of students evaluated their presence in field work as being "Just Right". Students were most positive about the following program characteristics, as indicated by at least 80% of students rating the item as "Just Right": fairness in evaluation of my performance (91.1%); willingness of social work students to help each other (84.8%); opportunity to see my field instructors when needed (83.7%); freedom to disagree with my field instructors (82.8%); field instructor's openness to my opinions (82.4%); field instructor's objectivity in dealing with me (82.2%); opportunity to make decisions on my own (80.8%); quality of

social work students (80.7%); and the number of field instructors (80.4%).

Of the eight items not rated as "Just Right" by the majority of respondents, more items were rated as "Too Little" present than "Too Much" present. More than half of the students felt that there were not enough agency-based group seminars for students (57.3%), and that they did not have enough contact with other child welfare disciplines (52.8%), nor the opportunity to watch their field instructors work (51.0%). Students also felt that they did not have enough opportunity to participate in decision making regarding student policies and procedures (48.9%), nor that enough attention was paid to the organizational environment (office space, supplies, support services) (45.3%).

Of the eight items not rated "Just Right" by the majority of respondents, three were rated as "Too Much" present. All three of these items related to organizational variables. Close to two-thirds of students (62.7%) rated the political tension in the agency as being "too much present". The rules, administrative details and red tape was evaluated similarly (58.0%). The organizational changes that occurred during field placement were "Too Much" present for 39.1% of these students.

These findings generally indicate areas in which

students perceive child welfare field work programs to be performing relatively well and poorly. In order to gain further insight into how these items might cluster together, and the relative importance among these items, a principal components factor analysis was performed, with all "Extent Explaining Satisfaction" items included in the model.

Sixteen factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were identified, together accounting for 70.3% of the total variance. Varimax rotation converged in 17 iterations. Each scale item was assigned only to the factor upon which it had the highest loading after varimax rotation. All 59 items carried a loading of at least .30667 for factors to which they were assigned. Table 11 shows the grouping of item stems into factors according to strength of loading.

Table 11

Factor Analysis Of Extent Explaining Satisfaction Items

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Item Stems</u> | <u>Loading</u> |
|--|---|----------------|
| <u>Factor 1: Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics</u> | | |
| 86 | Field instructors' helpfulness in learning about social work practice | .76064 |
| 69 | Field instructors' helpfulness with difficulty | .73434 |
| 74 | Amount of supervision received | .68051 |
| 46 | Field instructors' attention to understanding and use of self | .66899 |
| 93 | Field instructors' helpfulness in working with other disciplines | .65861 |
| 58 | Field instructors' sensitivity to educational needs | .62299 |
| 68 | Field instructors' attention to integration of learning | .62096 |
| 44 | Field instructors' attention to teaching about community resources | .61441 |
| 75 | Opportunity to see field instructor when need arises | .58864 |
| 85 | Field instructors' being open to opinions | .56985 |
| 67 | Field instructors' organization in presentation of material | .56411 |
| 53 | Opportunity to watch field instructor work | .56110 |
| 65 | Feedback from field instructor for a good job | .54942 |
| 90 | Opportunities to learn and develop social work practice skills | .54873 |
| 55 | Field instructors' offering of constructive criticism | .48793 |
| 54 | Opportunity to watch other agency staff work | .48441 |
| 71 | Orientation on roles and functions of social workers in this agency | .38874 |
| <u>Factor 2: Learning Assignment Opportunities</u> | | |
| 57 | Relevance of field assignments to learning goals | .73762 |
| 81 | Chance to make use of abilities and skills | .70459 |
| 83 | Feeling of accomplishment from work | .70385 |
| 48 | Variety in assignments | .68464 |
| 52 | Number of different practice methods used | .54374 |
| 79 | Number of different program/service areas assigned to | .49904 |
| 80 | Opportunity to participate in selection of learning experiences | .48840 |

Table 11 (continued)

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Item Stems</u> | <u>Loading</u> |
|--|---|----------------|
| <u>Factor 3: Support From School</u> | | |
| 98 | Support from school-based integrative field seminar | .85069 |
| 97 | School-based integrative seminar's helpfulness in integration of learning | .81692 |
| 96 | Faculty field liaison's helpfulness in integration of learning | .71985 |
| 102 | Faculty field liaison's helpfulness in dealing with placement | .58971 |
| <u>Factor 4: Field Instructor Evaluation Characteristics</u> | | |
| 50 | Field instructors' objectivity in dealing with student | .73153 |
| 59 | Fairness in evaluation of performance | .71895 |
| <u>Factor 5: Organizational Support</u> | | |
| 66 | Amount of support students receive when they make mistakes | .59185 |
| 77 | Field instructors' clear expectations at the beginning of placement | .49666 |
| 76 | Amount of attention given to safety of students | .40931 |
| 100 | Support given to students by agency staff | .39179 |
| <u>Factor 6: Orientation Characteristics</u> | | |
| 51 | Orientation received about agency's field work program | .74256 |
| 45 | Orientation received about agency policies and procedures | .67225 |
| 78 | Degree of involvement in evaluation of own performance | .39621 |
| <u>Factor 7: Organizational Environment</u> | | |
| 61 | Political tension in the agency | -.82144 |
| 60 | Rules, administrative details, red tape | -.79622 |
| 62 | Organizational changes in the agency | -.66062 |
| <u>Factor 8: Program Coordination</u> | | |
| 88 | Number of agency-based group seminars for students | .73708 |
| 94 | Degree to which social work student program is organized in agency | .47511 |
| 56 | Security students feel in offering new and original ideas | .47008 |
| 82 | Opportunity to participate in decisions regarding student policies | .33791 |
| <u>Factor 9: Student Workload</u> | | |
| 92 | Overall amount of work expected of students | .82267 |
| 64 | Amount of stress experienced in placement | .54930 |
| 72 | Number of learning experiences (cases, groups, projects) | .48120 |

Table 11 (continued)

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Item Stems</u> | <u>Loading</u> |
|--|--|----------------|
| <u>Factor 10: Student Peer Support</u> | | |
| 84 | Willingness of social work students in agency to help each other | .72545 |
| 89 | Quality of social work students in the agency | .55727 |
| 101 | Student peer support experienced in field placement | .51106 |
| <u>Factor 11: School/Agency Coordination</u> | | |
| 87 | Coordination between field instructors and faculty field liaison | .80487 |
| 95 | Coordination between my field instructors | .53604 |
| <u>Factor 12: Other Disciplines</u> | | |
| 70 | Contact with other child welfare disciplines | .70602 |
| <u>Factor 13: Other Students</u> | | |
| 99 | Number of other social work students at agency | .85817 |
| <u>Factor 14: Organizational Characteristics</u> | | |
| 63 | Attention to the organizational environment | .70066 |
| <u>Factor 15: Pre-placement Contact</u> | | |
| 47 | Contact with agency staff prior to first day of field work | .76057 |
| <u>Factor 16: Student Autonomy</u> | | |
| 91 | Number of field instructors | .66475 |
| 73 | Opportunity to make decisions on my own | -.36675 |
| 49 | Freedom to disagree with field instructors | .32277 |

Correlation analysis was used to examine associations between the 16 factors identified and the satisfaction scale items. Only Factor 1, Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics, had a statistically significant ($p < .000$) correlation with all the satisfaction scale items. Factor 2, Learning Assignment Opportunities, was significantly correlated with all satisfaction items ($p < .000$) except satisfaction with the field instructor. Similarly, Factor 5,

Organizational Support, was correlated with four satisfaction items--satisfaction with the field work program (p <.000), satisfaction with the field instructor (p <.002), satisfaction with the agency (p <.008), and satisfaction with the overall field experience (p<.005). As can be seen in Table 12, seven other factors were correlated with one or two measures of student satisfaction and six factors were not significantly correlated with any of the five satisfaction scale items.

Table 12

Correlations Between Extent Explaining Satisfaction Factors
And Student Satisfaction Scale Items

Student Satisfaction With Field...

| | <u>Learning</u> | <u>Program</u> | <u>Instructor</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Experience</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Factor 1</u> | .4399 | .3721 | .6377 | .3277 | .4007 |
| Instructor Relationship | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| <u>Factor 2</u> | .4839 | .3463 | ns | .3434 | .5565 |
| Learning Opportunities | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .000 |
| <u>Factor 3</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| School Support | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 4</u> | ns | ns | .2230 | ns | ns |
| Evaluation | | | .001 | | |
| <u>Factor 5</u> | ns | .2706 | .2162 | .1867 | .1968 |
| Organizational Support | | .000 | .002 | .008 | .005 |
| <u>Factor 6</u> | .1933 | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Orientation Characteristics | .005 | | | | |

Table 12 (continued)

| | <u>Learning</u> | <u>Program</u> | <u>Instructor</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Experience</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <u>Factor 7</u> | ns | .2067 | ns | .1864 | ns |
| Organizational Environment | | .003 | | .008 | |
| <u>Factor 8</u> | ns | .2436 | ns | .2002 | ns |
| Program Coordination | | .000 | | .004 | |
| <u>Factor 9</u> | ns | ns | ns | -.2772 | ns |
| Student Workload | | | | .000 | |
| <u>Factor 10</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Peer Support | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 11</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| School/Agency Coordination | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 12</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Other Disciplines | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 13</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Other Students | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 14</u> | ns | ns | ns | .2150 | .1864 |
| Organizational Characteristics | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 15</u> | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Pre-placement Contact | | | | | |
| <u>Factor 16</u> | .2080 | ns | ns | ns | ns |
| Student Autonomy | .003 | | | | |

Factor 1, Field Instructor Relationship

Characteristics, which was correlated with all the satisfaction items, was also the greatest contributor to variance in the sample, contributing 25%. Factor 2, Learning Assignment Opportunities, was the second most powerful contributor, with 7.3% of the variance. Factors 3 through 5

each contributed approximately 4% to the variance; Factors 6 through 10 each contributed around 3% to the variance; and Factors 11 through 16 each contributed 2% or less to the variance.

CHAPTER SIX

FINDINGS RELATED TO PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter presents descriptive data about program characteristics and reports findings regarding associations between program characteristics and student satisfaction scale items. Data in this chapter was obtained from the questionnaires of 206 social work students and 118 child welfare field instructors who participated in this study.

Program Dimensions Related To Learning Opportunities

Data was collected on organizational factors, field instructor demographics, field education variables, and characteristics of supervision in an effort to understand the field work experiences of social work students placed in child welfare settings in the state of Florida during the Spring 1995 semester.

Organizational Factors

The field instructors and students who responded to this survey represented voluntary/not-for-profit (38.2%), private/for-profit (5.3%) and public agencies (56.5%). As can be seen in Table 13, BSW students were more likely to be placed in an agency under public auspices and MSW students were slightly more likely to be placed in an agency under voluntary or private auspices.

The Child Welfare League of America (Curtis, 1994) identifies 21 potential service areas for child welfare

agencies; three additional areas were identified during the pre-testing of the questionnaires. Both the field instructors and the social work students were presented a child welfare services area list. The field instructors were asked to identify all the areas in which they were supervising students, and 40.7% of these respondents indicated that they were supervising students in more than one service area. The students, however, were asked to identify only the primary area of service of their field work placement. As can be seen in Table 13, the field instructors were supervising students in all areas of child welfare service, with individual counseling (33.9%) and family-centered casework (27.1%) being the most represented. The greatest percentage of BSW students were placed in child protective services (23.9%) and the greatest percentage of MSW students were placed in agencies focused on individual counseling (26.9%). None of the students who responded to this survey were involved with family-based day care, employment and training, housing and homelessness, or children with AIDS.

Table 13

Program Characteristics: Organizational Factors

| | Field Instructors (n=117) | BSW Students (N=71) | MSW Students (n=134) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>Agency Auspices</u> | | | |
| Voluntary, not-for-profit | 53 (45.3%) | 22 (31.0%) | 48 (36.1%) |
| Private, for-profit | 5 (4.3%) | 2 (2.8%) | 10 (7.5%) |
| Public | 59 (50.5%) | 47 (66.2%) | 75 (56.4%) |
| No Response | | | 1 (.7%) |
| <u>Agency Area of Service</u> | | | |
| Adoption | 12 (10.2%) | 3 (4.2%) | 11 (6.2%) |
| Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention | 12 (10.2%) | | 2 (1.5%) |
| Children with HIV/AIDS | 5 (4.2%) | | |
| Counseling-Group | 27 (22.9%) | | 1 (.7%) |
| Counseling-Individual/Family | 40 (33.9%) | 3 (4.2%) | 36 (26.9%) |
| Child Protective Services | 22 (18.6%) | 17 (23.9%) | 1 (.7%) |
| Drug/Alcohol Services | 8 (6.8%) | | 3 (2.2%) |
| Child Day Care-Center-Based | 5 (4.2%) | 1 (1.4%) | |
| Child Day Care-Family-Based | 5 (4.2%) | | |
| Day Treatment | 7 (5.9%) | 3 (4.2%) | 2 (1.5%) |
| Emergency Shelter Care | 10 (8.5%) | 4 (5.6%) | 5 (3.7%) |
| Employment And Training | 5 (4.2%) | | |
| Family-Centered Casework | 32 (27.1%) | 3 (4.2%) | 7 (5.2%) |
| Family Foster Care | 11 (9.3%) | 1 (1.4%) | 11 (8.2%) |
| Housing/Homelessness | 5 (4.2%) | | |
| Intensive Family-Centered | | | |
| Crisis Intervention | 21 (17.8%) | 8 (11.3%) | 10 (7.5%) |
| In-Home Aides | 6 (5.1%) | | 1 (.7%) |
| Independent Living | 7 (5.9%) | | 1 (.7%) |
| Residential Group Care | 10 (8.5%) | 2 (2.8%) | 1 (.7%) |
| Therapeutic Foster Care | 6 (5.1%) | | 1 (.7%) |
| Youth Leadership Development | 3 (2.5%) | | 1 (.7%) |
| School Social Work | 28 (23.7%) | 13 (18.3%) | 24 (17.9%) |
| Psychiatric/Mental Health | 23 (19.5%) | | 5 (3.7%) |
| Medical/Health Care | 10 (8.5%) | | 6 (4.5%) |
| Other | 2 (1.7%) | 13 (18.3%) | 5 (3.7%) |

These child welfare agencies were serving a large number of children monthly. For the month of February 1995, the majority of the agencies reporting (60.4%) were serving in excess of 100 children. The full-time staff employed to serve these children ranged from 1-80, with an average staff size of 12.86. BSWs represented a small portion of the total staff (10.3%), with MSWs being somewhat better represented (24.2%).

These 118 field instructors reported supervising 242 baccalaureate (32.6%) and master's (67.4%) social work students. Of the respondents who were supervising more than one student (46.6%), 32.7% were supervising both a BSW and MSW student at the same time. At the 118 agencies represented by these field instructors, 339 staff were identified as serving in the role of primary field instructor, task field instructor, or in dual capacities.

Field Instructor Demographics

As reported in Table 14, the "typical" field instructor who responded to this survey was a 43 year old Caucasian female with an MSW degree and 12.25 years of child welfare experience. She had an average of 5.4 years experience as a field instructor and spent an average of 18.68% of her time in field education activities.

Table 14

Program Characteristics: Field Instructor Demographics

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Age (n=115) | | |
| Mean | | 43.16 years |
| Range | | 25-70 years |
| Gender (n=116) | | |
| Male | | 12 (10.3%) |
| Female | | 104 (89.7%) |
| Ethnicity (n=116) | | |
| African-American/Black | | 21 (18.1%) |
| Caucasian | | 84 (72.4%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | | 8 (6.9%) |
| Other | | 3 (2.6%) |
| Highest Academic Degree (n=118) | | |
| BSW | | 5 (4.2%) |
| MSW | | 103 (87.3%) |
| Other | | 10 (8.3%) |
| Social Work Licensure (n=116) | | |
| Yes | | 52 (44.8%) |
| No | | 64 (55.2%) |
| Experience In Child Welfare (n=115) | | |
| Mean | | 12.25 years |
| Range | | 1.5-37 years |

Table 14 (continued)

Agency Position (n=116)

| | |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Direct Service Provider | 42 (36.2%) |
| Supervisor | 38 (32.8%) |
| Administrator | 20 (17.2%) |
| School of Social Work Employee | 6 (5.1%) |
| Other | 10 (8.7%) |

Experience As A Field Instructor (n=115)

| | |
|-------|------------|
| Mean | 5.4 years |
| Range | 0-48 years |

Average Percent Of Time Spent On Field Work Activities
(n=116)

| | |
|-------|---------|
| Mean | 18.68% |
| Range | 3%-100% |

Agency Reduces Workload For Field Instruction Activity
(n=116)

| | |
|-----|------------|
| Yes | 19 (16.4%) |
| No | 97 (83.6%) |

School Of Social Work Advisory Committee Member (n=118)

| | |
|-----|-------------|
| Yes | 13 (11.0%) |
| No | 105 (89.0%) |

Field Education Variables

The majority of child welfare field instructors who responded to this survey were supervising students from only one social work education program (71.2%), and working with only one faculty field liaison (68.1%). Three quarters of both the BSW (74.7%) and MSW (77.4%) students reported that their faculty field liaison had visited the agency one or more times during the course of the field placement.

Most of the programs (69.5%) reported having written policies and procedures for students, and half (50.0%) reported having written program evaluation forms for students to complete at the end of field placement. Only a small percentage (10.3%) of agencies were receiving external funding for their field work program.

Social work students at these child welfare agencies appeared to be carrying caseloads appropriate in size for learning and were involved in a variety of social work practice activities. Table 15 contrasts the practice activities of BSW and MSW social work students.

Table 15

Program Characteristics: Social Work Practice Activities Of
Social Work Students

| | BSW (n=71) | MSW (n=134) |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Caseload | | |
| Mean | 6.39 | 7.11 |
| Range | 0-25 | 0-28 |
| Number Of Service/Program Areas | | |
| One | 30 (42.3%) | 64 (47.8%) |
| Two | 14 (19.7%) | 28 (20.9%) |
| Three | 9 (12.7%) | 24 (17.9%) |
| More Than Three | 17 (23.9%) | 17 (12.7%) |
| Not Applicable | 1 (1.4%) | 1 (.7%) |
| Social Work Practice Methods Involvement | | |
| Work With Individuals | 67 (94.4%) | 128 (95.5%) |
| Work With Families | 57 (80.3%) | 124 (92.5%) |
| Work With Groups | 33 (46.5%) | 97 (72.4%) |
| Work With Communities | 23 (32.4%) | 30 (22.4%) |
| Work With Administration | 15 (21.1%) | 31 (23.1%) |
| Work With Research | 6 (8.5%) | 21 (15.7%) |

Table 15 (continued)

| | BSW | MSW |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Type Of Clients | | |
| Involuntary Only | 12 (16.9%) | 23 (17.2%) |
| Voluntary Only | 23 (32.4%) | 38 (28.4%) |
| Both Involuntary/ Voluntary | 31 (43.7%) | 57 (42.5%) |
| Not Applicable | 5 (7.0%) | 16 (11.9%) |
| Type Of Client Contact | | |
| Brief (1-4 Contacts) | 19 (27.1%) | 38 (28.4%) |
| Short (5-12 Contacts) | 38 (54.3%) | 79 (59.0%) |
| Long (12+ Contacts) | 22 (31.4%) | 65 (48.5%) |
| Length Of Client Contact | | |
| Less Than One Month | 4 (5.6%) | 12 (9.0%) |
| 1 or 2 Months | 30 (42.3%) | 36 (26.9%) |
| 3 or 4 Months | 33 (46.5%) | 54 (40.3%) |
| 5 or 6 Months | 1 (1.4%) | 14 (10.4%) |
| More Than 6 Months | 1 (1.4%) | 18 (13.4%) |

Table 15 (continued)

| | BSW | MSW |
|--|--------|--------|
| Average Percent Of Field Work Activity | | |
| Agency-Based Contact/Clients | 27.48% | 37.57% |
| Home Visit Contact/Clients | 29.22% | 26.46% |
| Paperwork | 24.82% | 19.88% |
| Agency Meetings/Staffings | 9.53% | 11.80% |
| Work With Other Agencies | 9.76% | 9.25% |
| Supervision/Training | 13.13% | 11.95% |
| Administrative Activities | 7.28% | 8.17% |
| Research Activities | 7.67% | 6.22% |

Characteristics Of Supervision

Of the BSW students who responded to this survey, the greatest percentage (45.1%) were being supervised by two field instructors, while the majority of MSW students (56%) were being supervised by only one field instructor. Similarly, most of the BSW students (49.3%) were receiving individual supervision, while the majority of MSW students (57.5%) were receiving both individual and group supervision. For both groups of students, the primary pattern of supervision was scheduled weekly plus as needed--this being true for 44.3% of the undergraduate students and 66.4% of the master's students.

While 57.6% of the field instructors reported

conducting group seminars for students, in addition to regular supervision, only 38.0% of the BSW students and 37.3% of the MSW students reported being involved in these seminars. According to the field instructors, these group seminars were conducted by the field instructor (60.3%), administrative or supervisory staff (60.3%), direct service staff (50.0%), and people from outside the agency (47.1%). The topics covered at these group seminars at the 68 agencies where they were offered are listed in Table 16.

Table 16

Program Characteristics: Group Seminar Topics (n=68)

| | Number | Percent |
|---|--------|---------|
| Agency Policies And Procedures | 47 | 69.1 |
| Case Material | 44 | 64.7 |
| Interdisciplinary Collaboration | 38 | 55.9 |
| Specific Problems (AIDS, Autism, Etc.) | 36 | 52.9 |
| Social Work Role And Function In Agency | 36 | 52.9 |
| Specific Interventions (Play Therapy, Etc.) | 35 | 51.5 |
| Expectations Of Student Performance | 30 | 44.1 |
| Other Systems (Mental Health, Judicial) | 29 | 42.6 |
| Child Welfare Policy | 25 | 36.8 |
| Field Work Program Policies | 24 | 35.3 |
| Professional Writing Skills | 18 | 26.5 |
| Security/Safety Training | 16 | 23.5 |

Outcome Measures

The child welfare field instructor satisfaction scale included three items not included in the student questionnaire. These items asked them to indicate their

levels of satisfaction with baccalaureate and master's social work students, as well as with the seminars provided by schools of social work for new field instructors. These respondents were generally satisfied with both BSW (89.8%) and MSW (88.9%) students, with average satisfaction scores of 4.41 and 4.42 respectively. They were somewhat less satisfied with the seminars for new field instructors; 70.7% of these field instructors indicated they were satisfied with these seminars, with an average satisfaction score of 3.85.

These child welfare field instructors were asked a series of questions relating to outcomes for the social work students they were supervising during the Spring 1995 semester. Table 17 presents data about problems experienced during the course of the semester. Of the 242 social work students interning at these agencies, these field instructors indicated that they would recommend hiring 78.5% of the baccalaureate students and 76.1% of the graduate students.

Table 17

Program Characteristics: Student Outcomes

| | BSW | MSW |
|---|----------|----------|
| Students Demonstrated Serious Problems In Field Placement | 5 (6.3%) | 9 (5.5%) |
| Students Left At Request Of Agency | 3 (3.8%) | 2 (1.2%) |
| Students Left At Request Of School | | |
| Students Left For Other Reasons | 2 (2.5%) | 3 (1.8%) |

Association Between Program Characteristics
And Satisfaction With Field Work

Relationships among program characteristics and the five satisfaction scale items were examined through t-tests and ANOVAs, as appropriate. In this area it appears that more variables related to learning opportunities were found to have a statistically significant relationship to student satisfaction than variables related to organizational and field education factors.

Of the organizational factors studied, neither the agency auspices nor the area of service provision were significantly related to the satisfaction items. In 128 instances, both the field instructor and the student, or students, they were supervising returned questionnaires. In these situations, student satisfaction was examined in

relation to the number of children served by the field work unit, the size of both the full and social work staff, and the number of students each field instructor was supervising. None of these variables was found to have a significant relationship to any level of student satisfaction.

Data was collected on a number of field instructor demographics. Of these, examining only the 128 matched cases, a field instructors' age, gender, ethnicity, degree, role, experience in child welfare and field instruction, licensure, practice activities, and advisory committee membership did not relate significantly to satisfaction.

Similarly, the field education variables of external funding, number of schools and field liaisons, frequency of field liaison visits, and whether or not an agency had a written policies and procedures manual for students or a written program evaluation form, did not relate to any area of satisfaction. Only one field education variable was found to have a relationship to some level of student satisfaction. Students who had field instructors whose agency gave them a workload reduction to fulfill their field education responsibilities were less satisfied with field learning ($t=-2.83$, $p<.005$), the field work program ($t=-2.89$, $p<.005$), and the field instructor ($t=-2.67$, $p<.009$).

Among the characteristics of supervision variables, no

statistically significant difference was detected between the satisfaction scale items and the mode of supervision or the presence of group seminars. A significant difference was found among the patterns of supervision and satisfaction with the field instructor. Students who had supervision scheduled weekly, plus were able to seek supervision when the need arose, were more satisfied with the field instructor (mean=4.29) than students who had other patterns of supervision (mean=3.89) ($t=2.69$, $p<.008$). Similarly, the number of field instructors to which one was assigned was found to be related to satisfaction with learning and satisfaction with field instructors. Students who had only one field instructor were less satisfied with field learning ($t=-3.08$, $p<.002$) and the overall field experience ($t=-2.88$, $p<.004$).

The different practice methods available during field placement, the voluntary/involuntary status of clients, and the type and length of client contact had no significant relationship to student satisfaction for this sample. Students who were assigned to only one program area, however, were less satisfied with their learning ($t=-2.96$, $p<.003$), the field work program ($t=-2.78$, $p<.006$), and the child welfare agency ($t=-2.85$, $p<.005$), than students who were assigned to two or more program areas. Tables summarizing select independent variables and their

relationship to the five satisfaction scale items are in the Appendix (Table 25).

CHAPTER SEVEN
FINDINGS RELATED TO DIFFERENCES IN
STUDENT AND FIELD INSTRUCTOR RESPONSES

This chapter presents a comparison of information provided by the student and field instructor respondents who participated in this study. In some instances, differences between students and field instructors are presented as differences in group percentages and/or means. In some areas, differences in the response of pairs of students and field instructors are the basis of analysis.

A Comparison Of Responses On Satisfaction Scale Items

A satisfaction scale was part of the questionnaire provided to both sets of respondents, with five items that were common to both--satisfaction with field learning, the field work program, the field instructors, the child welfare agency, and the overall field work experience. Table 18 presents a comparison of group responses for each of these items, at each level of satisfaction, as well as group means.

Field instructor satisfaction levels were higher than student satisfaction levels for each of the five satisfaction scale items, as well as for the overall satisfaction index. The greatest group rate differences were for satisfaction with the agency (89.3% vs 72.3%),

satisfaction with the overall field work experience (93.5% vs 80.3%), and satisfaction with the field instructors (92.0% vs 79.6%). Smaller differences were found related to satisfaction with learning (91.5% vs 81.6%) and satisfaction with the field work program (84.8% vs 75.3%). Consistent with these findings is the difference in the overall satisfaction index (21.61 vs 20.04).

Table 18

Comparison Of Student And Field Instructor Responses On Five Satisfaction Scale Items

| | 1=Very Dissatisfied | 2=Dissatisfied | 3=Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | 4=Satisfied | 5=Very Satisfied | |
|---|---------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------------|------|
| | VD | D | N | S | VS | MEAN |
| <u>Satisfaction With Learning</u> | | | | | | |
| Students (n=205) | 1.5% | 10.7% | 5.8% | 41.3% | 40.3% | 4.09 |
| Field Instructors (n=117) | 1.7% | 2.6% | 4.3% | 46.2% | 45.3% | 4.31 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | | | |
| Students (n=203) | 2.9% | 9.7% | 10.7% | 47.6% | 27.7% | 3.89 |
| Field Instructors (n=112) | .9% | 1.8% | 12.5% | 48.2% | 36.6% | 4.18 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Instructors</u> | | | | | | |
| Students (n=205) | 2.9% | 7.8% | 9.2% | 34.0% | 45.6% | 4.12 |
| Field Instructors (n=100) | | 1.0% | 7.0% | 48.0% | 44.0% | 4.35 |

Table 18 (continued)

| | VD | D | N | S | VS | MEAN |
|--|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | | | |
| Students (n=204) | 4.4% | 7.8% | 14.6% | 39.3% | 33.0% | 3.90 |
| Field Instructors (n=112) | | 4.5% | 6.3% | 48.2% | 41.1% | 4.26 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Experience</u> | | | | | | |
| Students (n=205) | 1.9% | 7.8% | 9.2% | 42.2% | 38.3% | 4.08 |
| Field Instructors (n=109) | | .9% | 5.5% | 55.0% | 38.5% | 4.31 |

As reported in Chapter Five, all satisfaction scale items were correlated at the .000 level of significance for students. This was not true for field instructors. For the latter respondents, only the satisfaction items related to the agency and the overall field work experience were significantly correlated ($p < .004$) with all the other satisfaction scale items. There was also a positive correlation ($p < .000$) between satisfaction with the field work program and the field instructors.

Table 19

Correlation Coefficients For Satisfaction Scale Items
(N=117)

Field Instructor Satisfaction With Field...

| | <u>Learning</u> | <u>Program</u> | <u>Instructor</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Experience</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <u>Learning</u> | 1.0000 | ns | ns | .3198 p<.001 | .3585 p<.000 |
| <u>Program</u> | | 1.0000 | .6392 p<.000 | .4301 p<.000 | .3173 p<.001 |
| <u>Instructor</u> | | | 1.0000 | .2884 p<.004 | .3011 p<.003 |
| <u>Agency</u> | | | | 1.0000 | .3815 p<.000 |
| <u>Experience</u> | | | | | 1.000 |

The students were asked whether or not they thought they would be offered employment by their field work agency; while the field instructors were asked if they would recommend their students for employment. Of the BSW students, 71.8% thought they would be offered employment and of the field instructors supervising BSW students, 78.5% would be recommended for employment. Of the MSW students, 81.3% thought they would be offered employment and of the field instructors supervising them, 76.1% would be recommended for employment.

Chi square analysis of the distribution of responses to the five satisfaction scale items that were similar, showed no statistically significant differences between the

responses of the students and the field instructors for each measure of student satisfaction. T-test comparisons of the means for these same items revealed no significant difference between students and field instructors on three items--satisfaction with learning, with the field instructor, and with the overall field experience. Students (mean=3.89) were, however, less satisfied than field instructors (mean=4.18) with the agency's field work program ($t=-2.63$, $p<.009$). Students (mean=3.90) were also less satisfied than field instructors (mean=4.26) with the child welfare agency ($t=-3.12$, $p<.002$).

T-tests for paired samples, for the 128 student-field instructor matches, revealed no statistically significant differences on four of the five satisfaction items. Only responses to one item--satisfaction with the agency's field work program--was significantly different ($t=3.45$, $p<.001$), with students (mean=3.96) less satisfied than their field instructors (mean=4.35). Table 26 (Appendix) illustrates these select differences.

A Comparison Of Field Work Characteristics

Both students and field instructors were presented with an Extent Explaining Satisfaction Scale, asking them to evaluate the presence of a number of field education variables. The majority of students indicated that these variables were present in "Just Right" amounts for 51 of the

59 variables presented. Consistent with the overall greater satisfaction rate of the field instructors, these respondents indicated that these variables were present in "Just Right" amounts for 55 of the 57 variables they were presented.

The greatest percentage of both students and field instructors indicated that fairness in evaluation of student performance was present in "Just Right" amounts (91.1% vs 96.6%). The greatest differences, more than 20 percentage points of difference, between students and field instructors in the amount assigned to the "Just Right" category were on the following items: opportunity to watch field instructors work (47.5% vs 73.0%); opportunity to watch other staff work (56.4% vs 81.0%); attention to teaching community resources (53.8% vs 76.9%); chance for students to make use of skills and abilities (71.6% vs 93.2%); amount of stress students experience (56.1% vs 77.6%); and the support given to students by agency staff (68.8% vs 88.8%). In each area, the field instructors perceived the item to be in greater presence than the students.

The students and field instructors both perceived more items to be "Too Little" present than "Too Much" present. The items rated "Too Much" present by both groups related to organizational factors: the organization changes (39.1% vs 42.9%); the red tape (58.0% vs 39.7%); and the political

tension (62.7% vs 44.3%). While these were rated as "Too Much" present by both groups, more students rated these items in such a manner than field instructors.

Four "Extent Explaining Satisfaction" items were rated as "Too Little" present by a number of students and field instructors: agency-based group seminars for students (57.3% vs 50.5%); contact with other child welfare disciplines (52.8% vs 34.5%); decision making regarding student policies and procedures (48.9% vs 32.3%); and attention to the organizational environment (45.3% vs 35.6%). The students also felt that they did not have enough opportunity to watch their field instructors work (51%); while the field instructors felt that the degree to which the social work program was organized at the agency was too little (34.5%).

Chi square analysis of distribution of responses between students and field instructors on the 57 "Extent Explaining Satisfaction" items revealed statistically significant differences on 30 (52.63%) items. In all of these instances, the student responses were more variable than the field instructor responses. T-test analysis of the mean differences similarly revealed significant differences between students and field instructors on 30 (52.63%) items. A review of Table 28 (Appendix) reveals that generally students viewed these items as being more "Too Little" present than the field instructors. Only on two items--

rules, administrative details and red tape, and the political tension in the agency--did the students differ from the field instructors by viewing the item as being "Too Much" present.

CHAPTER EIGHT
FINDINGS RELATED TO PREDICTION OF
STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH FIELD WORK

In this chapter, findings are presented about independent variables in this study which were found to be most predictive of each type of student satisfaction-- satisfaction with learning, the field work program, the field instructor, the child welfare agency, and the overall field experience. In addition, the ability of each of these satisfaction items to predict acceptance of employment and recommendation of the field placement to others is also explored.

Prediction Of Student Satisfaction

A review of the student demographics, education and field education variables, and characteristics of supervision included in this study identified eight independent variables that were found to be significantly associated with the dependent variables of student satisfaction. The independent variables of ethnicity, child welfare course since field placement, funding for field placement, pre-placement interview, field placement preference, pattern of supervision, the number of field instructors, and the number of program/service areas were all found to be associated with the dependent variable at a significance level of less than .009. Two factors--Field

Instructor Relationship Characteristics and Learning Assignment Opportunities--were related to the dependent variable at a significance level of less than .000. These two factors were also included as independent variables in the model.

A correlation matrix of these independent variables revealed only three significant relationships. The pre-placement interview variable was positively correlated with the variable related to remuneration for field work ($r=.3055$, $p<.000$) and ethnic identity ($r=.2048$, $p<.003$). Factor 1, Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics, was found to be negatively correlated with the pattern of supervision ($r=-.2165$, $p<.002$). In all instances, the correlation coefficients are low.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to examine the predictive value of these independent variables for each of the measures of student satisfaction. A review of Table 20 identifies six independent variables as predictive of one or more dependent variables. The variables related to field instructor relationship characteristics, learning assignment opportunities, and pre-placement interviews contributed to the prediction of all five satisfaction items. The variable related to field placement preference contributed to the prediction of satisfaction with learning, the field work program, and the field instructor. The variable related to

remuneration for field work and child welfare courses since beginning of field placement only contributed to the prediction of satisfaction with the child welfare agency.

Table 20

Stepwise Multiple Regressions In Analysis With Five Student Satisfaction Items As Dependent Variables And Ten Independent Variables

Independent

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Step</u> | <u>R²</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig.</u> |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|

Satisfaction With Learning

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------|-------|-------|
| Learning Assignment Opportunities | 1 | .23376 | 59.79 | .0000 |
| Field Instructor | 2 | .41726 | 69.81 | .0000 |
| Relationship Characteristics | | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | 3 | .47206 | 57.82 | .0000 |
| Placement First Choice | 4 | .49108 | 46.55 | .0000 |

Satisfaction With Field Work Program

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------|-------|-------|
| Placement First Choice | 1 | .12777 | 28.41 | .0000 |
| Field Instructor | 2 | .21735 | 26.79 | .0000 |
| Relationship Characteristics | | | | |
| Learning Assignment Opportunities | 3 | .28854 | 25.95 | .0000 |
| Pre-placement Interview | 4 | .31987 | 22.45 | .0000 |

Satisfaction With Field Instructor

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------|--------|-------|
| Field Instructor | 1 | .39773 | 129.43 | .0000 |
| Relationship Characteristics | | | | |
| Placement First Choice | 2 | .43637 | 75.48 | .0000 |
| Pre-placement Interview | 3 | .46191 | 55.51 | .0000 |
| Learning Assignment Opportunities | 4 | .47265 | 43.24 | .0000 |

Table 20 (continued)

Independent

| <u>Variable</u> | <u>Step</u> | <u>R²</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>Sig.</u> |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------|-------------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | |
| Learning Assignment Opportunities | 1 | .11550 | 25.59 | .0000 |
| Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics | 2 | .21976 | 27.46 | .0000 |
| Pre-placement Interview | 3 | .27836 | 24.94 | .0000 |
| Child Welfare Course Since Field Placement | 4 | .30475 | 21.14 | .0000 |
| Funding For Field | 5 | .31871 | 17.96 | .0000 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Overall Field Experience</u> | | | | |
| Learning Assignment Opportunities | 1 | .31412 | 89.76 | .0000 |
| Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics | 2 | .46507 | 84.76 | .0000 |
| Pre-placement Interview | 3 | .52776 | 72.27 | .0000 |

This model was better at predicting certain satisfaction items than others. This model was best at predicting satisfaction with the overall field experience, with 52.8% of the variance accounted for by the model. It was also good at predicting satisfaction with learning, explaining 49.1% of the variance, and satisfaction with the field instructor, contributing to 47.3% of the variance. This program model was least explanatory of satisfaction with the field work program and with the child welfare agency, accounting for approximately 32.0% of the variance for each.

A review of the independent variables that were found

to be predictive of the outcome measures, Factor 2, Learning Assignment Opportunities, was the most powerful predictor of three measures--satisfaction with learning (23.4%), satisfaction with the child welfare agency (11.6%), and satisfaction with the overall field experience (31.4%). Assessing the "Extent Explaining Satisfaction" items that comprise this factor, as well as the significance of two other independent variables--the number of field instructors and the number of program/service areas--to satisfaction, seems to underscore the importance of planning a diversity of relevant learning opportunities for students. This was the factor however, as reported in Chapter Seven, where there was significant differences between students and field instructors on the presence of six of the seven items. Collaboration between students and field instructors in planning learning assignments therefore appears crucial.

Factor 1, Field Instructor Relationship

Characteristics, was the most powerful predictor of satisfaction with the field instructor, contributing to 39.8% of the variance. This factor also contributed to the prediction of four other outcome measures--satisfaction with learning (18.35%), satisfaction with the field work program (8.9%), satisfaction with the child welfare agency (10.4%), and satisfaction with the overall field experience (15.1%). Field instructor relationship characteristics were prominent

in the factor analysis, with Factor 1 accounting for 25% of the variance. As schools and agencies seek to create satisfactory field experiences for students, this highlights the need to pay particular attention to the selection and training of field instructors. The latter is particularly important in view of the earlier finding of significant differences between students and field instructors on 11 of the 16 items that comprise this factor.

The independent variable related to the pre-placement interview also contributed to all five outcome measures, albeit to a lesser degree--satisfaction with learning (5.5%), satisfaction with the field work program (3.1%), satisfaction with the field instructor (2.6%), satisfaction with the agency (5.9%), and satisfaction with the overall field work experience (6.3%). The variable related to the placement being the student's first choice was the most powerful predictor of satisfaction with the field work program (12.7%), and also contributed to satisfaction with learning (1.9%) and satisfaction with the field instructor (3.9%). These two variables both relate to occurrences prior to placement and have implications for schools concerned about student satisfaction with field placement and the reprofessionalization movement.

Prediction Of Employment

As reported in Chapter Five, this study found a statistically significant relationship between each of the five student satisfaction measures and two of the non-scale items included in the questionnaire--acceptance of employment at the field placement agency if it were offered and recommendation of the field placement to other students. Logistic regression was used to examine these relationships further, with the five satisfaction items as independent variables and the two non-scale items as dichotomous dependent variables.

Examining the acceptance of employment and satisfaction, for this logistic regression model containing only the constant -2LL is 278.64, while -2LL for the model containing all the independent variables is 225.319. The Model Chi Square for this model is 53.321 and is statistically significant ($p < .000$) with 2 degrees of freedom. The Improvement Chi Square is 6.681 and is statistically significant ($p < .009$) with 1 degree of freedom. The Classification Table correctly classifies 50.25% of the cases with only the constant, and 67.66% of the cases with the model.

This model found two measures of student satisfaction significantly contributing to the prediction of acceptance of employment. Satisfaction with the child welfare agency

appeared to have the most influence on accepting employment ($R=-.3272$), with satisfaction with the overall field experience ($R=-.1779$) also contributing to this prediction. Other variables made smaller or no contributions to the model--satisfaction with learning ($R=.0423$), satisfaction with the field work program ($R=.0000$), and satisfaction with the field instructor ($R=.0000$).

Examining the recommendation of the field placement and satisfaction, for this logistic regression equation model containing only the constant -2LL is 149.308, while -2LL for the model containing all the independent variables is 128.889. The Model Chi Square for this model is 118.575 and is statistically significant ($p<.000$) with 2 degrees of freedom. The Improvement Chi Square is 20.419 and is statistically significant ($p<.000$) with 1 degree of freedom. The Classification Table correctly classifies 69.80% of the cases with only the constant, and 87.13% of the cases with the model.

This model found two measures of student satisfaction significantly contributing to the prediction of recommendation of field placement. Satisfaction with the field work program appeared to have the most influence on recommending a field placement ($R=-.4082$), with satisfaction with the overall field experience ($R=-.2395$) also contributing to this prediction. The other satisfaction

variables--satisfaction with learning ($R=.0000$), satisfaction with the field instructor ($R=.0000$), and satisfaction with the agency ($R=.0000$)--made no contributions to the model.

The variables found to be most predictive of employment acceptance and field placement recommendation in this study--satisfaction with the child welfare agency and satisfaction with the field work program--were the two satisfaction items least explained by our multiple regression models. As schools of social work and child welfare agencies continue to address reprofessionalization issues, research needs to focus on variables that contribute to satisfaction in these areas.

CHAPTER NINE

A COMPARISON OF FINDINGS ABOUT CHILD WELFARE AND HEALTH CARE STUDENTS IN FIELD WORK

The present study was based on a study conducted by Nancy Showers (1988) in New York City in the Spring of 1987. At that time there was a concern about rapid changes in hospital social work practice and its affect on the satisfaction of social work students in hospital field work programs. This chapter will present descriptive data contrasting the findings of these two studies.

A Comparison Of Methodology

Showers (1988) developed two questionnaires--a Hospital Field Work Coordinator Questionnaire and a Graduate Social Work Student Satisfaction Questionnaire--to gather descriptive information and satisfaction data from these two groups of respondents. The same format was used for this study, adapting the questionnaires for use in child welfare, for both undergraduate and graduate students, and for field instructors as opposed to field coordinators.

Both studies were conducted during the Spring semester when students were completing field placement. Both researchers were part of a field consortium which made the study possible, contributing listings of field placement sites.

All of Showers' field placement sites were in New York

City and she was able to speak with the hospital field work coordinators by phone and/or in person prior to the distribution of the survey materials. For this study, child welfare field placement sites around the entire state of Florida were used and therefore there was not similar contact with field instructors. There was, however, phone and in-person contact with the Field Directors at each of the cooperating schools of social work, as described in Chapter Three.

For both studies, questionnaires were distributed in a variety of ways, depending on the preferences of the hospital field work coordinators or the school field directors. In both studies, some questionnaires were distributed to students through the mail and some through agency representatives. Showers (1988) administered some questionnaires to students on site, while some field education directors in this study distributed questionnaires to students as part of the integrative field education seminar. All hospital field work coordinators and child welfare field instructors received their questionnaires through the mail.

In both instances, follow-up was conducted through the hospital field work coordinators and the child welfare field instructors. A raffle to encourage response was only used in the current study. Showers' response rate (100% for

coordinators; 85% for students) was higher than for the current study (59% for field instructors; 58.6% for students).

A Comparison Of Respondents

The hospital field work coordinators and students in Showers' (1988) study were all in hospitals in New York City. The students represented eight different schools, six of which were in New York, seven of which were accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, and six of which were affiliated with private universities. In contrast, the child welfare field instructors and students in the current study were in child welfare field placements throughout the state of Florida. The students represented seven different schools, all of which were in Florida and accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. All but one of these schools was affiliated with a public university.

The Students

Demographic data was collected on both groups of students. As can be seen in Table 21, these students appear to have similar distributions in respect to age and gender. The child welfare respondents, however, are more likely to be ethnically diverse, to be employed outside of field, and to have had prior experience in child welfare.

Table 21

A Comparison Of Student Demographics: Personal Characteristics

| | Hospital (n=238) | Child Welfare (n=206) |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Age | | |
| 20-29 years | 119 (50.0%) | 106 (52.0%) |
| 30-39 years | 72 (30.3%) | 50 (24.2%) |
| 40-49 years | 38 (16.0%) | 41 (19.9%) |
| 50 years and over | 8 (3.4%) | 7 (3.5%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 46 (19.3%) | 28 (13.6%) |
| Female | 191 (80.3%) | 176 (85.4%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| Ethnicity | | |
| White/Caucasian | 201 (84.5%) | 142 (68.9%) |
| African-American/Black | 13 (5.5%) | 29 (14.1%) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 13 (5.5%) | 22 (10.7%) |
| Asian | 9 (3.8%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| American Indian | | 2 (1.0%) |
| Middle Eastern | 1 (.4%) | |
| Other | | 6 (3.0%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 3 (1.5%) |
| Outside Employment | | |
| Not Employed | 167 (70.2%) | 99 (48.1%) |
| Employed | 62 (26.0%) | 106 (51.5%) |
| No Response | 9 (3.8%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Prior Hospital/Child Welfare Employment | | |
| None | 180 (75.6%) | 110 (53.4%) |
| Less than 1 year | 18 (7.6%) | 17 (8.3%) |
| 1-3 years | 20 (8.4%) | 35 (17.0%) |
| More than 3 years | 20 (8.4%) | 43 (20.9%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.5%) |

Educational Characteristics

Information on the educational experiences of these students was also collected. As can be discerned in Table 22, these respondents appear to be the most similar in the number of faculty field liaison visits. The child welfare students appear to be spending more hours in field weekly and were more likely to have taken child welfare courses previously, had a prior field placement, and be in a placement that was their first choice. The hospital field students were more likely to be taking a course concurrent with field and were more likely to have received some funding for their field experience.

The students from Showers' (1988) study were all completing placement in a hospital setting--a medical, a psychiatric, or a general hospital. The students in this study were completing their placements in a diversity of child welfare settings, as described in Chapter Five.

Table 22

A Comparison Of Student Demographics: Educational Characteristics

| | Hospital (n=238) | Child Welfare (n=206) |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Educational Level | | |
| BSW | | 71 (34.5%) |
| MSW | 237 (99.6%) | 134 (65.1%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Hours Per Week In Field | | |
| Less than 21 hours | 14 (5.9%) | 20 (9.9%) |
| 21-24 hours | 190 (79.8%) | 60 (29.1%) |
| More than 24 hours | 34 (14.3%) | 123 (59.8%) |
| No Response | | 3 (1.5%) |
| Course Enrollment | | |
| None | 7 (2.9%) | 22 (10.7%) |
| 1-2 courses | 18 (7.6%) | 103 (50.0%) |
| 3-4 courses | 179 (75.2%) | 71 (34.4%) |
| More than 4 courses | 32 (13.4%) | 8 (3.9%) |
| No Response | 2 (.8%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| Previous Field Placement | | |
| Yes | 75 (31.6%) | 99 (48.1%) |
| No | 162 (68.1%) | 106 (51.5%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Health Care/Child Welfare Courses Taken Previously | | |
| None | 122 (51.3%) | 50 (24.3%) |
| 1 course | 29 (12.2%) | 28 (13.6%) |
| 2 courses | 30 (12.6%) | 35 (17.0%) |
| 3 courses | 15 (6.3%) | 27 (13.1%) |
| 4 courses | 14 (5.9%) | 15 (7.3%) |
| More than 4 courses | 28 (11.8%) | 50 (24.3%) |
| No Response | | 1 (.5%) |

Table 22 (continued)

| | Hospital (n=238) | Child Welfare (n=206) |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Health Care/Child Welfare Courses Taken Concurrently | | |
| None | 57 (24.0%) | 109 (52.9%) |
| 1 course | 33 (13.9%) | 56 (27.2%) |
| 2 courses | 49 (20.6%) | 21 (10.2%) |
| 3 courses | 37 (15.5%) | 10 (4.9%) |
| 4 courses | 30 (12.6%) | 4 (1.9%) |
| More than 4 courses | 32 (13.4%) | 4 (1.9%) |
| No Response | | 2 (1.0%) |
| Remuneration For Field Work | | |
| None | 123 (51.7%) | 151 (73.3%) |
| State or Federal Grant | 44 (18.5%) | 7 (3.4%) |
| School of Social Work | 39 (16.4%) | 2 (1.0%) |
| Stipend from Hospital/ Agency | 14 (5.9%) | 15 (7.3%) |
| Agency Salary | 2 (.8%) | 18 (8.8%) |
| Tuition Reimbursement From Employer | | 6 (2.9%) |
| Combination Of Sources | 12 (5.0%) | 7 (3.4%) |
| No Response | 4 (1.6%) | |
| Placement Preference | | |
| First Choice | 114 (48.0%) | 131 (63.6%) |
| Second Choice | 29 (12.2%) | 29 (14.1%) |
| Third Choice | 15 (6.3%) | 8 (3.9%) |
| Not One of Top 3 | 79 (33.2%) | 19 (9.2%) |
| No Choice | | 18 (8.7%) |
| No Response | 1 (.4%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Faculty Field Liaison Visits | | |
| None | 64 (26.9%) | 49 (23.9%) |
| One | 120 (50.4%) | 117 (56.8%) |
| Two | 41 (17.2%) | 28 (13.6%) |
| Three | 7 (2.9%) | 1 (.5%) |
| More than three | 3 (1.3%) | 10 (4.9%) |
| No Response | 3 (1.3%) | 1 (.5%) |

A Comparison Of Student Satisfaction

Satisfaction Scale Items

Each group of students was asked to rate their satisfaction with five different areas of field education. As can be seen in Table 23, the satisfaction levels of students with field learning, the field work program, the field instructors and the overall field work experience are similar. The greatest percentage and mean difference between the groups was in the area of satisfaction with the hospital/child welfare agency, with the health care students less satisfied with their field placement organization. For

Table 23

A Comparison Of Hospital And Child Welfare Student Satisfaction Items

| | VD | D | N | S | VS | MEAN |
|---|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 1=Very Dissatisfied | | | | | | |
| 2=Dissatisfied | | | | | | |
| 3=Neither Satisfied Or Dissatisfied | | | | | | |
| 4=Satisfied | | | | | | |
| 5=Very Satisfied | | | | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Learning</u> | | | | | | |
| Hospital (n=236) | 1.7% | 3.8% | 8.5% | 45.8% | 40.3% | 4.19 |
| Child Welfare (n=205) | 1.5% | 10.7% | 5.8% | 41.3% | 40.3% | 4.09 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | | | |
| Hospital (n=237) | 3.0% | 10.1% | 12.7% | 50.2% | 24.1% | 3.82 |
| Child Welfare (n=203) | 2.9% | 9.7% | 10.7% | 47.6% | 27.7% | 3.89 |

Table 23 (continued)

| | VD | D | N | S | VS | MEAN |
|--|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Instructors</u> | | | | | | |
| Hospital (n=235) | 3.8% | 13.2% | 6.8% | 32.8% | 43.4% | 3.99 |
| Child Welfare (n=205) | 2.9% | 7.8% | 9.2% | 34.0% | 45.6% | 4.12 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Hospital/Agency</u> | | | | | | |
| Hospital (n=237) | 7.6% | 12.7% | 23.2% | 46.8% | 9.7% | 3.38 |
| Child Welfare (n=204) | 4.4% | 7.8% | 14.6% | 39.3% | 33.0% | 3.90 |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Experience</u> | | | | | | |
| Hospital (n=236) | 1.3% | 8.9% | 9.7% | 47.9% | 32.2% | 4.01 |
| Child Welfare (n=205) | 1.9% | 7.8% | 9.2% | 42.2% | 38.3% | 4.08 |

students in both hospital and child welfare placements, all the satisfaction scale items were inter-correlated at the .0000 level of significance.

Non-Scale Items

Both groups of students were asked three questions relating to employment and field placement recommendation. The data in Table 24 indicate that both groups are similar in expecting they would be offered a job and in recommending their placement to other students. The hospital field work students were less likely, however, to accept a job. The relationship between accepting a job and recommending a placement and the five satisfaction scale items was statistically significant in both studies. The relationship

between expecting to be offered a job and satisfaction with learning ($p < .004$), satisfaction with field instructors ($p < .000$), and satisfaction with the overall field experience ($p < .000$) was significant in the Showers' (1988) study. For the current study, this question was not significantly related to any area of student satisfaction.

Table 24

A Comparison Of Hospital And Child Welfare Student Responses On Three Non-Scale Items

| | Hospital (n=238) | Child Welfare (n=206) |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Would accept a job | | |
| Yes | 93 (39.1%) | 103 (50.0%) |
| No | 61 (25.6%) | 51 (24.8%) |
| Don't Know | 81 (34.0%) | 29 (14.1%) |
| Only If Desperate | | 12 (5.8%) |
| Already Employed By | | 10 (4.9%) |
| No Response | 3 (1.3%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Would be offered a job | | |
| Yes | 188 (79.0%) | 160 (77.7%) |
| No | 26 (10.9%) | 42 (20.4%) |
| Don't Know | | 3 (1.5%) |
| No Response | 24 (10.1%) | 1 (.5%) |
| Would recommend field placement | | |
| Yes | 164 (68.9%) | 143 (69.4%) |
| No | 36 (15.1%) | 42 (20.4%) |
| Don't Know | 36 (15.1%) | 19 (9.2%) |
| No Response | 2 (.8%) | 2 (1.0%) |

Independent Variables

Both Showers' (1988) study and this study were concerned with identifying those independent variables that were significantly related to student satisfaction. In both instances, this was part of an effort to enhance field placements and increase the likelihood of eventual employment in the respective areas of social work practice. Showers (1988) identified 16 demographic and educational variables that were significantly related to at least one area of student satisfaction. The present study identified ten such variables. Four variables--having a pre-placement interview, being in a placement that was their first choice, having more than one field instructor, and being assigned to more than one service area--were each significantly related to at least one area of student satisfaction for both studies.

Extent Explaining Satisfaction Items

Both groups of students were asked to evaluate the presence of different field education variables. Of the 50 variables presented to the hospital students, they perceived 35 of them to be present in "just the right" amount. Of the 59 items presented to the child welfare students, they perceived 51 of them to be present in "just the right" amount. The greatest percentage of both groups rated fairness in evaluation of performance as "Just Right" (81.0%

vs 91.1%).

While both groups perceived the rules and red tape in their respective organizations to be "Too Much" (64% vs 58%), there was less agreement about the presence of stress (58% vs 35.9%). Students in both hospital placements and child welfare placements would prefer more opportunity to watch their field instructors work (62% vs 51%) and to participate in decision making regarding policies and procedures related to students (67% vs 48.9%). The child welfare students were decidedly more interested in more group seminars (18% vs 57.3%).

Both researchers conducted a factor analysis of these variables in an effort to better conceptualize items that affect student satisfaction. Showers' (1988) factor analysis resulted in 14 factors accounting for 65.6% of the total variance. The process in the present study resulted in 16 factors accounting for 70.3% of the variance. Many of the factors were similar with two--Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics and Learning Assignment Opportunities--accounting for most of the variance in student satisfaction in both studies.

Predictors Of Student Satisfaction

Both studies used stepwise multiple regression with independent variables that had been found to be significantly related to the dependent variables of student

satisfaction. Three independent variables--Learning Assignment Opportunities, Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics, and placement as first choice--contributed to the prediction of at least one measure of student satisfaction for both studies.

A Comparison Of Differences With Field Instructors

The findings of both studies were similar in that both the hospital field work coordinators and the child welfare field instructors were more satisfied in all areas than were their students. In the four areas where they were each evaluated, the group rate differences for hospital and child welfare respondents are as follows: satisfaction with learning (2.8% vs 9.9%); satisfaction with field work program (18.3% vs 9.5%); satisfaction with field instructors (20.1% vs 12.4%); and satisfaction with hospital/agency (3.1% vs 17.0%).

These studies were similar in that the correlation among the satisfaction scale items was better for the students than the other respondents. For the hospital field work coordinators, only satisfaction between the field work program and the agency was statistically significant ($p < .000$). For the current study, satisfaction with the field work program and field instructor was positively correlated ($p < .000$). In addition, satisfaction with the agency and the overall field work experience was significantly correlated

($p < .004$) with all the other items of the satisfaction scale.

Just as the hospital field work coordinators and child welfare field instructors were more satisfied, they also perceived more field education variables to be present in just the right amount. The students and field instructors in both these studies agreed that there was just the right amount of involvement of students in the evaluation of their own performance, too many rules, administrative details and red tape, and too little contribution of students to decision making on student policies and procedures and too little opportunity for students to watch their field instructors work.

CHAPTER TEN

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted during the 1994-1995 academic year. Seven social work education programs in the state of Florida, all accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, participated in this study. Graduate and undergraduate social work students in child welfare field placements, and their field instructors, were surveyed during the Spring 1995 semester to assess their satisfaction with field placements in this area and the relationship of this satisfaction to employment interests and field placement recommendations.

An earlier study (Showers, 1988) was concerned about these same issues with social work students in hospital field placement settings. A framework was developed by Showers (1988) to study graduate social work field placements in hospitals during the 1986-1987 academic year. This framework was used for the current study. Questionnaires were adapted for the field of child welfare and to address both graduate and undergraduate students.

Both the profession of social work (Harris, 1988) and social work education (University of Southern Maine, 1987) have been part of a nationwide movement to reprofessionalize child welfare. It was reasoned that findings from this study could help child welfare agencies in their efforts to

recruit and retain (Helfgott, 1991) professional social workers. It was also anticipated that findings would assist child welfare agencies and social work education programs as they work together to shape field work programs that meet desired educational outcomes, are evaluated as satisfactory by the schools, the field instructors and the students, and that may positively contribute to the reprofessionalization effort.

This chapter summarizes findings about child welfare field placements, levels of student satisfaction, and variables associated with different measures of student satisfaction. Findings in this study will be contrasted with selected findings from other studies. The implications of this study are examined in relation to the reprofessionalization efforts of child welfare agencies and social work education programs, and the direction of future research in this area.

Child Welfare Field Placements In Florida

In 1991, a "Memorandum of Agreement" was signed by the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, the nine member universities of the Florida Association of Social Work Education Administrators, and the Florida Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (Greenfield, Gilman, & Kazmerski, 1992). This partnership agreement focused on the need to reprofessionalize public

social services. Four of the seven social work education programs who responded to this survey indicated that their school was indeed involved in special activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare. Close to half (46.75%) of the field placements in Florida for the Spring 1995 semester were identified as child welfare field placements; although the percentage of BSW and MSW students in such placements varied widely--from a low of 20.7% at one school to a high of 71.5% at another school.

From the responses to this survey it appears that child welfare field placements in Florida during the Spring 1995 semester were in public, voluntary, and private agencies, representing a wide diversity of program areas. BSW students appeared more likely to be placed in public agencies involved in child protective services, while MSW students were more likely to be in a voluntary or private agency engaged in individual and family counseling.

Both baccalaureate and master's students were involved in a variety of social work practice methods. More BSW students reported being engaged in work with communities and more MSW students reported working with families and groups. All students were involved in a diversity of field work activities, with BSW students spending a greater portion of their time doing paperwork and home visits and MSW students spending a greater portion of their time in agency-based

contact with clients.

Social work educators have long sought to define the BSW-MSW continuum (Hartman, 1983; Hollis & Taylor, 1951). Dinerman (1982) examined BSW and MSW program curricula and found discontinuity rather than a nonredundant continuum. Kolvezon and Biggerstaff (1983) surveyed BA, BSW and MSW workers and found the functional differentiation of job demands to be nonexistent. Instead of a continuum, Raymond and Atherton (1991) suggested that the two programs be conceived as separate entities:

The baccalaureate degree should focus on the training of case managers in public service agencies. The master's degree should prepare graduates with specific skills and knowledge that represent genuinely advanced practice.

(p.297)

The findings from this study appear to more closely resemble the latter model. Future research needs to more closely examine the roles and functions of BSW and MSW students and employees in child welfare. This information is important for social work education programs who are attempting to adequately prepare students for practice and to child welfare agencies who need to hire employees appropriate to different roles and functions.

Levels of Social Work Student Satisfaction

In 1979 Raskin (1982) found that 65% to 75% of BSW students in the state of Virginia were satisfied with their field placements. Fortune et al.'s (1985) study of MSW students at one university found 71% to 81% were satisfied with their field placements. Showers' (1988) study of graduate students in hospital field placements found 56% to 86% of them to be satisfied with different areas of their field placement. The majority of social work students responding to this survey were also generally satisfied with their field placements--ranging from a high of 81.6% for satisfaction with learning, to a low of 72.3% for satisfaction with the child welfare agency.

Showers (1988) noted that her respondents commented on the "organizational turmoil, political climate, and other organization environmental factors" (p.218), and suggested these items be included in future studies. These items were added to this study and a good proportion of these child welfare students did perceive the political turmoil (62.7%), the administrative details (58.0%) and the organizational changes (39.1%) to be "too much" present, and attention to the organizational environment (45.3%) to be "too little" present. While these items were part of two factors dealing with the organizational environment and organizational characteristics, they contributed to only a small proportion

of the variance (4.9%) in explaining satisfaction.

Predictors Of Student Satisfaction

Raskin (1989) found that a variable named New Learning--the actual achievement of field work objectives--was "strongly and positively associated with student satisfaction" (p.329), and was the largest contributor to variance in the dependent variable (59.3%). Fortune et al. (1985) found that the Relevant Learning Scale was one of two factors "most highly correlated with satisfaction with field work" (p.101). Fortune and Abramson (1993) found that most aspects of the structure of the learning experience and many types of learning activities were associated with satisfaction. Kissman and Van Tran (1990) found that "goal attainment, adequacy of case assignments, and students' perceived application of field placement experiences to future social work practice" (p.29) were significantly related to overall satisfaction with field placements. Showers (1988) found learning assignment opportunities to be predictive of student satisfaction with learning, field work program, hospital, and the overall field experience. Thus the findings of the current study, with learning assignment opportunities predictive of all measures of student satisfaction, are consistent with earlier findings.

A review of the items included in this factor reveal that students want to be involved in a variety of

assignments, in a diversity of areas, and with the chance to make use of their skills and abilities in a number of different practice methods. They want their field practice assignments to be relevant to their goals and future practice activities--and they want to be involved in the selection of these learning experiences. Fortune et al. (1985) noted that:

Social work educators often assert but seldom test the importance of relevant learning and student involvement in designing practicum experiences.

(p. 101)

Relevant learning assignments appear to play a major role in satisfaction with field placements. Schools of social work and child welfare field instructors need to work collaboratively with students in designing satisfactory learning experiences.

The importance of the field instructor and the supervisory relationship have also been found to be positively correlated with student satisfaction in a number of studies. Raskin (1982) found that supervisory factors accounted for 13.7 % of the variance in satisfaction. Fortune et al.'s (1985) Supervision Scale was one of two factors most highly correlated with field work satisfaction. Fortune and Abramson (1993) found that satisfaction with the

field experience was greater if the Quality of Field Instruction was better. Showers (1988) found that Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics were most predictive of satisfaction with the field instructor and was correlated with all measures of student satisfaction. The results of the current study are consistent with these results, with Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics contributing to the prediction of all measures of student satisfaction and correlated with all measures as well.

In addition to wanting more than one field instructor, the respondents to this study appear to see a field instructor in a diversity of roles. A review of the items comprising the Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics factor, seems to indicate that the students want the field instructor to serve as teacher, supervisor, and mentor. These multidimensional expectations have been identified before (Gray, Alperin, & Wik, 1989), and need to be considered in the selection and training of new field instructors. This may be particularly important in the field of child welfare as these respondents were supervising a number of students, in a number of different service areas, while also primarily being responsible for direct practice, supervision, or administration.

Raskin (1982) found no correlation between student satisfaction and preference for a type of agency. Showers

(1988) found field placement preference to contribute to the prediction of satisfaction with the field instructor. The current study, however, found field placement preference to contribute to the prediction of satisfaction with learning, the field work program, and the field instructor. The current study also found the pre-placement interview to contribute to the prediction of all measures of student satisfaction.

Items related to placement preference and personal contact with the agency prior to placement need to be included in future studies of student satisfaction with field work. If results in these areas are replicated, they may have implications for social work education programs and child welfare agencies. They may be reflective of adult learning principles (Davenport & Davenport, 1988; Hersh, 1984) and the need for Field Directors and field instructors to center learning around student-identified issues and goals. They may also indicate that students come to the field placement process with clear preferences. Exposure to opportunities in child welfare prior to placement would then become particularly important to the reprofessionalization movement.

Student Satisfaction And Employment

The results of this study are consistent with the findings of Showers (1988)--student satisfaction in field

placement was significantly related to the acceptance of employment, if offered, and the recommendation of the field placement to other students. As to the latter, 69% of the respondents to this study and Showers' (1988) study indicated they would recommend their field placement to others; while 86% of Raskin's (1982) respondents so indicated. Showers (1988) found it "encouraging" (p.122) that 39% of her respondents would accept employment. In the current study, 50% of the respondents indicated they would accept employment. Sixty percent of Raskin's (1982) BSW students in Virginia indicated they would accept employment at their field placement agency.

For the current study, satisfaction with the child welfare agency was found to be the greatest contributor to the prediction of accepting employment. It was also the area where a smaller percentage of students were satisfied and which was least explained by the multiple regression model. Of those students who indicated that they would not accept employment at the agency, 63.5% indicated that they were interested in pursuing a career in child welfare but at a different agency. Future research needs to focus more closely on the child welfare agency as a field placement site and identify the organizational variables that may contribute to student satisfaction with field placement and acceptance of employment.

REFERENCES

Albers, E., Reilly, T., & Rittner, B. (1993). Children in foster care: Possible factors affecting permanency planning. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 10(4), 329-341.

Alperin, D., & Griffith, M.E. (1995, January). Partnerships for child welfare newsletter. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University.

American Humane Association. (1986). Professionalism, take a stand #3 (Policy Statement). Denver, CO: Author.

Attinson, Z., & Glassberg, E. (1983). After graduation, what? Employment and educational experiences of graduates of BSW programs. Journal of Education for Social Work, 19(1), 5-13.

Baer, B., & McLean, A. (1994). A report: Child welfare curriculum in accredited BSW programs. Green Bay: University of Wisconsin Social Work Program.

Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc. (1987). The Maryland social work services job analysis and personnel qualifications study. Prepared for the Department of Human Resources, State of Maryland, Baltimore: MD.

Brennen, E., & Arkava, M. (1974). Students view the undergraduate curriculum. Journal of Education for Social Work, 10(3), 9-16.

Briar, K., Harris, N., & Alperin, D. (1992-1994). Partnership Newsletter. Miami: Florida International

University.

Briar,K., Harris,N., & Alperin,D. (1993). Partnership profile: Baseline information from a survey revealing partnership activity between schools and departments of social work and public child welfare agencies. Miami: Florida International University.

Briar,S. (1990). Empiricism in clinical practice: Present and future. In L.Videka-Sherman & W.Reid (Eds.), Advances in clinical social work research (pp.1-7). Silver Spring,MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Buttrick,S. (1992). Failed policies--the crisis in child welfare. Social Work Research & Abstracts, 28(1), 3-4.

Cenziper,D. (1995, April 9). HRS' protective supervision often neither. The Sun-Sentinel, pp. G1, G2.

Child Welfare League of America. (1984). Standards for organizations and administration for all child welfare services. Washington, DC: Author.

Cimino,D., Cimino,E., Nuehring,E., Raybin,L., & Wisler-Waldock,B. (1982). Student satisfaction with field work. Contemporary Social Work Education, 5(1), 68-75.

Commission on Accreditation. (1991). Handbook of accreditation standards and procedures. Alexandria,VA: Council on Social Work Education.

Costin,L., Bell,C., & Downs,S. (1991). Child welfare: Policies and Practice. New York: Longman.

Curtis,P. (1994). 1993 salary study. Washington,DC:
Child Welfare League of America.

Davenport,J., & Davenport,J. (1988). Individualizing student supervision: The use of andragogical-pedagogical orientation questionnaires. Journal Of Teaching In Social Work, 2(2), 83-97.

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services District IX. (1994,June). Annual report July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1994. Palm Beach County,FL: Author.

Dhooper,S., Royce,D., & Wolfe,L. (1990). Does social work education make a difference? Social Work, 35(1), 57-61.

Dinerman,M. (1982). A study of baccalaureate and master's curricula in social work. Journal of Education for Social Work, 18(2), 84-92.

Esposito,G., & Fine,M. (1985). The field of child welfare as a world of work. In J.Laird & A.Hartman (Eds.), A handbook of child welfare (pp.727-740). New York: Free Press.

Fortune,A., & Abramson,J. (1993). Predictors of satisfaction with field practicum among social work students. The Clinical Supervisor, 11(1), 95-110.

Fortune,A., Feathers,C., Rook,S., Scrimenti,R., Smollen,P., Stemerman,B., & Tucker,E. (1985). Student satisfaction with field placement. Journal of Social Work Education, 21(3), 92-104.

George,A. (1982). A history of social work field

instruction: Apprenticeship to instruction. In B.Sheafor & L.Jenkins (Eds.), Quality field instruction in social work (pp.37-59). New York: Longman.

Goldberg,T., & Lamont,A. (1989). Curriculum change as viewed by students: A three year study. Journal of Social Work Education, 25(2), 150-159.

Gomez,M., & Harris,N. (1992). Child welfare curriculum survey. In K.Briar, V.Hansen, & N.Harris (Eds.), New partnerships: Proceedings from the National Public Child Welfare Training Symposium 1991 (pp.45-51). Miami: Florida International University.

Gordon,W., & Gordon,M. (1982). The role of frame of reference in field instruction. In B.Sheafor & L.Jenkins (Eds.), Quality field instruction in social work (pp.21-36). New York: Longman.

Gray,S., Alperin,D., & Wik,R. (1989). Multidimensional expectations of student supervision in social work. The Clinical Supervisor, 7(1), 89-102.

Greenfield,W., Gilman,E., & Kazmerski,K. (1992). Florida's statewide model of collaboration. In K.Briar, V.Hansen, & N.Harris (Eds.), New partnerships: Proceedings from the National Public Child Welfare Training Symposium 1991 (pp.73-80). Miami: Florida International University.

Harris,D. (1988). Renewing our commitment to child welfare. Social Work, 33(6), 483-484.

Harris,N. (1992-1993). An exploratory survey regarding partnerships between schools/departments of social work and public sector/public child welfare agencies. In Research internship reports by PhD students in social welfare. Miami: Florida International University.

Hartman,A. (1983). Concentrations, specializations, and curriculum design in MSW and BSW programs. Journal of Education for Social Work, 19(2), 16-25.

Helfgott,K. (1991). Staffing the child welfare agency: Recruitment and retention. Washington,DC: Child Welfare League of America.

Hersh,A. (1984). Teaching the theory and practice of student supervision: A short-term model based on principles of adult education. The Clinical Supervisor, 2(1), 29-44.

Hollis,E., & Taylor,A. (1951). Social work education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hopps,J., & Pinderhughes,E. (1987). Profession of social work: Contemporary characteristics. in A.Minahan (Ed.), Encyclopedia of social work (pp.351-365). Silver Spring,MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Hughes,E., Thorne,B., DeBaggis,A., Gurin,A., & Williams,D. (1973). Education for the professions of medicine, law, theology, and social welfare. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jenkins,L., & Sheafor,B. (1982). An overview of social work field instruction. In B.Sheafor & L.Jenkins (Eds.),

Quality field instruction in social work (pp.3-20). New York: Longman.

Johnson,H. (1982). Undergraduate social work education in one state: Issues and implications. Child Welfare, 61(3), 131-141.

Judah,E. (1976). Acculturation to the social work profession in baccalaureate social work education. Journal of Education for Social Work, 12(3), 65-71.

Judah,E. (1979). Values: The uncertain component in social work. Journal of Education for Social Work, 15(2), 79-86.

Kadushin,A. (1987). Child welfare services. In A.Minahan (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Social Work (pp.265-275). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Kadushin,A. (1991). Field education in social work: Contemporary issues and trends. In D.Schneck, B.Grossman, & U.Glassman (Eds.), Field education in social work (pp.11-12). Dubuque, IA:Kendall/Hunt.

Kaplan-Vinokur,D., Gray,S., & Saalberg,E. (1981). National follow-up study: Child welfare trainees. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan School of Social Work.

Kissman,K., & Van Tran,T. (1990). Perceived quality of field placement education among graduate social work students. Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 5(2), 27-31.

Kolvezon,M., & Biggerstaff,M. (1983). Functional

differentiation of job demands: Dilemmas confronting the continuum in social work education. Journal of Education for Social Work, 19(2), 26-34.

Kravitz, S. (1992). Professional social work education and public child welfare. In K. Briar, V. Hansen, & N. Harris (Eds.), New partnerships: Proceedings from the National Public Child Welfare Training Symposium 1991 (pp. 25-36). Miami: Florida International University.

Land, H. (1987). The effects of licensure on student motivation and career choice. Social Work, 32(1), 75-77.

Land, H. (1988). The impact of licensing on social work practice: Values, ethics, and choices. Journal of Independent Social Work, 2(4), 87-96.

Lennon, T. (1994). Statistics on social work education in the United States: 1993. Alexandria, VA: Council on Social Work Education.

Lieberman, A., Hornby, H., & Russell, M. (1988). Analyzing the educational backgrounds and work experiences of child welfare personnel: A national study. Social Work, 33(6), 485-489.

Liederman, D. (1991). Preface. In K. Helfgott, Staffing the child welfare agency: Recruitment and retention (pp. v-vii). Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.

Mahler, R. (1982). Baccalaureate social work graduates: Reflections on employment, professional identification, and

educational preparedness. Journal of Education for Social Work, 18(1), 80-85.

Maier,H. (1981). Chance favors the prepared mind. Contemporary Social Work Education, 4(1), 14-20.

Meenaghan,T., & Molnar,J. (1982). Assessing competency in a specialized program. Journal of Education for Social Work, 18(2), 103-110.

Millar,K. (1986). Declassification of professional social workers: A personnel issue facing the human services. Administration in Social Work, 19(4), 15-21.

Murphy,S. (1992). New partnerships. In K.Briar, V.Hansen, & N.Harris (Eds.), New partnerships: Proceedings from the National Public Child Welfare Training Symposium (pp. 11-15). Miami: Florida International University.

National Association of Social Workers. (1991). Public child welfare. In Social work speaks: NASW policy statements. Silver Spring,MD: Author.

National Commission on Child Welfare and Family Preservation. (1990). Factbook on public child welfare services and staff. Washington,DC: American Public Welfare Association.

Neikrug,S. (1978). Approaches to social work practice: Values of students, faculty, and field advisers. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 14(2), 36-43.

Olsen,L., & Holmes,W. (1982). Educating child welfare

workers: The effects of professional training on service delivery. Journal of Education for Social Work, 18(1), 94-102.

Pecora, P., & Austin, M. (1983). Declassification of social service jobs: Issues and strategies. Social Work, 28(6), 421-426.

Pecora, P., Briar, K., & Zlotnik, J. (1989). Addressing the program and personnel crisis in child welfare. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Radin, N. (1976). A follow-up study of social work graduates. Journal of Education for Social Work, 12(3), 103-107.

Raskin, M. (1982). Factors associated with student satisfaction in undergraduate social work field placements. Arete, 7(1), 44-54.

Raskin, M. (1989). Introduction. In M. Raskin (Ed.), Empirical studies in field instruction (pp.1-8). New York: Haworth.

Raskin, M. (1989). Factors associated with student satisfaction in undergraduate social work field placements. In M. Raskin (Ed.), Empirical studies in field instruction (p.321-335). New York: Haworth Press.

Raymond, G., & Atherton, C. (1991). Blue smoke and mirrors: The continuum in social work education. Journal of Social Work Education, 27(3), 297-304.

Richman, J., & Rosenfeld, L. (1988). Advanced standing

versus regular two-year MSW graduates: Program evaluation and employment history. Journal of Social Work Education, 24(1), 13-19.

Roberts,R. (1973). An interim report on the development of an undergraduate, graduate continuum of social work education in a private university. Journal of Education for Social Work, 9(3), 58-64.

Rodgers,A., & Williams,E. (1977). Field instruction and evaluation: Some continuing and some new issues. Arete, 4(4), 225-234.

Rome,S. (1994). Choosing child welfare: An analysis of social work students' career choices. Washington,DC: National Association of Social Workers.

Rubin,A., Johnson,P., & DeWeaver,K. (1986). Direct practice interests of MSW students: Changes from entry to graduation. Journal of Social Work Education, 22(2), 98-108.

Samantrai,K. (1992). Factors in the decision to leave: Retaining social workers with MSWs in public child welfare. Social Work, 37(5), 454-458.

Schlesinger,E. (1976). Graduate social work education: Impact on social change and behavioral science orientation. Journal of Education for Social Work, 12(1), 113-120.

Showers,N. (1988). Factors associated with graduate social work student satisfaction in hospital field education programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University

of New York.

Showers,N. (1990). Hospital graduate social work field programs: A study in New York City. Health and Social Work, 15(1), 55-63.

Shyne,A., & Schroeder,A. (1978). National study of social services to children and their families: Overview. U.S. Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington,DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Siegel,M. (1978). Social policy specialization in social work education: A survey of graduates. Journal of Education for Social Work, 14(3), 114-119.

Thyer,B., & Biggerstaff,M. (1989. Social work credentialing and legal regulation. Springfield,ILL: C.C. Thomas.

Tolson,E., & Kopp,J. (1988). The practicum: Clients, problems, interventions, influences on student practice. Journal of Education for Social Work, 24, 123-134.

University of Southern Maine. (1987). Professional social work practice in public child welfare: An agenda for action. Portland: Author.

Vinokur-Kaplan,D. (1987). Where did they go? A national follow-up of child welfare trainees. Child Welfare, 66(5), 411-420.

Vinokur-Kaplan,D., & Hartman,A. (1986). A national profile of child welfare workers and supervisors. Child

Welfare, 65(4), 323-335.

Wagner, D. (1989). Fate of idealism in social work: Alternative experiences of professional careers. Social Work, 34(5), 389-395.

York, P., Denton, R., & Moran, J. (1990). Congruence between specialization in graduate school and post-graduate employment patterns for social workers. Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 4(1), 3-15.

APPENDIX

Field Placements In Child Welfare:
A Preliminary Proposal

1. _____ : (Please check one)
name of university

_____ WILL BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY ON
FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

_____ WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY ON
FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

2. In January 1995, please send your SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE to the following field educators at our university:

3. Our social work education program prefers to provide you information about child welfare field instructors and their students in the following way: (Please check one)

_____ WE WILL SEND YOU THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF OUR CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTORS AND THE NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS THEY ARE SUPERVISING IN PLACEMENT

_____ WE WILL SEND YOU THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF OUR CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTORS MATCHED WITH THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF THE STUDENTS THEY ARE SUPERVISING IN PLACEMENT

_____ WE WILL SEND YOU THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF OUR CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTORS AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS THEY ARE SUPERVISING IN PLACEMENT; PLEASE SEND THE SOCIAL WORK STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES TO THE FIELD EDUCATORS LISTED BELOW. THEY WILL DISTRIBUTE AND COLLECT THESE QUESTIONNAIRES THROUGH

OUR INTEGRATIVE FIELD SEMINAR.

4. In providing you with the names and addresses of our child welfare field instructors, our university would prefer:
(Please check one)

_____ TO SEND YOU OUR FIELD PLACEMENT LIST INDICATING THE CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTORS AND THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS THEY ARE SUPERVISING

_____ TO COMPLETE THE FIELD INSTRUCTORS IN CHILD WELFARE FORM YOU WILL PROVIDE

5. Please estimate the following: (Fill in the number)

_____ NUMBER OF CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTORS WE ANTICIPATE WILL BE SUPERVISING STUDENTS DURING THE SPRING 1995 SEMESTER

_____ NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS WHO WILL BE IN CHILD WELFARE FIELD PLACEMENTS DURING THE SPRING 1995 SEMESTER

Additional comments: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!
Diane Elias Alperin
Florida Atlantic University
Department of Social Work
Boca Raton, FL 33431
(407) 367-3245



FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

777 GLADES ROAD
P.O. BOX 3091
BOCA RATON, FLORIDA 33431-0991

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
(407) 367-3234

January 1995

Dear _____ :

First, let me thank you for agreeing to participate in this study and for all the work you have already done to facilitate this research project.

As Director of Field Education for the School of Social Work at _____ you are well aware of how integral field education is to the social work curriculum and how highly it is valued by social work students. As social workers in Florida, and across the nation, seek to reprofessionalize child welfare, they too look to field education as one method of attracting practitioners to this particular field of practice.

As you may recall, at the October meeting of the Florida Field Consortium I asked for your assistance in helping us learn more about field placements in child welfare. I have enclosed two forms for your completion which should help in this process.

The first form, Social Work Program Questionnaire, asks several questions about your social work education program. It is a short form intended to assist in the description of the study sample.

The second form, Field Instructors In Child Welfare, asks you to identify all those field instructors in child welfare who are supervising students for you during the Spring 1995 semester. You are asked to provide their name, address and phone number, as well as the number of students they are currently supervising. Please return both forms in the stamped self-addressed envelope provided.

In March, I will be mailing the Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaires directly to your field instructors. I will also be sending them an appropriate number of Social Work Student Questionnaires for distribution to the students they are currently supervising. Should you decide you would prefer to distribute the student questionnaires through the field seminars, please let me know.

Several of the Field Directors who reviewed my survey forms were concerned about their length. In response to that, I will be adding an incentive. Students and field instructors who return completed survey forms will earn a chance to win \$200.00 in a raffle, with the winners selected at the April 7th meeting of the Florida Field Consortium. I will also be underwriting our luncheon on that day, as a small way to say thank you for all your efforts on behalf of this project.

As a Field Education Director for 15 years, I am well aware of how busy you are and therefore sincerely appreciate all the time and effort that will go into providing this material. I will call you in a few days to answer any questions you may have and to see if there is any way I can be of assistance.

Very truly yours,

Diane Elias Alperin, ACSW, LCSW
Associate Professor
Field Education Coordinator
FAX (407) 367-2866

SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather descriptive information about your social work education program. This information will be used to describe the study sample. This questionnaire will also ask questions about your opinions about field placements in child welfare from your perspective as a Director of Field Education. For the purpose of this survey, child welfare is defined as:

"...a specialized field of social work practice ...to help in the prevention, amelioration, or maintenance without further deterioration of the social situations affecting children".

Encyclopedia of Social Work

Such child welfare services may be provided in public, voluntary/not-for-profit or private/for-profit agencies where the primary focus is on clients under the age of 18 and where the child is the primary focus of services.

The purpose of this study is to gather information about field placements in child welfare from the perspective of the school, the agency-based field instructor and the student. The information gathered will be used to describe social work program characteristics as well as to examine relationships between program characteristics and levels of satisfaction with field work.

This Social Work Program Questionnaire is being sent to the Directors of Field Education at nine social work education programs accredited by the Council on Social Work Education in the state of Florida. It is important that you keep the following points in mind when completing this questionnaire:

- A. This questionnaire will in no way identify you, your students or your field instructors.
- B. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your responses will indicate your opinions about an educational experience.
- C. Please answer every question. Please feel free to include additional comments in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

The first part asks for information about your school and field work program. The second part asks for your opinions.

Completing this questionnaire should take approximately 20 minutes of your time. Thank you for taking this time and for cooperating in this study.

SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

SOCIAL WORK PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

1. Please indicate the auspices of the university of your social work program. (Check one)

_____ 1. PUBLIC

_____ 2. PRIVATE

2. Please indicate the degrees offered by your program. (Check all that apply)

_____ 1. BSW _____ 2. MSW _____ 3. DSW/PHD

3. The selection of a particular field placement agency for a particular student is a decision made by: (Check one)

_____ 1. THE SCHOOL ALONE

_____ 2. THE AGENCY ALONE

_____ 3. THE STUDENT ALONE

_____ 4. THE SCHOOL AND THE AGENCY

_____ 5. THE SCHOOL AND THE STUDENT

_____ 6. THE STUDENT AND THE AGENCY

_____ 7. THE SCHOOL, THE AGENCY AND THE STUDENT

_____ 8. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

4. Please indicate if social work students participate in pre-placement interviews with their field instructors at the agency prior to the beginning of placement?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

5. If your social work program offers a **BSW** degree, please answer the following questions: (If your program only offers an **MSW** degree, please skip to QUESTION 6)
- 5a. Please indicate the number of BSW students who are in field placement during the Spring 1995 semester.
- _____ # OF BSW STUDENTS IN FIELD PLACEMENT
- 5b. Please indicate the total number of agency-hours required for your BSW students.
- _____ # OF AGENCY HOURS REQUIRED FOR FIELD PLACEMENT
- 5c. Please indicate how many semesters your BSW students are in field placement to complete this hourly requirement.
- _____ # OF SEMESTERS REQUIRED FOR FIELD PLACEMENT
- 5d. Please indicate how many different agencies a BSW student may use to complete their field placement.
- _____ # OF DIFFERENT AGENCIES FOR FIELD PLACEMENT
- 5e. In regard to academic courses while in field placement, BSW students: (Check one)
- _____ 1. MUST BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK COURSE
- _____ 2. MAY BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK COURSE
- _____ 3. MAY BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK OR NON-SOCIAL WORK COURSE
- _____ 4. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)
- 5f. Please indicate if a school-based Integrative Field Seminar is required of your BSW students.
- _____ 1. YES
- _____ 2. NO

(Continued on the next page)

6. If your social work program offers an **MSW** degree, please answer the following questions: (If your program only offers a **BSW** degree, please skip to QUESTION 7)

6a. Please indicate the number of MSW students who are in field placement during the Spring 1995 semester.

_____ # OF MSW STUDENTS IN FIELD PLACEMENT

6b. Please indicate the total number of agency-hours required for your MSW students.

_____ # OF AGENCY HOURS REQUIRED FOR FIELD PLACEMENT

6c. Please indicate how many semesters your MSW students are in field placement to complete this hourly requirement.

_____ # OF SEMESTERS REQUIRED FOR FIELD PLACEMENT

6d. Please indicate how many different agencies an MSW student may use to complete field placement.

_____ # OF DIFFERENT AGENCIES FOR FIELD PLACEMENT

6e. In regard to academic courses while in field placement, MSW students: (Check one)

_____ 1. MUST BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK COURSE

_____ 2. MAY BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK COURSE

_____ 3. MAY BE ENROLLED IN A SOCIAL WORK OR NON-SOCIAL WORK COURSE

_____ 4. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

6f. Please indicate if a school-based Integrative Field Seminar is required of your MSW students.

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

(Continued on the next page)

6g. Does your school require students to select a methods concentration?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

6ga. If YES, please indicate which of the following methods concentrations are available for your MSW students. (Check all that apply)

_____ 1. DIRECT PRACTICE

_____ 2. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING

_____ 3. ADMINISTRATION OR MANAGEMENT

_____ 4. COMBINATION OF DIRECT PRACTICE WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION OR ADMINISTRATION

_____ 5. COMBINATION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

_____ 6. GENERIC

_____ 7. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

6h. Does your school require students to select a field of practice specialization?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

6ha. If YES, please indicate which of the following field of practice specializations are available for your MSW students. (Check all that apply)

_____ 1. AGING/GERONTOLOGICAL SOCIAL WORK

_____ 2. ALCOHOL, DRUG OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE

_____ 3. CHILD WELFARE

_____ 4. COMMUNITY PLANNING

_____ 5. CORRECTIONS/CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(Continued on the next page)

- _____ 6. FAMILY SERVICES
- _____ 7. GROUP SERVICES
- _____ 8. HEALTH
- _____ 9. OCCUPATIONAL/INDUSTRIAL
SOCIAL WORK
- _____ 10. MENTAL HEALTH OR COMMUNITY
MENTAL HEALTH
- _____ 11. MENTAL RETARDATION
- _____ 12. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE/PUBLIC
WELFARE
- _____ 13. REHABILITATION
- _____ 14. SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK
- _____ 15. OTHER (SPECIFY:_____)

7. Please indicate the number of full-time field faculty assigned to your program.

_____ # OF FULL-TIME FIELD FACULTY

8. Please indicate the number of part-time field faculty assigned to your program.

_____ # OF PART-TIME FIELD FACULTY

9. Does your program visit the field agencies during the course of a student's field placement?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

9a. If YES, how many times are visits made to an individual agency during a typical semester?

_____ # OF AGENCY VISITS PER SEMESTER

(Continued on the next page)

9b. If YES, who typically does these visits?
(Check all that apply)

_____ 1. FULL-TIME FIELD FACULTY

_____ 2. PART-TIME FIELD FACULTY

_____ 3. FACULTY FIELD LIAISONS

_____ 4. FACULTY ADVISORS

_____ 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

10. Does your social work program provide training for new field instructors?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

10a. If YES, how many hours of training are provided?

_____ # OF HOURS OF TRAINING

11. Does your social work program provide advanced training for experienced field instructors?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

11a. If YES, how many hours of training are provided?

_____ # OF HOURS OF TRAINING

(Continued on the next page)

PART II

FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR LEVEL OF SATISFACTION.

SATISFACTION SCALE

1=VERY DISSATISFIED
 2=DISSATISFIED
 3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED

4=SATISFIED
 5=VERY SATISFIED

In the child welfare field placements used by my social work program for BSW students, this is how I rate my level of satisfaction.....

(If your program only offers an MSW, please skip to QUESTION 17)

VD D N S VS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the <u>learning opportunities</u> provided as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the agency <u>field work programs</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the <u>child welfare agencies</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I would rate my level of satisfaction with my <u>field instructors</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with <u>child welfare field experiences</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1=VERY DISSATISFIED
 2=DISSATISFIED
 3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED

4=SATISFIED
 5=VERY SATISFIED

In the child welfare field placements used by my social work program for MSW students, this is how I rate my level of satisfaction.....

(If your program only offers a BSW, please skip to QUESTION 22)

VD D N S VS

-
17. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the learning opportunities provided as.....
18. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the agency field work programs as.....
19. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the child welfare agencies as.....
20. I would rate my level of satisfaction with my field instructors as.....
21. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with child welfare field experiences as.....
22. Is your social work program engaged in any special activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare?

_____ YES

_____ NO

22a. If YES, briefly please indicate what these activities are:

23. From your perspective as a Director of Field Education, please indicate what you believe, if anything, could be done by the schools or the agencies to enhance field placements in child welfare.

24. Additional comments regarding field placements in child welfare:

PLEASE PROCEED TO THE FIELD INSTRUCTORS IN CHILD WELFARE FORMS
OR YOUR FIELD PLACEMENT LIST FOR SPRING 1995.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

FIELD INSTRUCTORS IN CHILD WELFARE

In the spaces provided below, please indicate the field instructor's name, address, phone number and the number of students in this child welfare field placement for the current Spring 1995 semester. For the purpose of this survey child welfare is defined as:

"...a specialized field of social work practice
...to help in the prevention, amelioration, or
maintenance without further deterioration of
the social situations affecting children".

Encyclopedia of Social Work

Such child welfare services may be provided in public, voluntary/not-for-profit or private/for-profit agencies where the primary focus is on clients under the age of 18 and where the child is the primary focus of services.

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTOR'S NAME _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE (_____) _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN PLACEMENT _____

FIELD INSTRUCTORS IN CHILD WELFARE

Please attach your **Field Placement List** for Spring 1995, indicating which are your child welfare field placements. For the purpose of this survey child welfare is defined as:

"...a specialized field of social work practice
...to help in the prevention, amelioration, or
maintenance without further deterioration of
the social situations affecting children".

Encyclopedia of Social Work

Such child welfare services may be provided in public, voluntary/not-for-profit or private/for-profit agencies where the primary focus is on clients under the age of 18 and where the child is the primary focus of services.

The Field Placement List should include the field instructors name, agency, address, phone number and the **number of students** in this particular placement for the Spring 1995 semester.



DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
(407) 367-3234
FAX (407) 367-2866
March 1995

Dear Child Welfare Field Instructor:

As a field instructor for a social work program you are well aware of how integral field education is to the social work curriculum and how highly it is valued by social work students. As Florida, and the nation, is increasingly concerned about effective service delivery in child welfare, field education is looked to as one method of attracting competent practitioners to this particular field of practice.

The Florida Field Consortium is composed of field educators representing all the social work education programs in Florida. Your name was submitted by one or more of these schools as a child welfare field instructor who is supervising social work students during the current Spring 1995 semester. I am asking for your assistance in helping us learn more about field placements in child welfare.

The first form, Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire, asks questions about you, your agency and your field work program. It is to be completed by you and returned in the prepaid, self-addressed envelope provided.

The second form, Social Work Student Questionnaire, asks your students questions about their perceptions of their child welfare field experience. The number of forms enclosed is based on the number of students you are supervising, determined from information provided by the cooperating schools. Please distribute these forms to your students and ask them to return them in the envelope they have been provided. If you have not been supplied with the correct number of forms please call me at (407) 367-3245 and more forms will be sent to you.

As a Field Education Director for 15 years, and as someone who has also served as an agency-based field instructor, I am well aware of how busy you are and therefore sincerely appreciate all the time and effort that will go into providing this material. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Diane Elias Alperin, ACSW, LCSW
Associate Professor
Field Education Coordinator



DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK

(407) 367-3234

FAX (407) 367-2866

March 1995

Dear Child Welfare Field Instructor:

As a field instructor for a social work program you are well aware of how integral field education is to the social work curriculum and how highly it is valued by social work students. As Florida, and the nation, is increasingly concerned about effective service delivery in child welfare, field education is looked to as one method of attracting competent practitioners to this particular field of practice.

The Florida Field Consortium is composed of field educators representing all the social work education programs in Florida. Your name was submitted by one or more of these schools as a child welfare field instructor who is supervising social work students during the current Spring 1995 semester. I am asking for your assistance in helping us learn more about field placements in child welfare.

I have enclosed a Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire for this purpose. This questionnaire asks questions about you, your agency and your field work program. It is to be completed by you and returned in the prepaid, self-addressed envelope provided.

Another form, the Social Work Student Questionnaire, is being distributed to the social work student(s) you are supervising by the Directors of Field Education at their school.

As a Field Education Director for 15 years, and as someone who has also served as an agency-based field instructor, I am well aware of how busy you are and therefore sincerely appreciate all the time and effort that will go into providing this material. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Diane Elias Alperin, ACSW, LCSW
Associate Professor
Field Education Coordinator

FIELD INSTRUCTORS !!

EARN A CHANCE TO WIN \$200.00 !!

Here's what you have to do....

1. Complete the enclosed Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire.
2. Fill out the form below, snip it and enclose in the envelope labeled **FIELD INSTRUCTOR RAFFLE**. Seal the envelope.
3. Put the Questionnaire and the **FIELD INSTRUCTOR RAFFLE** envelope together in the prepaid self-addressed envelope provided.
4. Return this packet by mail in the envelope provided.
5. Once your packet is received, the Questionnaire and **FIELD INSTRUCTOR RAFFLE** envelope will be separated to protect your anonymity.
6. All **FIELD INSTRUCTOR RAFFLE** envelopes will be placed in a sealed box.
7. The winner will be selected from the sealed box at the April 7th meeting of the Florida Field Consortium. The winner will be notified immediately.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

PHONE _____

SCHOOL(S) _____

CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is concerned with characteristics of your child welfare field work program and your opinions about them.

The purpose of this study is to gather information about field placements in child welfare from the school, the agency-based field instructor and the student. The information gathered will be used to describe program characteristics of field placements in child welfare as well as to examine relationships between program characteristics and levels of satisfaction with field work.

This study involves gathering data from a large number of field instructors supervising social work students in child welfare field placements in the state of Florida during the Spring 1995 semester. Nine social work education programs are cooperating with this study, with surveys being sent to 320 child welfare field instructors and 426 social work students in child welfare field placements.

It is important that you keep the following points in mind when completing this questionnaire:

- A. This questionnaire will in no way identify you or your student. The number code on the first page is to enable the researcher to pair field instructors and students, but not to identify them.
- B. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your responses will indicate your opinions about an educational experience.
- C. Please answer every question. Please feel free to include additional comments in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire asks for information about you and your agency. The second part asks for your opinions.

Completing the questionnaire should take approximately 20-30 minutes of your time. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it in the envelope provided. If the envelope has become detached from the questionnaire, please return it to:

Professor Diane Alperin
Florida Atlantic University
Department of Social Work
SO 284C
Boca Raton, FL 33431

The opinion of field instructors is extremely important in designing satisfactory field work placements. Thank you for taking this time and cooperating in this study.

CHILD WELFARE FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

AGENCY CHARACTERISTICS

1. Please check the category which best describes the auspices of the child welfare setting in which your field work program is located. (Check one)

- 1. VOLUNTARY, NONPROFIT
- 2. FOR PROFIT
- 3. MUNICIPAL
- 4. COUNTY
- 5. STATE
- 6. FEDERAL

2. Please check the categories which best describe the type of child welfare service provided in which your field work program is located. (Check all those where you are currently supervising a social work student)

- 1. ADOPTION
- 2. ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION SERVICES
- 3. CHILDREN WITH HIV/AIDS
- 4. COUNSELING-GROUP
- 5. COUNSELING-INDIVIDUAL/FAMILY
- 6. CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
- 7. DRUG/ALCOHOL SERVICES
- 8. CHILD DAY CARE--CENTER-BASED
- 9. CHILD DAY CARE--FAMILY-BASED
- 10. DAY TREATMENT
- 11. EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE
- 12. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

(Continued on the next page)

- 13. FAMILY-CENTERED CASEWORK
- 14. FAMILY FOSTER CARE
- 15. HOUSING/HOMELESSNESS
- 16. INTENSIVE FAMILY-CENTERED CRISIS INTERVENTION
- 17. IN-HOME AIDES
- 18. INDEPENDENT LIVING
- 19. RESIDENTIAL GROUP CARE
- 20. TREATMENT/SPECIALIZED/THERAPEUTIC FOSTER CARE
- 21. YOUTH LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
- 22. SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK
- 23. PSYCHIATRIC/MENTAL HEALTH
- 24. MEDICAL/HEALTH CARE
- 25. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

3. What is the total number of children served by the unit in which your field work program is located, for February 1995?

OF CHILDREN SERVED DURING FEBRUARY 1995

4. How many full-time staff are employed in this unit?

OF FULL-TIME STAFF

5. How many of the full-time staff in this unit have BSW degrees?

OF BSW STAFF

6. How many full-time staff in this unit have MSW degrees?

OF MSW STAFF

7. Has your field instruction program received any external funding for the 1994-1995 academic year? (Check one)

1. YES

2. NO

8. For each of the following categories, please indicate the number of social work students you are supervising in field placement during this Spring 1995 semester:

- _____ 1. # OF BSW STUDENTS
- _____ 2. # OF MSW STUDENTS IN TRADITIONAL TWO ACADEMIC YEAR PROGRAMS
 - _____ # OF FIRST YEAR STUDENTS
 - _____ # OF SECOND YEAR STUDENTS
- _____ 3. # OF MSW STUDENTS IN ADVANCED STANDING
- _____ 4. # OF DSW/PHD STUDENTS

THE FOLLOWING SECTION OF QUESTIONS REFERS ONLY TO THAT PART OF YOUR PROGRAM DEALING WITH SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS IN FIELD WORK IN YOUR CHILD WELFARE PROGRAM DURING THE CURRENT SPRING 1995 SEMESTER.

9. How many schools of social work have had social work students placed in your child welfare field work program during the Spring 1995 semester?

_____ # OF SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

10. In all, how many different faculty field liaisons (faculty members designated as liaisons between school and field for individual students) have been assigned to students in your unit this semester?

_____ # OF SCHOOL FACULTY LIAISONS

11. During the current semester, how many BSW and/or MSW students left your unit before completing field placement as originally planned? (Please indicate the number of students in each of the following categories)

| BSW | MSW | |
|-------|-------|--|
| _____ | _____ | 1. # OF STUDENTS WHO LEFT AT THE REQUEST OF YOUR PROGRAM |
| _____ | _____ | 2. # OF STUDENTS WITHDRAWN BY THE SCHOOL |
| _____ | _____ | 3. # OF STUDENTS WHO LEFT FOR OTHER REASONS |

12. How many BSW and/or MSW students do you consider to have demonstrated serious problems in your field placement program during the current semester?

| | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| BSW | MSW | |
| _____ | _____ | # OF STUDENTS WITH SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN PLACEMENT |

13. How many BSW and/or MSW students currently in your program carry the number of placement assignments specified in each of the following categories?

| | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| BSW | MSW | |
| _____ | _____ | 1. # OF STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO ONE SERVICE OR PROGRAM AREA |
| _____ | _____ | 2. # OF STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO TWO SERVICE OR PROGRAM AREAS (PRIMARY PLUS SECONDARY/TASK ASSIGNMENT) |
| _____ | _____ | 3. # OF STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO THREE OR MORE SERVICE OR PROGRAM AREAS |

14. How many field instructors for BSW and/or MSW students currently are in your program?

| | |
|-------|---|
| _____ | 1. # SERVING AS PRIMARY FIELD INSTRUCTORS ONLY (CONSIDERED BY SCHOOLS TO BE OFFICIAL FIELD INSTRUCTORS FOR ASSIGNED STUDENTS) |
| _____ | 2. # SERVING AS SECONDARY OR TASK FIELD INSTRUCTORS (SUPPLEMENTAL SUPERVISORS NOT DESIGNATED BY A SCHOOL AS FIELD INSTRUCTOR FOR STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO THEM BY YOUR PROGRAM) |
| _____ | 3. # SERVING IN DUAL ROLES AS SECONDARY OR TASK INSTRUCTOR AS WELL AS PRIMARY FIELD INSTRUCTOR |

15. Please indicate your terminal academic degree. (Check one)

| | |
|-------|-----------------|
| _____ | 1. AA/AS DEGREE |
| _____ | 2. RN DEGREE |
| _____ | 3. BSW DEGREE |
| _____ | 4. BA/BS DEGREE |

(Continued on the next page)

- 5. MSW DEGREE
- 6. MA/MS DEGREE
- 7. DSW/PHD IN SOCIAL WELFARE DEGREE
- 8. OTHER DOCTORATE DEGREE
- 9. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)
- 10. NONE

16. Are you licensed as a social worker?

- 1. YES
- 2. NO

16a. If YES, please indicate the state(s) in which you are licensed: _____

17. How many years of experience do you have in child welfare?

_____ # OF YEARS OF CHILD WELFARE EXPERIENCE

18. How many years of experience do you have as a field instructor?

_____ # OF YEARS AS A FIELD INSTRUCTOR

19. What is your age?

_____ YEARS

20. What is your gender?

- 1. MALE
- 2. FEMALE

21. What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all applicable)

- 1. AFRICAN AMERICAN/BLACK
- 2. AMERICAN INDIAN
- 3. ASIAN
- 4. CAUCASIAN
- 5. HISPANIC/LATINO
- 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

22. Does your agency reduce the workload responsibilities of field instructors in order to provide them with time for field instruction activity? (Check one)

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

23. Which of the following categories best describes your status in your agency this semester? (Check one)

_____ 1. DIRECT SERVICE PROVIDER

_____ 2. SUPERVISOR

_____ 3. ADMINISTRATOR

_____ 4. EMPLOYED BY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

_____ 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

24. What is your organizational title?

25. On the average, what percent of your job time do you estimate you spend in activities related to the following responsibility areas? (Total should be 100%):

_____ 1. % SOCIAL WORK FIELD INSTRUCTION

_____ 2. % DIRECT SERVICE

_____ 3. % STAFF SUPERVISION

_____ 4. % PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

_____ 5. % OTHER ADMINISTRATION

_____ 6. % OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

100% TOTAL

26. What mode of student supervisory conferences did you provide to your students this semester? (Check one)

_____ 1. INDIVIDUAL SUPERVISION ONLY

_____ 2. GROUP SUPERVISION ONLY

_____ 3. BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP SUPERVISION

27. What pattern of student supervisory conferences did you provide to your students this semester? (Check one)

- 1. SCHEDULED WEEKLY PLUS AS NEEDED
- 2. SCHEDULED WEEKLY ONLY
- 3. SCHEDULED AS NEEDED
- 4. INFORMAL; NOT SCHEDULED
- 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

28. Did your agency also provide regularly scheduled group seminars (other than supervision) for your students in field placement?

- 1. YES
- 2. NO

(If NO, please skip to QUESTION 29)

28a. If YES, how frequently were seminars held for the students in your program during the Spring 1995 semester? (Check one)

- 1. WEEKLY
- 2. EVERY OTHER WEEK
- 3. MONTHLY
- 4. EVERY OTHER MONTH
- 5. ONCE/SEMESTER
- 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

28b. Please indicate below the area of content that was included in the student group seminars during the period of the Spring 1995 semester. (Check all applicable)

- 1. EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT PERFORMANCE
- 2. FIELD WORK PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
- 3. AGENCY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
- 4. SOCIAL WORK ROLE AND FUNCTION IN YOUR AGENCY

(Continued on next page)

- 5. CASE MATERIAL
- 6. PROFESSIONAL WRITING SKILLS
- 7. CHILD WELFARE POLICY AND/OR ORGANIZATION AND DELIVERY OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES
- 8. INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATION
- 9. OTHER SYSTEMS (i.e. MENTAL HEALTH, JUDICIAL, ETC.)
- 10. SPECIFIC PROBLEMS (i.e. AIDS, AUTISM, ETC.)
- 11. SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS (i.e. PLAY THERAPY, FAMILY-FOCUSED PRACTICE, ETC.)
- 12. SECURITY/SAFETY TRAINING
- 13. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

28c. Who taught these student seminars? (Check all applicable)

- 1. FIELD INSTRUCTOR
- 2. ADMINISTRATIVE OR SUPERVISORY STAFF
- 3. DIRECT SERVICE STAFF
- 4. PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE THE AGENCY
- 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

29. What contact did you have with individual students prior to their beginning this field work placement? (Check all applicable)

- 1. NONE
- 2. WRITTEN MATERIAL SENT TO STUDENTS
- 3. TELEPHONE CONTACT
- 4. INDIVIDUAL MEETING(S)/PRE-PLACEMENT INTERVIEW(S) WITH STUDENTS
- 5. GROUP MEETING(S) WITH STUDENTS
- 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

30. Have you served on any school of social work advisory committees during the current academic year? (Check one)
- _____ 1. YES
- _____ 2. NO
31. Do you have written policies and procedures for students?
- _____ 1. YES
- _____ 2. NO
32. Does your agency administer written program evaluation forms to students at the end of the program year? (Check one)
- _____ 1. YES
- _____ 2. NO

PART II

FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR LEVEL OF SATISFACTION FOR THE CURRENT SPRING 1995 SEMESTER.

SATISFACTION SCALE

1=VERY DISSATISFIED
 2=DISSATISFIED
 3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
 4=SATISFIED
 5=VERY SATISFIED
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

| In this program, this is how I rate my level of satisfaction..... | VD | D | N | S | VS | NA |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|----|
| 33. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with this semester's <u>BSW students</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 34. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with this semester's <u>MSW students</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 35. I would rate my level of satisfaction with <u>student learning</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=VERY DISSATISFIED
 2=DISSATISFIED
 3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
 4=SATISFIED
 5=VERY SATISFIED
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

| In this program, this is how I rate my level of satisfaction..... | VD | D | N | S | VS | NA |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|
| 36. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the <u>agency's field work program</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 37. I would rate my level of satisfaction with my agency's <u>field instructors</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 38. I would rate my level of satisfaction with this <u>child welfare agency</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 39. I would rate my level of satisfaction with <u>seminars provided by schools of social work</u> for new field instructors as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 40. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with <u>child welfare field experiences</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS RELATE TO FACTORS THOUGHT TO INFLUENCE SATISFACTION WITH FIELD WORK. OPINIONS ABOUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH FACTOR IS PRESENT IN YOUR FIELD WORK PROGRAM MAY BE IMPORTANT IN EXPLAINING DIFFERENT LEVELS OF SATISFACTION. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE SCALE THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FACTOR IS PRESENT IN YOUR CHILD WELFARE FIELD WORK PROGRAM DURING THIS CURRENT SPRING 1995 SEMESTER.

EXTENT EXPLAINING SATISFACTION

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT
 4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

| In this program, this is my opinion about the extent of..... | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 41. Attention to teaching students about community resources. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In this program, this is my
 opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 42. The orientation students received about agency policies and procedures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 43. Attention to students' understanding of and use of self. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 44. Contact between program and students prior to the first day of field work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 45. The variety in student assignments. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 46. The freedom of students to disagree with field instructors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 47. Objectivity in dealing with students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 48. The orientation students received about this agency's field work program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 49. The number of different practice methods which students have used in field work this semester. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 50. The opportunity for students to watch their field instructors work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 51. The opportunity for students to watch other agency staff work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 52. Provision of constructive criticism to students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 53. The security students feel in offering new and original ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In this program, this is my
 opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 54. The relevance of field work assignments to students' learning goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 55. Sensitivity to students' educational needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 56. Fairness in evaluation of student performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 57. The rules, administrative details and red-tape involved in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 58. The political tension in the agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 59. The organizational changes in the agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 60. Attention to the organizational environment (i.e. office space, supplies, support services, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 61. The amount of stress that students experience in this child welfare placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 62. The feedback when students do a good job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 63. The amount of support students receive when they make mistakes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 64. Organization in presenting material to students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 65. Attention to students' integration of field and classroom learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In this program, this is my
 opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTM | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 66. Helpfulness when students have difficulty. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 67. The contact students have had with other child welfare disciplines. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 68. The orientation that students received about the function and roles of social workers in this child welfare agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 69. The number of learning experiences that students have been given here (i.e. number of cases, groups, projects, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 70. The opportunity for students to make their own decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 71. The amount of student supervision provided. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 72. Opportunity for students to see field instructors when the need arises rather than having to wait for supervisory conferences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 73. The amount of attention given to the safety of students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 74. Making expectations clear to students at the beginning of placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 75. The degree to which students have been involved in evaluating their own performances. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 76. The number of different services and program areas to which students have been assigned. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In this program, this is my
 opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 77. Opportunities for students to participate in selection of their learning experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 78. The chance for students to make use of their abilities and skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 79. The opportunity for students to participate in decision making regarding policies and procedures relating to students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 80. The feeling of accomplishment that students get from their work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 81. The willingness of social work students in this agency to help each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 82. Being open to students' opinions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 83. Helpfulness in teaching about social work practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 84. The coordination between field instructors and school faculty field liaisons assigned to individual students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 85. The number of agency-based group seminars for students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 86. The quality of social work students in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 87. Opportunities for students to learn about and develop skills in social work practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In this program, this is my
 opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 88. The number of field instructors to which students have been assigned at this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 89. The overall amount of work expected of students in this field placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 90. Helpfulness to students in their learning to work with other disciplines. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 91. The degree to which the social work student program is organized in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 92. The coordination between different field instructors working with the same students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 93. School faculty field liaisons' helpfulness to students' in their integration of class and field learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 94. The number of social work students involved in field work at this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 95. Support given to students by agency staff. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 96. Student peer support that students have experienced in this field work program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 97. School faculty field liaison's helpfulness to students in dealing with this field work placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

98. Of the BSW and/or MSW students assigned to your program this semester, how many would you recommend for employment at your agency?

| BSW | MSW | # OF STUDENTS RECOMMENDED FOR AGENCY EMPLOYMENT |
|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | |

99. Is your child welfare agency engaged in any special activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

99a. If YES, briefly please indicate what these activities are:

100. From your perspective as a field instructor, please indicate what you believe, if anything, could be done by the schools or the agencies to enhance field placements in child welfare.

101. Additional comments regarding field placements in child welfare:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!



FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

777 GLADES ROAD

P.O. BOX 3091

BOCA RATON, FLORIDA 33431-0991

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
(407) 367-3234
FAX (407) 367-2866

March 1995

Dear Social Work Student:

As a social work student currently in field placement, you are well aware of the importance of field education. The field education component of the social work curriculum is generally highly valued by students and is often reported to be the most influential component of their education.

The Florida Field Consortium is composed of field educators representing all the social work education programs in Florida. We meet regularly to discuss issues important to field education. The Director of Field Education at your school is a member and is helping me contact you.

As Florida, and the nation, is increasingly concerned about effective service delivery in child welfare, field education is looked to as one method of attracting competent practitioners to this particular field of practice. If this effort is to be successful, however, we need to understand the student perspective. I am asking for your assistance in helping us learn more about field placements in child welfare.

I have enclosed a Social Work Student Questionnaire for this purpose. This questionnaire asks questions about you and your field placement. It is to be completed by you and returned in the prepaid, self-addressed envelope provided.

Another form, the Child Welfare Field Instructor Questionnaire, is being mailed directly to your field instructor at your field placement agency.

As a Field Education Director for 15 years, I am well aware of how very busy you are at this point in the semester and therefore sincerely appreciate all the time and effort that will go into completing this questionnaire. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Diane Elias Alperin, ACSW, LCSW
Associate Professor
Field Education Coordinator

STUDENTS !!

EARN A CHANCE TO WIN \$200.00 !!

Here's what you have to do....

1. Complete the enclosed Social Work Student Questionnaire.
2. Fill out the form below, snip it and enclose in the envelope labeled **STUDENT RAFFLE**. Seal the envelope.
3. Put the Questionnaire and the **STUDENT RAFFLE** envelope together in the prepaid self-addressed envelope provided.
4. Return this packet by mail in the envelope provided.
5. Once your packet is received, the Questionnaire and **STUDENT RAFFLE** envelope will be separated to protect your anonymity.
6. All **STUDENT RAFFLE** envelopes will be placed in a sealed box.
7. The winner will be selected from the sealed box at the April 7th meeting of the Florida Field Consortium. The winner will be notified immediately.

NAME

ADDRESS

PHONE

SCHOOL

SOCIAL WORK STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

SOCIAL WORK STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is concerned with your experience as a social work student in your child welfare field work placement this semester.

The purpose of this study is to gather information about field placements in child welfare from the perspective of the school, the agency-based field instructor and the student. The information gathered will be used to describe program characteristics of field placements in child welfare as well as to examine relationships between program characteristics and levels of satisfaction with field work.

This study involves gathering data from a large number of students in child welfare field placements in the state of Florida during the Spring 1995 semester. Nine social work education programs are cooperating with this study, with surveys being sent to 320 child welfare field instructors and 426 social work students in child welfare field placements.

It is important that you keep the following points in mind when completing this questionnaire:

- A. This questionnaire will in no way identify you or your field instructor. The number code on the first page is to enable the researcher to pair students and field instructors, but not to identify them.
- B. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Your responses will indicate your opinions about an educational experience.
- C. Please answer every question. Please feel free to include additional comments in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire asks for information about you and your placement. The second part asks for your opinions.

Completing the questionnaire should take approximately 20-30 minutes of your time. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it in the envelope provided. If the envelope has become detached from the questionnaire, please return it to:

Professor Diane Alperin
Florida Atlantic University
Department of Social Work-SO 284C
Boca Raton, FL 33431

The opinion of social work students is extremely important in designing satisfactory field work placements. Thank you for taking this time and cooperating in this study.

SOCIAL WORK STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. Please check the category that best describes your educational status this semester. (Check one)

- 1. BSW/JUNIOR YEAR
- 2. BSW/SENIOR YEAR
- 3. MSW/FIRST YEAR
- 4. MSW/TRADITIONAL/SECOND YEAR
- 5. MSW/ADVANCED STANDING/SECOND YEAR
- 6. PHD/DSW
- 7. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

2. What is your expected date of graduation?

- 1. YEAR
- 2. MONTH

3. What is the date you began your current child welfare field placement?

- 1. YEAR
- 2. MONTH

4. What is the date you completed this questionnaire?

- 1. YEAR
- 2. MONTH

5. How many hours of field work do you complete each week?

OF HOURS OF FIELD WORK PER WEEK

6. How many academic courses are you enrolled in, in addition to field work?

OF ACADEMIC COURSES

7. Are you also required to attend a school-based Integrative Field Seminar while in field placement?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

8. Are you also employed while completing your field education requirement?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

8a. If YES, how many hours a week are you involved in employment, outside of field work? _____

9. Have you had another field placement prior to starting this current child welfare field placement?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

9a. If YES, please indicate the field of practice (i.e. child welfare, mental health, etc.): _____

9b. If YES, please indicate the number of months of previous placement: _____

10. Please indicate the amount of paid employment experience you have had in child welfare prior to beginning this current field work placement. (Check one)

_____ 1. NONE

_____ 2. LESS THAN ONE YEAR

_____ 3. ONE TO THREE YEARS

_____ 4. MORE THAN THREE YEARS

11. Please indicate the amount of volunteer experience you have had in child welfare prior to beginning this current field work placement. (Check one)

_____ 1. NONE

_____ 2. LESS THAN ONE YEAR

(Continued on the next page)

- 3. ONE TO THREE YEARS
- 4. MORE THAN THREE YEARS

12. Please indicate any previous academic degrees you have earned. (Check all applicable)

- 1. AA/AS DEGREE
- 2. RN DEGREE
- 3. BSW DEGREE
- 4. BA/BS DEGREE
- 5. MA/MS DEGREE
- 6. PHD DEGREE
- 7. JD DEGREE
- 8. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)
- 9. NONE

13. What is your age?

_____ YEARS

14. What is your gender?

- 1. MALE
- 2. FEMALE

15. What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all applicable)

- 1. AFRICAN AMERICAN/BLACK
- 2. AMERICAN INDIAN
- 3. ASIAN
- 4. CAUCASIAN
- 5. HISPANIC/LATINO
- 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

(If you are a **BSW** student, please skip to QUESTION 18)

16. If you are an **MSW** student, does your school require students to select a methods concentration?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

16a. If YES, please indicate your methods concentration. (Check one)

_____ 1. DIRECT PRACTICE

_____ 2. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING

_____ 3. ADMINISTRATION OR MANAGEMENT

_____ 4. COMBINATION OF DIRECT PRACTICE WITH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION OR ADMINISTRATION

_____ 5. COMBINATION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

_____ 6. GENERIC

_____ 7. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

17. If you are an **MSW** student, does your school require students to select a field of practice specialization?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

17a. If YES, please indicate your field of practice specialization. (Check one)

_____ 1. AGING/GERONTOLOGICAL SOCIAL WORK

_____ 2. ALCOHOL, DRUG OR SUBSTANCE ABUSE

_____ 3. CHILD WELFARE

_____ 4. COMMUNITY PLANNING

_____ 5. CORRECTIONS/CRIMINAL JUSTICE

_____ 6. FAMILY SERVICES

_____ 7. GROUP SERVICES

_____ 8. HEALTH

(Continued on next page)

- 9. OCCUPATIONAL/INDUSTRIAL SOCIAL WORK
- 10. MENTAL HEALTH OR COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH
- 11. MENTAL RETARDATION
- 12. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE/PUBLIC WELFARE
- 13. REHABILITATION
- 14. SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK
- 15. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

18. Please indicate the number of social work courses with specific child welfare content that you took before beginning this field work placement (i.e., courses with content in areas such as child welfare policy, child welfare programs, social work practice with children, child development, etc.)

OF PREVIOUS COURSES WITH CHILD WELFARE CONTENT

19. Please indicate the number of social work courses with specific child welfare content that you have taken since beginning the current field work placement.

OF COURSES WITH CHILD WELFARE CONTENT SINCE PLACEMENT BEGAN

20. Have you taken any social work courses that specifically focused on children and child welfare?

1. YES

2. NO

20a. If YES, please list the title(s): _____

21. Are you receiving any of the following specifically for your field work activities? (Check all applicable)

1. I RECEIVE A STIPEND FROM THE AGENCY WHERE I AM IN FIELD PLACEMENT.

2. I RECEIVE MONEY THROUGH A STATE OR FEDERAL GRANT.

3. I RECEIVE MONEY AVAILABLE THROUGH MY OWN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK FOR FIELD WORK.

(Continued on the next page)

- 4. I AM BEING GIVEN RELEASE TIME AND PAID MY SALARY BY AN AGENCY WHILE I GO TO SCHOOL.
- 5. I AM EMPLOYED BY THE CHILD WELFARE AGENCY IN WHICH I HAVE MY FIELD PLACEMENT.
- 6. I RECEIVE TUITION REIMBURSEMENT OR A TUITION WAIVER FROM MY EMPLOYER.
- 7. I HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY MONEY FOR MY FIELD WORK ACTIVITIES.

22. Please check the category which best describes the auspices of the child welfare agency in which you are completing your field placement. (Check one)

- 1. VOLUNTARY, NONPROFIT
- 2. FOR PROFIT
- 3. MUNICIPAL
- 4. COUNTY
- 5. STATE
- 6. FEDERAL

23. Please check the category which best describes the type of child welfare service you are providing in your field work placement. (Check one)

- 1. ADOPTION
- 2. ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION SERVICES
- 3. CHILDREN WITH HIV/AIDS
- 4. COUNSELING-GROUP
- 5. COUNSELING-INDIVIDUAL/FAMILY
- 6. CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES
- 7. DRUG/ALCOHOL SERVICES
- 8. CHILD DAY CARE--CENTER-BASED
- 9. CHILD DAY CARE--FAMILY-BASED
- 10. DAY TREATMENT

(Continued on next page)

- 11. EMERGENCY SHELTER CARE
- 12. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING
- 13. FAMILY-CENTERED CASEWORK
- 14. FAMILY FOSTER CARE
- 15. HOUSING/HOMELESSNESS
- 16. INTENSIVE FAMILY-CENTERED CRISIS INTERVENTION
- 17. IN-HOME AIDES
- 18. INDEPENDENT LIVING
- 19. RESIDENTIAL GROUP CARE
- 20. TREATMENT/SPECIALIZED/THERAPEUTIC FOSTER CARE
- 21. YOUTH LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT
- 22. SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK
- 23. PSYCHIATRIC/MENTAL HEALTH
- 24. MEDICAL/HEALTH CARE
- 25. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

24. How many different service and/or program areas have you been assigned to in your current child welfare field work placement?

- 1. ONE
- 2. TWO
- 3. THREE
- 4. MORE THAN THREE
- 5. NOT APPLICABLE

25. In my field placement, my work with clients has involved:
(Check all applicable)

- 1. BRIEF CONTACT (1-4 CLIENT CONTACTS)
- 2. SHORT TERM WORK (5-12 CLIENT CONTACTS)

(continued on next page)

- _____ 3. LONG TERM ON-GOING WORK (MORE THAN 12 CLIENT CONTACTS)
- _____ 4. NOT APPLICABLE
26. The longest period of time that I have worked with a client or client system in this field placement has been: (Check one)
- _____ 1. LESS THAN ONE MONTH
- _____ 2. ONE OR TWO MONTHS
- _____ 3. THREE OR FOUR MONTHS
- _____ 4. FIVE OR SIX MONTHS
- _____ 5. MORE THAN SIX MONTHS
- _____ 6. NOT APPLICABLE
27. During my field placement, I have worked with the following types of clients: (Check one)
- _____ 1. INVOLUNTARY CLIENTS ONLY
- _____ 2. VOLUNTARY CLIENTS ONLY
- _____ 3. BOTH INVOLUNTARY AND VOLUNTARY CLIENTS
- _____ 4. NOT APPLICABLE
28. During my field placement, the largest number of cases I have been responsible for at one time is:
- _____ LARGEST # OF CASES
29. In this child welfare field placement, my work has involved the following methods: (Check all applicable)
- _____ 1. WORK WITH INDIVIDUALS
- _____ 2. WORK WITH FAMILIES
- _____ 3. WORK WITH GROUPS
- _____ 4. WORK WITH COMMUNITIES
- _____ 5. WORK IN ADMINISTRATION
- _____ 6. WORK IN RESEARCH
- _____ 7. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

30. On the average, what percent of your field work time do you estimate you spend in activities related to the following responsibility areas? (Total should be 100%):

- _____ 1. % AGENCY-BASED CONTACT WITH CLIENTS
- _____ 2. % HOME VISIT CONTACT WITH CLIENTS
- _____ 3. % PAPERWORK
- _____ 4. % AGENCY MEETINGS/STAFFINGS ON BEHALF OF CLIENTS
- _____ 5. % WORK WITH OTHER AGENCIES/SYSTEMS ON BEHALF OF CLIENTS
- _____ 6. % SUPERVISION AND TRAINING
- _____ 7. % ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- _____ 8. % RESEARCH ACTIVITIES
- _____ 9. % OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)
- 100% TOTAL

31. How many field instructors (including task supervisors/secondary field instructors) have you been assigned to in your child welfare field placement? (Check one)

- _____ 1. ONE
- _____ 2. TWO
- _____ 3. THREE
- _____ 4. MORE THAN THREE

32. What is your current primary field instructor's previous experience in supervising students? (Check one)

- _____ 1. NEVER SUPERVISED STUDENTS BEFORE
- _____ 2. SUPERVISED STUDENTS BEFORE
- _____ 3. DON'T KNOW

33. What mode of supervisory conferences did you receive from your primary field instructor this semester? (Check one)

- _____ 1. INDIVIDUAL SUPERVISION ONLY

(Continued on next page)

_____ 2. GROUP SUPERVISION ONLY

_____ 3. BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP SUPERVISION

34. What pattern of supervisory conferences did you receive from your primary field instructor this semester? (Check one)

_____ 1. SCHEDULED WEEKLY PLUS AS NEEDED

_____ 2. SCHEDULED WEEKLY ONLY

_____ 3. SCHEDULED AS NEEDED

_____ 4. INFORMAL; NOT SCHEDULED

_____ 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

35. Did your child welfare agency also have regularly scheduled group seminars (other than supervision) for students in placement during the Spring 1995 semester?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

35a. If YES, how frequently were seminars held during the Spring 1995 semester?

_____ 1. WEEKLY

_____ 2. EVERY OTHER WEEK

_____ 3. MONTHLY

_____ 4. EVERY OTHER MONTH

_____ 5. ONCE/SEMESTER

_____ 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

36. What contact did you have with agency staff from your field work placement prior to the day field work began? (Check all applicable)

_____ 1. NONE

_____ 2. I WAS SENT WRITTEN MATERIAL

_____ 3. TELEPHONE CONTACT

_____ 4. INDIVIDUAL MEETING(S)/PRE-PLACEMENT INTERVIEW(S)
WITH FIELD INSTRUCTOR

(Continued on next page)

_____ 5. GROUP MEETING(S) WITH OTHER STUDENTS AND FIELD STAFF

_____ 6. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

37. How many times has your faculty advisor or faculty field liaison visited you and/or your field instructor(s) at the child welfare field work placement since you began field work there? (Check one)

_____ 1. NONE

_____ 2. ONCE

_____ 3. TWICE

_____ 4. THREE TIMES

_____ 5. MORE THAN THREE TIMES

38. This child welfare field placement was: (Check one)

_____ 1. MY FIRST CHOICE (PREFERENCE)

_____ 2. MY SECOND CHOICE (PREFERENCE)

_____ 3. MY THIRD CHOICE (PREFERENCE)

_____ 4. NOT ONE OF MY TOP THREE PREFERENCES

PART II

FIELD PLACEMENTS IN CHILD WELFARE

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR LEVEL OF SATISFACTION FOR THE CURRENT SPRING 1995 SEMESTER.

SATISFACTION SCALE

1=VERY DISSATISFIED

2=DISSATISFIED

3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED

4=SATISFIED

5=VERY SATISFIED

NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is how I would rate my level of satisfaction.....

VD D N S VS NA

39. I would rate my level of satisfaction with my learning in this placement as.....

1 2 3 4 5 NA

1=VERY DISSATISFIED
 2=DISSATISFIED
 3=NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED
 4=SATISFIED
 5=VERY SATISFIED
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is how I would rate my level of satisfaction.....

| | VD | D | N | S | VS | NA |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|----|
| 40. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the <u>agency's field work program</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 41. I would rate my level of satisfaction with the agency <u>field instructors</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 42. I would rate my level of satisfaction with this <u>child welfare agency</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 43. I would rate my level of overall satisfaction with this field work <u>experience</u> as..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS RELATE TO FACTORS THOUGHT TO INFLUENCE STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH FIELD WORK. YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH FACTOR IS PRESENT IN YOUR FIELD PLACEMENT MAY BE IMPORTANT IN EXPLAINING YOUR LEVELS OF SATISFACTION. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER ON THE SCALE THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FACTOR IS PRESENT IN YOUR CHILD WELFARE FIELD WORK PLACEMENT DURING THIS CURRENT SPRING 1995 SEMESTER.

EXTENT EXPLAINING SATISFACTION

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT
 4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 44. My field instructor's attention to teaching me about community resources. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 45. The orientation I received about agency policies and procedures. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 46. My field instructor's attention to my understanding and use of self. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 47. My contact with people from this agency program prior to the first day of field work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 48. The variety in my assignments. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 49. The freedom to disagree with my field instructors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 50. My field instructors' objectivity in dealing with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 51. The orientation I received about the agency's field work program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 52. The number of different practice methods I have used in field work here. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 53. The opportunity to watch my field instructors work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 54. The opportunity to watch other agency staff work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 55. My field instructors' offering of constructive criticism. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 56. The security that students feel in offering new and original ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 57. The relevance of my field work assignments to my own learning goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 58. My field instructors' sensitivity to my educational needs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 59. Fairness in evaluation of my performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 60. The rules, administrative details and red-tape involved in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 61. The political tension in the agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 62. The organizational changes in the agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 63. Attention to the organizational environment (i.e. office space, supplies, support services, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 64. The amount of stress I have experienced in this child welfare field placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 65. Feedback from my field instructors when I did a good job. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 66. The amount of support students receive when they make mistakes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 67. My field instructors' organization in presenting material to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 68. My field instructors' attention to my integrating field and classroom learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 69. My field instructors' helpfulness when I have difficulty. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|--|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 70. The contact I have had with other child welfare disciplines. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 71. The orientation that I received about the functions and roles of social workers in this child welfare agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 72. The number of learning experiences I have been given here (i.e. number of cases, groups, projects, etc.). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 73. The opportunity to make decisions on my own. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 74. The amount of supervision I received. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 75. The opportunity to see my field instructors when the need arises rather than having to wait for supervisory conferences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 76. The amount of attention given to the safety of students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 77. My field instructors making expectations clear to me at the beginning of placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 78. The degree to which I have been involved in evaluation of my own performance. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 79. The number of different services and program areas I have been assigned to. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 80. The opportunity to participate in the selection of my learning experiences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 81. The chance to make use of my abilities and skills. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 82. The opportunity to participate in decision making regarding policies and procedures relating to students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 83. The feeling of accomplishment I get from my work. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 84. Willingness of social work students in this agency to help each other. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 85. My field instructors' being open to my opinions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 86. My field instructors' helpfulness to me in my learning about social work practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 87. The coordination between my field instructors and my school faculty field liaison. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 88. The number of agency-based group seminars for students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 89. The quality of social work students in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 90. Opportunities for students to learn about and develop skills in social work practice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 91. The number of field instructors I have been assigned to in this child welfare placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 92. The overall amount of work expected of me in this child welfare placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

1=MUCH TOO LITTLE
 2=TOO LITTLE
 3=JUST RIGHT

4=TOO MUCH
 5=MUCH TOO MUCH
 NA=NOT APPLICABLE

In my child welfare field placement, this is my opinion about the extent of.....

| | MTL | TL | JR | TM | MTM | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|----|-----|----|
| 93. My field instructor's helpfulness to me in my learning to work with other disciplines. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 94. The degree to which the social work student program is organized in this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 95. Coordination between my field instructors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 96. My faculty field liaison's helpfulness in my integration of class and field learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 97. The school-based integrative field seminar's helpfulness in my integration of class and field learning. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 98. The support received from my school-based integrative field seminar. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 99. The number of other social work students involved in field work at this agency. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 100. Support given to students by agency staff. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 101. Student peer support I have experienced in this field work placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |
| 102. My school faculty field liaison's helpfulness to me in dealing with this field work placement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NA |

103. Would you accept a social work job at the child welfare agency in which you are doing your field work if it were offered? (Check one)

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

_____ 3. DON'T KNOW

_____ 4. ONLY IF I WERE DESPERATE FOR EMPLOYMENT

_____ 5. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

103a. If NO, are you interested in pursuing a career in child welfare, but at a different agency?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

_____ 3. DON'T KNOW

104. Do you think this child welfare agency would offer you a position if you had graduated and wanted a job there? (Check one)

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

105. Do you plan to continue your education **immediately** after the completion of the Spring 1995 semester?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

105a. If YES, please indicate your educational plans:

_____ 1. COMPLETE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS DEGREE

_____ 2. PURSUE AN MSW DEGREE

_____ 3. PURSUE A PHD/DSW DEGREE

_____ 4. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

106. Would you recommend your child welfare agency as a field placement to other social work students who had similar interests to your own? (Check one)

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

_____ 3. DON'T KNOW

_____ 4. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)

107. Was your child welfare agency or social work education program engaged in any special activities to enhance and/or encourage field placements in child welfare?

_____ 1. YES

_____ 2. NO

107a. If YES, briefly please describe what these activities are:

108. From your perspective as a student, please indicate what you believe, if anything, could be done by the schools or the agencies to enhance field placements in child welfare.

109. Additional comments regarding field placements in child welfare:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

APPENDIX

Table 25

T-Tests Of Select Independent Variables And Student Satisfaction Items For Student Respondents

| Independent Variable | Mean Score | T-Score | df | p |
|---|------------|---------|-----|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Learning</u> | | | | |
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 4.36 | 5.46 | 203 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 3.61 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 4.54 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.58 | | | |
| Number of Areas of Service | | | | |
| One | 3.86 | -2.96 | 201 | .003 |
| More Than One | 4.28 | | | |
| Number of Field Instructors | | | | |
| One | 3.87 | -3.08 | 203 | .002 |
| More Than One | 4.30 | | | |
| Field Instructor Workload Reduction | | | | |
| Yes | 3.82 | -2.83 | 123 | .005 |
| No | 4.33 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | |
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 4.15 | 5.30 | 201 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 3.41 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.05 | 3.97 | 201 | .000 |
| No | 3.44 | | | |
| Number of Areas of Service | | | | |
| One | 3.67 | -2.78 | 199 | .006 |
| More Than One | 4.07 | | | |
| Ethnicity/Race | | | | |
| Caucasian | 4.00 | 2.68 | 198 | .008 |
| Other | 3.58 | | | |

Table 25 (continued)

| Independent Variable | Mean Score | T-Score | df | p |
|--|------------|---------|-----|------|
| Field Instructor Workload Reduction | | | | |
| Yes | 3.55 | -2.89 | 122 | .005 |
| No | 4.10 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Instructor</u> | | | | |
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 4.34 | 4.15 | 203 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 3.73 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 3.48 | 203 | .001 |
| No | 3.71 | | | |
| Pattern of Supervision | | | | |
| Scheduled Weekly Plus | | | | |
| As Needed | 4.29 | 2.69 | 202 | .008 |
| Other Pattern | 3.89 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | |
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 4.11 | 3.96 | 202 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 3.50 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.09 | 4.28 | 202 | .000 |
| No | 3.38 | | | |
| Number of Areas of Service | | | | |
| One | 3.67 | -2.85 | 200 | .005 |
| More Than One | 4.10 | | | |
| Funding For Field | | | | |
| Yes | 3.49 | -3.31 | 202 | .001 |
| No | 4.05 | | | |
| Child Welfare Course Since Field Placement | | | | |
| Yes | 4.08 | 2.66 | 200 | .009 |
| No | 3.68 | | | |
| Field Instructor Workload Reduction | | | | |
| Yes | 3.59 | -2.67 | 123 | .009 |
| No | 4.13 | | | |

Table 25 (continued)

| Independent Variable | Mean Score | T-Score | df | p |
|----------------------|------------|---------|----|---|
|----------------------|------------|---------|----|---|

Satisfaction With Overall Field Experience

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------|-------|-----|------|
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 4.33 | 5.15 | 203 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 3.64 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 4.27 | 4.78 | 203 | .000 |
| No | 3.56 | | | |
| Number of Field Instructors | | | | |
| One | 3.88 | -2.88 | 203 | .004 |
| More Than One | 4.27 | | | |
| Funding For Field | | | | |
| Yes | 3.78 | 2.65 | 203 | .009 |
| No | 4.19 | | | |

Satisfaction Index

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----|------|
| Placement Preference | | | | |
| First Choice | 21.32 | 5.99 | 200 | .000 |
| Not First Choice | 17.74 | | | |
| Pre-placement Interview | | | | |
| Yes | 20.93 | 4.94 | 200 | .000 |
| No | 17.67 | | | |
| Number of Areas of Service | | | | |
| One | 19.02 | -3.07 | 198 | .002 |
| More Than One | 20.91 | | | |

APPENDIX

Table 26

Independent Sample And Paired T-Tests Of Select Satisfaction
Items For Student And Field Instructor Respondents

| Satisfaction Item | Mean Score | T- Score | df | p |
|---|---------------|-------------|-----|------|
| <u>Satisfaction With Field Work Program</u> | | | | |
| Students | 3.89 | -2.63 | 313 | .009 |
| Field Instructors | 4.18 | | | |
| Students | 3.96 | 3.45 | 118 | .001 |
| Field Instructors | 4.35 | | | |
| <u>Satisfaction With Child Welfare Agency</u> | | | | |
| Students | 3.90 | -3.12 | 314 | .002 |
| Field Instructors | 4.26 | | | |

APPENDIX

Table 27

Extent Explaining Satisfaction Factor Items: Agreement Between Students And Field Instructors

Factor 1: Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics

Field instructors' attention to understanding and use of self
Field instructors' offering of constructive criticism
Field instructors' organization in presentation of material
Field instructors' attention to integration of learning
Opportunity to see field instructor when need arises

Factor 2: Learning Assignment Opportunities

Variety in assignments

Factor 3: Support From School

Support from school-based integrative field seminar
School-based integrative seminar's helpfulness in integration of learning
Faculty field liaison's helpfulness in integration of learning
Faculty field liaison's helpfulness in dealing with placement

Factor 6: Orientation Characteristics

Orientation received about agency policies and procedures
Orientation received about agency's field work program
Degree of involvement in evaluation of own performance

Factor 7: Organizational Environment

Organizational changes in the agency

Factor 8: Program Coordination

Degree to which social work student program is organized in agency

Factor 9: Student Workload

Amount of stress experienced in placement
Number of learning experiences (cases, groups, projects)
Overall amount of work expected of students

Table 27 (continued)

Factor 10: Student Peer Support

Willingness of social work students in agency to help each other

Quality of social work students in agency

Student peer support experienced in field placement

Factor 11: School/Agency Coordination

Coordination between field instructors and faculty field liaison

Coordination between field instructors

Factor 13: Other Students

Number of other social work students at agency

Factor 14: Organizational Characteristics

Attention to the organizational environment

Factor 15: Pre-placement Contact

Contact with agency staff prior to first day of field work

Factor 16: Student Autonomy

Opportunity to make decisions on my own

APPENDIX

Table 28

Extent Explaining Satisfaction Factor Items: Differences
Between Students And Field Instructors

| | Student Mean | Instructor Mean | T- Score | df | p |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|
| <u>Factor 1: Field Instructor Relationship Characteristics</u> | | | | | |
| Field instructors' attention to teaching about community resources | 2.48 | 2.82 | -4.34 | 314 | .000 |
| Opportunity to watch field instructor work | 2.24 | 2.72 | -5.19 | 311 | .000 |
| Field instructors' sensitivity to educational needs | 2.75 | 2.94 | -3.36 | 320 | .001 |
| Feedback from field instructor for a good job | 2.71 | 2.91 | -3.21 | 319 | .001 |
| Field instructors' helpfulness with difficulty | 2.82 | 3.01 | -3.57 | 321 | .000 |
| Orientation on roles and functions of social workers in this agency | 2.58 | 2.81 | -3.39 | 312 | .001 |
| Amount of supervision received | 2.73 | 2.99 | -4.19 | 321 | .000 |
| Field instructors' being open to opinions | 2.84 | 3.02 | -4.03 | 313 | .000 |
| Field instructors' helpfulness in learning about social work practice | 2.78 | 2.94 | -2.89 | 317 | .004 |
| Opportunities to learn and develop social work practice skills | 2.70 | 2.97 | -4.49 | 318 | .000 |
| Field instructors' helpfulness in working with other disciplines | 2.72 | 2.94 | -3.71 | 312 | .000 |

Table 28 (continued)

| | Student Mean | Instructor Mean | T- Score | df | p |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|
| <u>Factor 2: Learning Assignment Opportunities</u> | | | | | |
| Number of different practice methods used | 2.58 | 2.80 | -3.35 | 314 | .001 |
| Relevance of field assignments to learning goals | 2.74 | 2.94 | -3.34 | 318 | .001 |
| Number of different program/service areas assigned to | 2.70 | 2.92 | -3.16 | 303 | .002 |
| Opportunity to participate in selection of learning experiences | 2.71 | 2.93 | -3.25 | 317 | .001 |
| Chance to make use of abilities and skills | 2.77 | 3.02 | -4.06 | 319 | .000 |
| Feeling of accomplishment from work | 2.69 | 2.91 | -3.38 | 319 | .000 |
| <u>Factor 4: Field Instructor Evaluation Characteristics</u> | | | | | |
| Field instructors' objectivity in dealing with student | 2.83 | 3.01 | -4.15 | 317 | .000 |
| Fairness in evaluation of performance | 2.92 | 3.03 | -3.29 | 305 | .001 |
| <u>Factor 5: Organizational Support</u> | | | | | |
| Amount of support students receive when they make mistakes | 2.75 | 2.97 | -3.77 | 308 | .000 |
| Amount of attention given to the safety of students | 2.68 | 2.92 | -3.71 | 313 | .000 |
| Field instructors' clear expectations at the beginning of placement | 2.65 | 2.89 | -3.63 | 318 | .000 |
| Support given to students by agency staff | 2.62 | 3.01 | -5.59 | 316 | .000 |
| <u>Factor 7: Organizational Environment</u> | | | | | |
| Rules, administrative details, red tape | 3.72 | 3.36 | 3.74 | 314 | .000 |
| Political tension in the agency | 3.81 | 3.44 | 3.73 | 297 | .000 |

Table 28 (continued)

| | Student Mean | Instructor Mean | T- Score | df | p |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|
| <u>Factor 8: Program Coordination</u> | | | | | |
| Security students feel in offering new and original ideas | 2.71 | 2.90 | -2.95 | 316 | .003 |
| Opportunity to participate in decisions regarding student policies | 2.40 | 2.67 | -3.08 | 275 | .002 |
| Number of agency-based group seminars for students | 2.21 | 2.48 | -2.70 | 275 | .007 |
| <u>Factor 12: Other Disciplines</u> | | | | | |
| Contact with other child welfare disciplines | 2.37 | 2.65 | -3.64 | 311 | .000 |
| <u>Factor 16: Student Autonomy</u> | | | | | |
| Freedom to disagree with field instructors | 2.79 | 3.04 | -4.81 | 309 | .000 |

VITA

August 21, 1945 Born, Bronx, New York

1967 B.A., Psychology
SUNY Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York

1969 M.S., Social Work
Columbia University
New York, New York

1969-1973 Social Worker
McGuire VA Hospital
Richmond, Virginia

1975 Program Director
Family Center
Delray Beach, Florida

1975-1977 Social Worker
A Associated Home Health
Lake Worth, Florida

1977-1979 Social Worker
Children's Home Society
West Palm Beach, Florida

1979-1980 Director
Respite Care, Inc.
Boca Raton, Florida

1980-1989 Assistant Professor and Field
Experience Coordinator
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida

1987 Florida Chapter N.A.S.W.
Social Worker of the Year

1988 College of Social Science
Excellence in Undergraduate
Instruction Award

1989-1995 Associate Professor and Field
Education Coordinator
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida

| | |
|--------------|--|
| 1990 | Florida Atlantic University Award for Innovation in Undergraduate Advising |
| 1991 | College of Social Science Outstanding Scholar Award |
| 1995-present | Associate Professor and Chairperson Florida Atlantic University Boca Raton, Florida |

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Alperin, D. (1981, July). Self-help housing in two migrant communities: An issue of empowerment. Paper presented at the Sixth National Institute on Social Work in Rural Areas, Beaufort, SC.

Alperin, D. (1982). Self-help housing in two migrant communities: An issue of empowerment. In L. Clemmons (Ed.), Dignity, diversity and opportunity in changing rural communities (pp. 206-212). Columbia: University of South Carolina.

Alperin, D. (1982, March). Field experience for the undergraduate of the 80s: A need for differential goals. Paper presented at the Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education, New York, NY.

Alperin, D. (1985). Hospice social work: Support for generalist training. Social Work In Health Care, 10, 119-122.

Alperin, D. (1985, June). Hospice social work: Functions and skills. Paper presented at the Social Work Clinical Study Tour of the Soviet Union, Krasnodar, U.S.S.R.

Alperin, D. (1988). The physically disabled BSW student: Implications for field education. Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 2, 99-111.

Alperin, D. (1989). Confidentiality and the BSW field work placement process. Journal of Social Work Education, 25, 98-108.

Alperin, D. (1992). Family services agencies: Responding to change in a conservative decade. Families In Society, 73, 32-39.

Alperin,D. (1993). Family service agency personnel profiles in the 1980s: Implications for leadership and practice. Families In Society, 74, 232-239.

Alperin,D. (1993). Family service agencies: Responding to need in the 1980s. Social Work, 38, 597-602.

Alperin,D. (1994,March). Designing and implementing the integrative seminar. Paper presented at the Second National Child Welfare Conference, HHS, Arlington, VA.

Alperin,D. (1995,February). The (new/continuing) Partnership Newsletter and some tentative results of research on barriers to partnerships. Paper presented at the Third National Child Welfare Conference, HHS, Arlington, VA.

Alperin,D. et al (1989,March). The relationship between the professional community and the schools of social work. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference on Professional Social Work Development, Florida NASW, Tampa, FL.

Alperin,D. et al (1990,June). Ethical issues in child abuse and neglect. Paper presented for Everglades and Central Florida AHEC, Belle Glade and Sanford, FL.

Alperin,D. et al (1993,April). Healthy schools and healthy communities: Implications for universities. Paper presented at a Conference on Healthy Learners, Healthy Schools and Healthy Communities, Institute on Children and Families at Risk, Miami,FL.

Alperin,D. & Gray,S. (1986,March). Multidimensional demands on field education: Synthesizing and selecting field models. Faculty Development Institute presented at the Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Miami, FL.

Alperin,D., Gray,S. & Wik,R. (1990). Two models of social work field education: A multidimensional view. The Clinical Supervisor, 8, 5-18.

Alperin,D. & Richie,N. (1986). The hospice administrator as counselor. The Hospice Journal, 2, 71-78.

Alperin,D. & Richie,N. (1988). Social services in continuing/life care communities. Arete, 13, 29-34.

Alperin,D. & Richie,N. (1989). Community-based AIDS service organizations: Challenges and educational preparation. Health and Social Work, 14, 165-173.

Alperin,D. & Richie,N. (1990). Continuing/life care facilities and the continuum of care. Journal of Housing for the Elderly, 6, 125-130.

Alperin,D. & Richie,N. (1991). Comprehensive care in community-based AIDS services agencies. AIDS Patient Care, 5, 252-254.

Alperin,D., Zare,N., & Cowan,A. (1986). Is quality field education a matter of academic credentials? The Clinical Supervisor, 4, 121-127.

Council on Social Work Education Ad Hoc Technical Assistance Committee on Field Instruction (1985,February). CSWE's role in current issues and future directions in field instruction. Paper presented at the Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education, Washington DC.

Gray,S., Alperin,D., & Wik,R. (1989). Multidimensional expectations of student supervision in social work. The Clinical Supervisor, 7, 89-102.

Greenfield,W., Alperin,D., & Madden,L. (1981,October). Self-help amongst South Florida migrants. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Conference on Professional Social Work Development, Florida NASW, St. Petersburg,FL.

Richie,N. & Alperin,D. (1989). Work force characteristics of continuing/life care administrators: Implications for teaching and counseling. The Journal of Health Administration Education, 7, 70-76.

Richie,N. & Alperin,D. (1991). Characteristics, functions, and skills of AIDS agency administrators: Curriculum implications. The Journal of Health Administration Education, 9, 35-43.

Richie,N. & Alperin,D. (1992). Innovation and change in the human services. Springfield,ILL: C.C. Thomas.