



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

1977-01-01

0001-0001

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Fieldwork Supervisors as Adult Educators in
Geriatric and Gerontological Settings

Margaret LeBrun

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

March 1993

© Margaret LeBrun, 1993



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Author's name

Author's name

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-84711-5

Canada

ABSTRACT

Fieldwork Supervisors as Adult Educators in Geriatric and Gerontological Settings

Margaret LeBrun

An increasingly large population of elders living to four score years and more has prompted a call for educational institutions to prepare more professionals and paraprofessionals to work with elders. This study investigated adult education processes in fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings in the Montreal Island area.

A two-part questionnaire formed the first step of a triangulation research methodology. Forty fieldwork supervisors responded whose group scores supported a collaborative teaching-learning mode as conceptualized by Gary J. Conti's central principles of adult learning. From the forty respondents, four supervisors working in a variety of agencies serving elders were selected for deeper inquiry through interviews and observations, forming the second and third triangulation steps.

The interview and observation findings showed additional support for a collaborative mode of teaching-learning. An incongruency between the survey results and the interview and observation findings was linked to emergent contextual fieldwork factors associated with experiential learning. Two other emergent factors were examined as a function of adult education occurring outside traditional classrooms.

In this study fieldwork settings were a significant variable in determining the transactive nature of teaching and learning. Future research of adult education processes is recommended for other professional fieldwork settings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We shall not cease from exploration And the end
of all our exploring Will be to arrive where we
started

And know the place for the first time.

... *T.S. Eliot*

This personal odyssey was made possible by many people: Dr. Gary J. Conti of Montana State University who so generously shared The Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) including the computer commands, Barbara Thomlison of the University of Calgary for allowing me to adapt the Demographic Data Sheet, the fieldwork supervisors who responded to the survey questionnaire, the fieldwork supervisors who were interviewed, their agencies, the students who were observed with their supervisors and their educational institutions. My deepest appreciation goes to all.

Many thanks also go to colleagues Aida Vidzer, Mona Rutenberg, Monique Koven, Sheryl Leibner-Besner, Anne-Marie Kyte and Marcy Dudkiewicz whose reflections and suggestions were invaluable.

To Riva Heft, "merci milles fois" for encouraging me to endure the ambiguity of this journey.

Finally, without the unconditional love and support of my family this work could not have been accomplished. Thank you: husband, Keith; children, Kim, John, Susan, Nancy, Jason, Jane; granddaughters, Emily, Elsie and Sarah; and mother, Winifred.

Margaret LeBrun

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter I. FIELD OF INQUIRY	1
The Problem	1
The Purpose of the Study	4
Theoretical Framework of this Research	4
Research Questions	6
Definition of Terms	7
Limitations of the Study	8
Chapter II. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction	10
Adult Education Major Concepts	10
Educational Concepts in Social Service Settings	17
Collaborative Teaching-Learning Mode in Fieldwork Supervision	23
Chapter III. PROCEDURE	28
Introduction	28
Purpose and Focus of Study	28
Research Method	30
Research Design: Case Study	31
Triangulation Strategies	31
First Strategy: Survey	31
Second Strategy: Case Study Interviews	33
Third Strategy: Case Study Observations	35
Sample Selection	36
Instrumentation	38
The Survey Instrument	38
The Interview Guide	43
The Observation Guide	44
Data Collection	45
Data Analysis	49
Statistical Analysis of the Survey	49
Analysis of the Interview and Observation Transcripts	50

Chapter IV: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND	
INTERPRETATION OF DATA	53
Introduction	53
The Survey Analysis and Findings	54
The Principle of Adult Learning Scale	
(PALS) Data	54
Demographic Data	59
Summary of Survey Analysis and Findings .	63
Analyses and Findings of the Four Cases . . .	66
Introduction	66
Case A: Fieldwork Supervision in a	
Senior's Community Service Agency	67
The Interview Data Analysis	68
The Observations Data Analysis	72
Emergent Findings	78
Case B: Fieldwork Supervision in a	
Seniors' Residence	81
The Interview Data Analysis	82
The Observations Data Analysis	87
Emergent Findings	95
Case C: Fieldwork Supervision in an Adult	
Day Center	98
The Interview Data Analysis	99
The Observations Data Analysis	104
Emergent Findings	109
Case D: Fieldwork Supervision in a	
Hospital	111
The Interview Data Analysis	112
The Observations Data Analysis	117
Emergent Findings	125
Conclusion	127
 Chapter V: DISCUSSION	 128
Introduction	128
Discussion of Findings	128
Survey Findings: The Principles of Adult	
Learning Scale	128
Survey Findings: Demographic Data Sheet .	133
Discussion of Findings: The Four Case	
Studies	134
Implications of Fieldwork Supervision as Adult	
Education	142
Implications of the Study for Fieldwork	
Supervision in Geriatric and	
Gerontological Settings	144
Contributions of the Study	147
Extending the use of Conti's Principles	
of Adult Learning Scale	147
Future Research	148
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 150

APPENDICES

Appendix A	
The Survey Package	156
Correspondence Accompanying the Survey	156
Demographic Data Sheet	158
Principles of Adult Learning Scale Answer Sheet	160
Principles of Adult Learning Scale by Gary J. Conti	161
Appendix B	
Letter of Permission from Gary J. Conti, author of Principles of Adult Learning Scale	164
Original Principles of Adult Learning Scale	165
Appendix C	
Letter of Permission from Barbara Thomlison, an author of the Parts I and II of a Study entitled <u>Trends and Issues in the Field Preparation of Social Work Manpower</u>	167
Original Demographic Data Sheet	168
Appendix D	
Letters of Permission for Participation in the Study	173
Appendix E	
The Principles of Adult Learning Scale Forty-Four Items Listed by Factor	189
Appendix F	
Interview Guide	194
Appendix G	
Observation Guide	201
Appendix H	
Peer Check Schedule	202
Appendix I	
Member Check Schedule	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Fieldwork Supervisor (N=40) Scores and Normative Scores for PALS	55
2. Fieldwork Supervisor Factor Scores . .	59
3. Summary of Ages of the On-Site Fieldwork Supervisors	60
4. Summary of Fieldwork Supervisors' Academic Levels	61
5. Summary of the Fieldwork Supervision Settings	62
6. Summary of Years of Experience in Fieldwork Supervision	62

Chapter I

FIELD OF INQUIRY

The Problem

This century has witnessed a globally changing picture of aging populations with increasing proportions of people living to old age (Chappell, 1990: 8). Canadians born in 1960 can anticipate living at least twenty years longer than those born in 1900. In Canada old age at 65 years and over is primarily defined by legislation on old age security payments and by societal norms for retirement. Current low birth rates, the post-World War II "baby boom" and technological advances leading to greater longevity than in the past are held mainly responsible for the changing demographics. By the year 2031 the proportion of elderly Canadians is expected to peak at 20 per cent.

Furthermore, Statistics Canada (Stone and Fletcher, 1986: 1) predict a dramatic growth rate of 4% for people in their 80s and 90s in the last decade of this century. By the year 2031 almost 45 per cent of Canadian elders will have reached 75 years or more (Chappell, 1990: 11), a time in life often demarcated by chronic illnesses and physical limitations.

In Gerontologist Ken Dychtwald's (1990) optimistic view the demographic shift in population throughout North America will give rise to an augmentation of the

status of elders and to creative societal responses.

A report by the National Advisory Council on Aging (NACA) in 1988 recognized the challenge of demographic predictions by calling for the adaptation of social institutions and, in particular, for educators to ensure "excellent initial and on-going training for professionals and paraprofessionals who work directly with the elderly" (Matthews and Stryckman, 1988: 2). By 1991 NACA, with a greater sense of urgency, identified a "serious lack of education about seniors and aging" (National Advisory Council on Aging, 1991: 5) even though many more gerontology programs had been offered in Canadian educational institutions throughout the 1980s. NACA recommended that health and human service fields should make concerted efforts to include education about elders and aging processes in their current training programs.

In human service professions including those in geriatric and gerontological areas, on-site fieldwork supervisors play a vital role in developing competencies among adult students (Munson, 1984: 1). As educators, fieldwork supervisors are role models offering guidance and support as they engage students in teaching and learning processes.

Students enrolled in fieldwork in the Montreal area represent a variety of human service departments of educational institutions which include special care

counselling, social counselling, leisure studies, gerontology, exercise science, family life education and adult education. Their field experiences often occur in geriatric and gerontological settings which provide contexts for applying a knowledge base, and developing proficiencies and professional attitudes for working with elders. The educational orientation and fields of study of some fieldwork supervisors is the same as their students, as is the case in most social work fieldwork. Yet many geriatric and gerontological fieldwork supervisors are required to train students from a variety of educational institutions and fields of study each with its own philosophy and educational objectives.

The matching educational backgrounds of supervisors and students surfaced as an issue in a study prepared for the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (Kimberley and Watt, 1982: 110). On a positive note, it was found that the expansion of social work training into non-traditional areas broadened the employment scope of social work. However, this was outweighed by the limitations of fieldwork supervisors untrained in the philosophy and objectives of social work.

A unifying factor for examining fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings may be provided through the framework of adult education. Concepts of adult education contain elements of design

which are "deliberate, systematic and sustained" over time (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 6). The field is based on a humanistic philosophy in which adult learners engage in experiential, learner-centered activities. Adult education is not confined to the field of education but is often evident in related human services fields and "can never be reduced to any single purpose or function other than the broadest commitment to human and societal development" (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 30).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings using concepts of collaborative teaching and learning for adult learners to support the view that on-site fieldwork supervision is a form of adult education contributing to the competencies of future workers in practical work settings. This study was based on information from fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings within a variety of human service agencies located on Montreal Island.

Theoretical Framework of this Research

The focus of this study was guided by concepts of adult education, particularly those of Cyril O. Houle, Malcolm Knowles, Alan Knox, David Kolb and Stephen

Brookfield. Literature on educational supervision in social work was used generically to illuminate the application of adult education concepts within a variety of human service agencies. Educational supervision in social work was mainly illustrated by Alfred Kadushin, Louis Lowy, and Marion Bogo and Elaine Vayda.

The extensive array of providing agencies is reflective of adult education practices in North America where programs and settings identified as typical by adult educators are "bewilderingly wide ranging" (Brookfield, 1988: 14) and where adult education may be provided by people whose occupations decree education, training or supervision of others as a secondary concern (Boshier: 1985: 6).

Given the expectations of the variety of institutions placing students in fieldwork, on-site geriatric and gerontological fieldwork supervisors assume an important role in educating potential and current workers with elders. To Houle (1972: 97) tutorial teaching and learning in a supervision dyad is a dynamic interactional encounter involving direct confrontation. The teaching and learning roles in the dyad may be predetermined by the supervisor or may spontaneously evolve according to the needs of the situation (Houle, 1972: 100).

Malcolm Knowles (1980: 135) applied adult education concepts to situations beyond classroom settings. In

discussing teaching and learning undertaken within a supervision format, he identified a transformation in the perception of supervisors as mainly interested in governing the behavior of subordinates. In a new vision supervisors have become facilitators and resources in the self-development of learners.

Louis Lowy examined teaching and learning processes (1983: 61) noting the exemplary contribution made by social work supervision models for training in other human service professions in several European countries. He suggested transferring the concept of "generic supervision" to North America.

For purposes of this study a social work generic supervision model was employed to illustrate fieldwork supervision in other human service fields in geriatric and gerontological settings: a seniors' residence, a seniors' community organization, an adult day center and a hospital geriatric unit.

Research Questions

Research questions in this study focussed on a collaborative mode of teaching and learning as identified by Gary J. Conti from among the writings of many adult education leaders including Cyril Houle, Malcolm Knowles and Alan Knox. Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (1985) contains seven factors which form the basic components of a collaborative teaching-

learning mode: 1) learner-centered activities;
2) personalizing instruction; 3) relating to experience;
4) assessing students needs; 5) climate building;
6) participation in the learning process; and
7) flexibility for personal development.

Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (1985) provided a framework for the triangulation research methodology of this study.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the terms "adult educator" and "fieldwork supervisor" will be defined as follows:

Adult Educator

Brookfield (1988: 19) categorizes adult educator functions into four basic roles: teaching, program development, training and human resource development, and community action. The role of a teacher in adult education may be defined "in its broader sense to denote anyone who directly facilitates learning" (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 17). To Brookfield (1988: 20) a teaching role in adult education may be described as "facilitator" and as "critical analyst". The facilitator role embodies supportive, nurturing attributes and the critical analyst challenges learners to consider alternative ways of thinking and acting.

For purposes of this study an adult educator will be defined as a teacher in the roles of facilitator and critical analyst.

Fieldwork Supervisor

In social work the terms "fieldwork supervisor", "field teacher", "field instructor" and "supervisor" have often been used interchangeably, particularly in agencies where training for student and novice social workers traditionally has been provided through supervision. Dastyk-Blackmore's (1982:75-80) comparison of field teachers and supervisors outlines the functions of both roles: a field teacher is primarily concerned with a student's ability to integrate theory and practice according to criteria set by an educational institution whereas a supervisor's main function is as a tutor, facilitator and trainer of work-related knowledge as set by the agency with the criteria determined by clients' needs. For purposes of this study a fieldwork supervisor is one who incorporates the functions of a field instructor and a supervisor as described by Dastyk-Blackmore.

Limitations of the Study

Two limitations of this study are the researcher's own experience as a fieldwork supervisor, and the relationship between the researcher and the participating fieldwork supervisors.

The researcher of this study is a fieldwork supervisor and, therefore, has not been an outsider with a detached stance in examining the issue of on-site teaching and learning processes in fieldwork supervision. She is aware of a possible bias in the interpretation of the results of the interviews and observations over which she had control. However, the integrity of the study has been strengthened by the use of triangulation, ongoing member checks and peer checks.

In addition, the researcher was acquainted with many of the survey respondents including the four fieldwork supervisors participating in interviews and observations of this study. She recognizes that the interviewer-respondent relationship can be a strength or limitation in determining the quality of an interview (Merriam, 1988: 86). In response to the intimacy of the personal interaction, respondents may give misleading or dubious information, consciously or not, and create an "observer effect" (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 109). To reduce the possibility of this effect the researcher discussed her concerns regarding this issue with each of the participants interviewed and observed for the case studies.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study seeks to understand some adult education processes of supervising and training future non-medical gerontology workers within geriatric and gerontological fieldwork settings. The literature review in this chapter will encompass concepts of adult education and educational fieldwork supervision in social service settings which support a collaborative mode of teaching and learning.

Adult Education Major Concepts

One of the major tasks of fieldwork supervisors is to structure learning situations for students to create a link between processes of education and personal experiences. Philosopher John Dewey's "principle of interaction" (Houle, 1984: 6; Gitterman and Miller, 1977: 104) suggests an interactive dynamic between the learner and the subject to be learned that lends itself to fieldwork. He proposed that learning is more meaningful when the subject matter can be experienced personally by the learner rather than remain in the realm of abstraction (Gitterman, 1972: 27). Dewey saw the teacher as neither strictly authoritarian nor totally permissive. The teacher creates a climate which encourages learning and is open to learning from the

student. The teacher organizes, implements and evaluates the educational process in a mutually cooperative teaching-learning relationship with the student (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 56) and in a manner that fosters student interaction with the environment (Gitterman, 1972: 27).

Dewey's view of the transactive nature of experience and learning was later expanded by adult educators to include experiential learning that occurs in and beyond the boundaries of the classroom. David Kolb and Ronald Fry (1975: 33 and 43) incorporated learning concepts of Kurt Lewin and Jean Piaget in addition to Dewey's and proposed a model of individual learning styles. Effective experiential learning includes: 1) concrete experiences where an unbiased learner becomes immersed in new experiences which form the basis for 2) reflective observation in order to expand one's perspective; this allows for 3) abstract conceptualization to form rational theories for solving problems and making decisions for proceeding with 4) active experimentation.

Fry and Kolb (1979: 81) have identified four parallel learning environments which enhance a particular mode of learning. They are: 1) an affective environment supporting concrete experiences; 2) a symbolic environment encouraging abstract conceptualization; 3) a perceptual environment focussing

on reflective observation; and 4) a behavioral environment oriented to action and the consequences of that action. Fieldwork supervision might be categorized by Kolb (1979: 83) as primarily taking place within a behavioral learning environment with the teacher assuming a coaching role and the learner being compelled to accept responsibility for the aftermath of his or her actions.

Kolb has provided a model for an educational approach based on experiential learning which informs and orients the Department of Applied Social Science at Concordia University in Montreal, along with theoretical conceptualizations of others. Some of these as cited by D. Markiewicz (1984: 5) are: R. Chin and K. Benne, 1976; H.G. Dimock, 1976; and R.D. McDonald, 1981. In essence, the department stresses "approaches to action, and the most central theories or conceptual frames of reference deal with the change-process and intervention at each of these levels". Participation and learning through experience are required of students who take responsibility for and have a stake in their own learning. Emphasis is placed on open communication, the development of trust between people and a cooperative relationship between instructors and students. Field experiences are an integral part of the learner's development within the department.

Donald Brundage and Dorothy MacKeracher (1980: 2)

prepared a report on adult learning principles for the Ontario Ministry of Education which specifically centers on individual as opposed to group learning and which has implications for fieldwork supervision. One of the principles they identified (1980: 114) is that learning which results from interactions between instructor and learner is facilitated when both share in assuming responsibility for planning, carrying out and evaluating learning experiences in a trusting, responsive atmosphere. They suggest that an effective instructor relinquishes some control over the teaching process and becomes a learner as well. The supervisor-student dyad does imply a level of interaction and may result in an interdependent learning relationship.

Fieldwork in education may be understood from other educational perspectives. Cyril O. Houle (1972: 44) has categorized learning into eleven "educational design situations" ranging from individual, group, and institutional activities to mass audience activities. To Houle (1972: 97) teaching-learning in an individual supervisory situation reaches its zenith in tutorial teaching where direct confrontation heightens the interdependence of the supervisor and learner dyad. Both supervisor and learner engage in an evolutionary process characterized by an element of risk-taking (Houle, 1972: 99; Houle, 1984: 192). It begins with the supervisor taking cognizance of a learner's abilities

and requirements, and carefully guiding the individual through a series of steps. It concludes with the learner discovering his or her own unique abilities. Throughout the process the supervisor offers the learner a balance of challenge and support. Toward the end of the learning situation, the roles of tutor and learner are blended as interaction increases.

Another classification which might inform fieldwork supervision was developed by Brian Groombridge (1983: 15). He reduced Houle's eleven categories to three modes of study: 1) prescriptive or traditional schooling, 2) personal or popular and 3) partnership between teacher and learner. A partnership mode encompasses a tutor-learner relationship: decisions for learning are negotiated between teachers and learners, and academic scholarship and life experience are equally valued sources of knowledge.

While Houle has focussed on the connection of adult education to educational establishments (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 230), others like Malcolm Knowles have stressed the role of informal adult education as a community force for social change. Nevertheless, Knowles (1972: 32-39) has extended his views on adult education to include social work instruction emphasizing the role of experience and a problem-centered orientation to learning. He recommends the creation of flexible, supportive educational environments conducive

to the development of competencies among student social workers. Given the appropriate conditions of learning Knowles (1980: 135) expects the supervisor-learner dyadic relationship to progress in a cooperative effort toward that of facilitator and self-directed learner.

Stephen Brookfield has explored both facilitation and self-direction in learning. He sees facilitating learning as a "transactional encounter" (1987: 97) or a negotiation of both the learner's definition of learning needs and the facilitator's ideas on content and methods of instruction. Supervisor and learner in such an encounter challenge and inspire one another. Learning is also facilitated by a "responsive" (Brookfield, 1991: 24) instructor who is aware of the context of the teaching-learning experience and who inspires critical thinking among learners.

Self-directed learning according to Brookfield (1987: 67) is not necessarily the most effective learning style for all adults, nor can successful self-directed learners be identified by commonly-held characteristics (1987: 44). However, several studies have shown that adults who are competent in self-directed learning generally locate their learning within social contexts and respond to the influence of other people who model skills and provide knowledge. In this sense, fieldwork supervision encompasses ideals of self-directed learning for both supervisor and learner.

Alan B. Knox (1986: 142) also has discussed instructor responsiveness with reference to learner needs and motives. Three methods for helping adults learn are instruction, inquiry and performance. Supervision within a performance method of instruction enables the learner to strive for a high behavioral level which can be replicated. The learner performs in an actual work setting and reflects upon the experience in cooperation with a supervisor or instructor before taking more action. In addition the supervisor delineates standards and reasons for performance. Knox suggests that instructors and learners mutually design a "practice audit" (1986: 189) by deciding on essential steps to achieve desired performance levels. The steps may include setting standards of performance, identifying units of behaviour for improvement and analysis, comparing the behaviour with the criteria set by the standards to ascertain learning gaps, evaluating the behaviour and reapplying new learnings to future performances. The instructor uses a variety of methods and materials (Knox, 1986: 199) to facilitate learning in a supportive environment.

The setting for educational fieldwork and the primary occupation of the instructor help to shape educational outcomes. Adult education can occur in a variety of settings with instructors recruited from many occupations and fields of study (Boshier, 1985: 3).

There are agencies where adult education is 1) a main function; 2) a secondary function such as a university; 3) an allied function such as a community agency; or 4) a subordinate function only used to enhance that agency's special concerns. Agencies whose "primacy" of professional concern is not adult education often cannot allow time for extensive training outside the workplace unless it is specifically related to the primary occupational role of the worker (Boshier, 1985: 10). Furthermore, adult educators in part time secondary professional roles may be unaware of any affiliation with a world-wide group of adult educators even though their contributions are substantial to agencies and communities. Adult education in fieldwork supervision in human service organizations usually occurs as allied or subordinate functions.

The major educational concepts discussed in this section include: experiential learning; affective learning climates; individualized learning; tutorial teaching in a partnership mode; participation of both instructor and learner in an interactive, interdependent learning situation; ideals of facilitation, self-direction and responsiveness within a performance mode of instruction; and the role of non-traditional settings and providers of instruction in adult education.

Educational Concepts in Social Service Settings

The literature review in this section is based on

several premises: 1) that fieldwork is a valuable component of a student's education; 2) that educational concepts in social work supervision can be transferred to other human service fields; and 3) that writings on social work supervision contain references to adult education concepts.

The fieldwork experience of a student's education is seen as essential to the development of proficiencies in many of the helping professions (Munson, 1984: 1). Indeed, social work students have rated fieldwork as the most meaningful component of the teaching and learning process (Siporin, 1982: 175; Rotholz and Werk, 1984: 25). Sheafor and Jenkins (1982: x) name it "a fully legitimate and respectable form of education" where the blending of both social work and educational concepts occurs. More than an apprenticeship model, fieldwork endeavors to link classroom theoretical knowledge to practical everyday experiences which inculcate social work proficiencies and professionalism in novice workers (Jenkins and Sheafor, 1982: 4; George, 1982: 55). The centrality of the student's educational development is underlined by the teaching stance of the fieldwork supervisor.

"Front-line" supervision in other human service fields also requires models of educational approaches to shape the teaching or instructional component of supervision (Speers, 1990: 15). According to Louis Lowy

(1983: 61) a social work supervision model was successfully transferred to training programs in other European human service professions. Lowy (1983: 56) defines social work supervision as:

a learning and teaching process designed to incorporate and integrate the various dimensions of the professional role of social work, such as values, ethics, purposes, knowledge, methods and skills in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Concepts of teaching and learning processes have been applied to discussions of social work supervision (Alfred Kadushin, 1976; Louis Lowy, 1983; Marion Bogo and Elaine Vayda, 1987) enabling social work students to identify and develop professional competencies.

Alfred Kadushin in 1974 published some results of a nation-wide American survey of 750 professional social work supervisors and 750 supervisees. Social work functions directly related to learning were identified by the majority of the respondents as most important. Kadushin (1974: 296) noted the increasingly expanded supervisory roles assumed by graduate professional social workers and called for more research on supervision processes.

In a later work Kadushin (1976) separated social work supervision into three major categories: administrative, educational and supportive. He recognized the educational component as a supervisor's major role (1976: 126). He also viewed learning as a

creative experience guided by some general principles: 1) the supervisor motivates learning by using teachable moments to challenge the preconceptions of unmotivated students (1976: 131); 2) learning becomes the focal point in educational supervision in a supportive, flexible environment where clearly stated expectations are mutually agreed upon (1976: 135); 3) the active participation of a learner involves engagement with the learning content through experience, discussion, feedback and opportunities for further action (1976: 142); 4) effective learning is meaningfully presented in a variety of ways (1976: 144); and 5) learning is individualized when the student's uniqueness as a learner is taken into account (1976: 145). Moreover, in a positive relationship the supervisor serves as a role model for a student to emulate in his or her own work (1976: 148).

Concepts of adult education espoused by Malcolm Knowles have been influential in the field of social work. In a 1971 speech on social work education, Knowles (1972: 33) introduced a learner-centered approach to teaching social work. A subsequent social work training program based on Knowles assumptions (Gelfand, 1975: 55) indicated that a participative style of learning was the preferred method of training. Since then Louis Lowy (1983: 60) has proposed a phase theory of social work supervision integrating Knowles's

conceptual framework of adult education. Social work supervision is seen as a teaching and learning process. Emphasis is placed on a supportive learning climate and a collaborative relationship where supervisor and student clarify common expectations and share in preparing an educational contract.

Knowles's influence has carried over to fieldwork supervision instructional approaches. The University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work employed a model for training novice social work supervisors using Knowles's basic assumptions and blending it with a short-term "sequencing structure" (Hersh, 1984: 36). This model suggests that adults are apt to be problem-centered rather than subject-centered in their approach to learning; that they are interested in the immediate application of learning; that adult learners are increasingly self-directed; that adults' prior experiences are valuable resources for learning; and that adults are ready to learn in order to satisfy their developmental needs.

Bogo and Vayda have transferred some adult education concepts developed by Knowles (1987: 29) to social work field education. They cite a dynamic teaching-learning dyad of supervisor and student actively engaged in experiential learning. In an informal, mutually respectful learning climate, social work competencies are developed through diagnosing

learning needs, formulating objectives, designing activities, participating in learning experiences, evaluating learning and re-diagnosing further required competencies. A collaborative teaching-learning mode contributes to problem-solving, action and analysis of experience.

Bogo and Vayda (1987: 2) also have adapted Kolb's four-point model of individual learning, 1) concrete experience, 2) reflective observation, 3) abstract conceptualization, and 4) active experimentation explicitly for social work fieldwork supervision. From it they developed the I.T.P. (Integration of Theory and Practice) loop of retrieval, reflection, linkage and professional response. Beginning with retrieval of practical experience, a student notes his or her role as a participant in a situation and observes the context of the experience. Both supervisor and student reflect on the efficacy of the retrieved practice and some possible influences on the recalled facts to develop self-awareness in the student. Then they seek linkages to social work knowledge or theories to illuminate appropriate professional responses. This model reminds both fieldwork supervisor and student, especially when they become comfortable in their roles, of the value of reflection and of making connections to an existing knowledge base as they strive to develop social work competencies outside of the classroom.

Professionalism and competencies among social work students in field placements may be promoted with attention to students as adult learners. Some basic tenets of adult education are found among Susanna J. Wilson's guiding principles (1981: 92-94) which include: learner participation in planning learning experiences, critical responsiveness to student needs, individualizing the learning by building on students' prior experiences, and creating a non-threatening climate conducive to risk-taking.

Several other factors promote effective fieldwork teaching and learning in social work. First, a tutorial model readily lends itself to the use of a wide variety of teaching methods and materials. The intimacy of a tutorial dyad in supervision based on direct experiences enhances the integration of theoretical knowledge and practice, and the development of professional attitudes (Shafer, 1982: 219). Another factor is the conscious use of knowledge and reflection as indispensable to integration of learning experiences on both affective and cognitive levels (Chambers and Spano, 1982: 226). Furthermore, an "educational diagnosis" of a student's strengths and limitations is required to facilitate and individualize learning (Dea, Grist and Myli, 1982: 240).

Collaborative Teaching-Learning Mode in Fieldwork Supervision

The literature review clearly gives evidence of

the relevance in fieldwork supervision to concepts in adult education and in educational social work supervision. The concepts are closely aligned with those described by Gary J. Conti (1978; 1979; 1983; 1985 and 1989) as operating in a collaborative teaching-learning mode.

Conti developed the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) in 1978. Based on the thinking of prominent adult education leaders including Houle, Knowles and Knox (Conti: 1979: 3), it measures the degree of support a fieldwork supervisor might have for a collaborative mode of teaching and learning.

Conti (1985: 11 and 1989: 15) also suggests that the use of PALS represents a shift from determining a "best" teaching style in professional development to assessing the "internal consistency" of a teacher's style.

To date PALS has been used in over thirty doctoral dissertations. A study in 1986 showed that field instructors from accredited graduate schools of social work in the state of Texas mainly adhered to a collaborative teaching-learning mode of adult education (Clancy, 1986: iii).

In a 1983 factor analysis the construction of the instrument was statistically validated. Seven factors emerged embodying common basic assumptions on adult learning (Conti, 1983; 1985; 1989). They are:

Factor 1: Learner Centered Activities. This factor focuses on learning as an active, as opposed to passive, activity with students taking initiative and responsibility for their own learning.

Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction. Self-paced learning is encouraged among students and a variety of methods and materials are used to suit the individual needs of students. Students participate in setting their learning objectives.

Factor 3: Relating to Prior Experience. Students' prior experiences, linking learning to everyday experiences and problem solving encourage independent, critical thinking among students.

Factor 4: Assessing Student Needs. Through individual conferences students and instructors collaborate to diagnose gaps between existing and desired levels of performance. They also develop short and long-range learning objectives.

Factor 5: Climate Building. In a physically and psychologically comfortable environment students are encouraged to interact with others, to use their existing abilities, to take risks and to accept errors as beneficial to learning.

Factor 6: Participation in the Learning Process. Students are encouraged to participate in deciding on the type and evaluation of the learning content.

Factor 7: Flexibility for Personal Development. The

teacher as a facilitator adjusts the environment and the educational objectives to address the student's changing needs. Topics relating to the student's self-concept or values are openly discussed to prompt self-awareness and personal growth.

Conti's seven factors (1985: 10) of a collaborative mode of teaching and learning are allied to philosophies of humanism and progressivism. Humanism sees personal development as the major function of education (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 46). Brookfield (1983: 150) has summarized the two humanistic assumptions bearing on adult education as:

1) Human beings are innately good and those in authority are responsible for encouraging the articulation of the goodness.

2) Human beings are born with free will. Rather than faulting genetic predispositions or learned behaviours for individual acts, human beings are morally impelled to make free choices to direct their lives.

Adult educators accepting these tenets will expect students to participate in decision-making and will assist them in the direction of responsible maturation (Brookfield, 1983: 150).

Knowles (1980: 67) was also a proponent of humanistic, democratic goals which

gives precedence to the growth of *people* over the accomplishment of *things* when these two things are in conflict. It emphasizes the release of human potential over the control of human

behavior.

Progressivism in education advocates for the growth of society as well as the development of individuals within that society (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 50). Adults' needs and ambitions emanate from the social milieu and therefore the aims of adult education cannot be separated from the needs of society as a whole.

Adult educators assume an increasingly meaningful role in the lives of people seeking to develop their potential (Knowles, 1980: 37). As change agents their influence extends beyond traditional classroom boundaries. Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale has provided a means to examine factors contributing to a collaborative mode of teaching and learning in a variety of areas including fieldwork supervision.

Chapter III

PROCEDURE

Introduction

This chapter will consider the focus of the study and the procedure in conducting the research. A discussion of the procedure followed will include the research method and design and their justification, sample selection, instrumentation, data collection and data analyses.

Focus of the Study

This study examined the extent to which fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings support collaborative instructional methods as described in adult education literature. Central principles of adult learning as articulated by Conti (1983: 63) are that the activities are learner-centered, that the student takes an active role in the learning process, that learning episodes relate to the student's experience, that the student participates in needs assessment, goal setting and evaluating outcomes, that the psychological environment empowers the student and allows for risk-taking and errors, and that the supervisor acts as a facilitator and resource person rather than as an expert holder of knowledge.

The study began by questioning forty fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings

about their perceptions of on-site instructional processes. Then the study focused on four of the fieldwork supervisors and how their supervision practices supported or not the collaborative mode as it relates to Conti's central principles of adult learning. Four different public and private agencies were selected as the settings in order to gather data from a cross section of available providers of social services to an elderly population in the Montreal community. They were: a seniors' community service agency, a seniors' low-income residential complex, an adult day center for frail elders and a geriatric unit in a general hospital. The fieldwork supervisors in these settings, in addition to their occupational responsibilities, were expected to supervise college and university students from various social service disciplines.

Educational Experience of Supervisors

At the time of the study, one of the supervisors held a Master of Arts degree in Art Therapy and was supervising a college student in recreation leadership training. Another supervisor had a Bachelor of Arts degree in Recreation Science and was supervising a part-time university student in community social sciences. And two supervisors had Bachelor of Arts degrees in Social Work; one supervised a university social work student and the other supervised a college student training to work with specialized populations.

Research Method

The case study method was chosen for this project to explore instructional methods used for training adult learners outside the classroom within a field placement setting. As an applied investigative method, the case study interprets specific situations and processes within prescribed boundaries. It is descriptive and allows for the integration of unanticipated data (Merriam, 1988: 20-21). And it seeks to preserve the unity of significant attributes of everyday real experiences (Yin, 1989: 14). For these reasons it was preferred for this project over other methods that tend to control and manipulate variables out of context and reject unexpected findings.

The credibility of the study's method was strengthened by the application of several practices suggested in the literature on qualitative studies (Guba, 1981: 80-87). These are member checks, peer checks and triangulation.

- *Member checks*, considered essential by Guba, consisted of continuously checking specific data and interpretations with each selected supervisor pertaining to her own involvement in the study.

- *Peer checks* enabled the researcher to modify case study instruments for the survey, the interviews and the observations following field tests with colleagues.

- *Triangulation* or multiple strategies were employed to collect data because in a synthesis of all methods the limitations of one counteracts the weaknesses of another and the best data from all methods surfaces (Merriam, 1988: 69). In this case the methodological triangulation combined a survey, interviews and observations.

Research Design

This section will examine reasons for using each of the three triangulation strategies stated above, as well as their limitations. The quantitative and qualitative data resulting from the three strategies all interpreted the instructional experiences of on-site fieldwork supervisors. An overview of the strategies used and specific references to the strategies will be detailed in the instrumentation section.

Triangulation Strategies

First Strategy, a Survey

Surveys are commonly used strategies in social research. In qualitative investigations they are usually used after background information has been gathered in less structured ways (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 121). A survey may justifiably be used within a case study providing that it is "embedded" within the major focus of the study and that the survey is only one of several analytical methods used in the total case

study (Yin (1989: 121). The efficacy of a survey is largely dependent on the use of questions that are relevant to the respondents and that generate the information required (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 121). The findings of a survey are provided in numerical form. The quantitative data of a survey can extend the understanding of a qualitative case study by verifying field observations, by supporting generalizations made from limited field studies or by clarifying otherwise unexplainable case study findings (Merriam, 1988: 69).

Surveys' limitations include the maintenance of physical and psychological distances from the respondents and the interpretation of data with minimum reference to the respondents' context. Surveys are also limited to measuring written information but not recording actual behavior (Merriam, 1988: 69; Yin, 1989: 96; Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 122).

In this study the survey was used to elicit data from as many on-site fieldwork supervisors as possible in geriatric and gerontological settings in one urban area and to provide a conceptual foundation upon which to build a more extensive study.

The survey used as a first strategy in this study was a questionnaire comprised of two parts: The Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) (Conti, 1978) and a Demographic Data Sheet (Kimberley, Thomlison and Watt, 1980). This questionnaire helped the researcher

to accomplish several tasks. First, the survey was a means of establishing a broad base of forty respondents from which to identify characteristics of a typical (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 81) on-site fieldwork supervisor who was able to respond to questions about educational processes. Second, from the demographic data four of the respondents who closely approximated the profile of a typical fieldwork supervisor were selected for further participation in the study. And last, the PALS seven factors identified by Conti as basic components of collaborative instructional processes provided the foundation for the interview and observation guides for the remainder of this study.

The survey in this case study was limited to measuring the extent to which forty fieldwork supervisors perceived their own instructional behaviors. Greater depth and details about the nature of instructional practices in fieldwork supervision were obtained from the four selected supervisors through the second and third triangulation strategies.

Second Strategy, Interviews

Interviews recorded on audio tapes and lasting between one and two hours were conducted with each of the four selected fieldwork supervisors as a second triangulation strategy.

Interviews form a major strategy of a case study by the collection and recording of data with persons

knowledgeable about the topic being studied. An interviewer can ask questions to clarify a viewpoint and can probe for contextual details. The semistructured interview guided by a prepared set of questions is the most commonly used form of interview in case studies (Merriam, 1988: 86). Semistructured interviews strengthen the case study method because acquisition of information can be controlled and attention can remain on the study's focus (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 109).

Interviews are limited in several ways. First, the interviewing skills and comportment of the interviewer are largely responsible for achieving a successful interview (Merriam, 1988: 86). The interviewer's approach must be guided by a clear understanding of the information required. Second, because they are interactive, interviews are more vulnerable to researcher influence on participant responses (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 109). And third, the "authenticity" of evaluations in qualitative inquiries can be distorted by inadequate recording and scrutiny of data (Guba, 1978: 62).

The seven factors identified by Conti (1985: 9) as constituting the basic components of instructional processes in facilitating adult learning provided a framework for articulating questions for the interview which were relevant to the reality of fieldwork supervisors. The questions provided a guide for the

semistructured interviews used in this study which enabled the researcher to perceive instructional practices in fieldwork supervision from the unique viewpoints of each of the four selected supervisors. However, the wording and order of the questions changed according to the reactions of the supervisors and allowed for clarification probes, refocusing and summarizing (Goetz and LeCompte, 1988: 129).

Third Strategy, Observations

Observations of supervision sessions between each of the four selected supervisors and their students formed the third strategy for obtaining data for this study.

Observations differ from interviews by occurring in natural settings compared to appointed places for interviews and by providing the researcher firsthand views of behavior in contrast to the secondhand reporting of interviewees (Merriam, 1988: 87). Nonparticipant observations were appropriate for this study because they enabled the researcher to compile detailed, descriptive accounts of behaviors (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 143-145).

A limitation of nonparticipant observations is that while it requires a detached researcher to observe and record behaviors as unobtrusively as possible, the presence of the researcher with a tape recorder does mean that some social interaction takes place.

Reactivity, even at a minimal level, can cause an "observer effect" (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 109) whereby participants, consciously or not, provide misleading or dubious information.

Conti's seven factors used in the interviews also provided a framework for observing actual behavior. Due to circumstances beyond the researcher's control, the observations were limited in time; the shortest lasted three-quarters of an hour and the longest took place over four hours. Each supervisor-student pair was observed by the researcher several times over a month; three times for two pairs and twice for two pairs. Dialogues between supervisors and students during the observations were recorded on audio tape while the researcher made notes.

The "observer effect" did occur when one of the supervisors joked with her student several times about the audio tape recording.

Sample Selection

The participants in the case study formed two distinctive samples: 1) a group of forty (N=40) survey respondents from which to extrapolate attributes of a "typical" fieldwork supervisor and, 2) a selected sample of four (N=4) "typical" fieldwork supervisors who were willing and able to be interviewed and observed for further exploration of instructional processes in

fieldwork supervision.

The First Sample (N=40)

The first step of the design procedure was to create a foundation for the study by eliciting as many responses as possible from on-site fieldwork supervisors working with an elderly population in the Montreal Island area. For this sample selection, the Committee of Geriatric Coordinators based in the area under study was the first organization to be approached. Its members work in a wide variety of public and private agencies. However, only some members of this group supervised students and could respond to the questionnaire. Many other fieldwork supervisors were not members of this Committee and had to be approached separately.

To facilitate access to these supervisors letters of intention and introduction from the researcher's educational institution and place of work, respectively, accompanied the survey questionnaire (Appendix A). For reasons unknown to the researcher some agencies made the questionnaire available to only a few selected supervisors and in other instances, of those fieldwork supervisors who were reached, not all were able to respond.

A total of 73 survey packages were distributed. Of the 40 usable responses to the survey questionnaire,

only 23 respondents chose to identify themselves.

The Second Sample (N=4)

For the second sample (N=4), the sampling strategy was "purposive" or "criterion-based" (Merriam, 1988: 48). From the 23 known respondents, four were selected because they met most of the criteria for typical fieldwork supervisors determined by the survey results: they were female supervisors with a bachelor of arts degree or more, they each had two to five years of supervision experience and were currently supervising adult students and they worked mainly with an elderly population. In addition, they worked in four of the major settings identified through the survey, that is, a community social-recreational agency, a seniors' residence, a hospital and an adult day center.

The four selected supervisors agreed to be interviewed and observed by the researcher but they chose to remain anonymous for the remainder of the study.

Instrumentation

This section will examine the instrumentation used in the three parts of the study design: the survey, the interviews and the observations.

The Survey Instrument: Principles of Adult Learning Scale and Demographic Data Sheet

The survey employed a two-part self-administered questionnaire consisting of the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) (Appendix A) and a Demographic Data Sheet (Appendix A).

Principles of Adult Learning Scale

The researcher obtained permission from the author of PALS, Gary J. Conti, to use his survey instrument (Appendix B). Developed in 1978 it uses a six point modified Likert scale to rate forty-four items in determining the frequency and extent to which the respondents act in a collaborative mode when instructing adult learners. Items were positively and negatively formulated and scoring key adjustments were made. PALS scores range from 0 to 220 with a normed mean of 146 and a standard deviation of 20. High scores indicate learner-centered, initiating behaviors while low scores reflect teacher-centered, reactive behaviors. PALS can be completed in less than fifteen minutes (Conti, 1989: 6). The construction of PALS is based only on adult education literature and the normative scores were established with adult education practitioners (Conti, 1985: 222), making it the most suitable instrument to measure the frequency and degree to which fieldwork supervisors adhere to principles of adult learning as reflected in a collaborative mode of supervising students.

The total PALS score can be reduced to seven

factors which the author defines as basic components of a teaching-learning interaction (Conti, 1983). The factors are (Conti, 1989: 10-11):

Factor 1, Learner-Centered Activities. The twelve items in this factor focus on the learner and learner-centered activities. The instructor's behavior encourages students taking responsibility for their own learning.

Factor 2, Personalizing Instruction. This factor contains nine items. The uniqueness of the student determines learning objectives, instructional methods and materials, and self-pacing of the student.

Factor 3, Relating to Experience. When they adhere to the six items in this factor, instructors help students link prior experience to new learning and relate learning episodes to everyday problems the student may encounter. Learning experiences filtered through such a process tend to nurture student independence.

Factor 4, Assessing Student Needs. The four items concentrate on conferences and informal counseling which enable instructors to discover students' learning needs. Students are helped to identify gaps between their goals and existing level of performance. Instructors and students participate in determining short-range and long-range objectives to address the rediagnosed learning needs.

Factor 5, Climate Building. This factor consists of four items. In an informal, accepting environment, students are encouraged to utilize competencies they already possess, to take risks and to view their errors as essential steps to learning.

Factor 6, Participation in the Learning Process. Four items make up this factor. Instructors expect students to be involved in deciding on the learning content and the criteria for evaluation. Students are encouraged to identify problems for solving.

Factor 7, Flexibility for Personal Development. This factor consists of five items. The instructor serves as a facilitator rather than as an expert in providing knowledge. Acting as a resource person with a flexible approach the instructor can respond to unexpected needs of students.

Since PALS was developed in 1978, statistical and interpretive data have proven its validity and reliability. Construct validity of the forty-four PALS items was initially established by the testimony of ten well-known professors in adult education (Conti, 1979: 6) and later verified by factor analysis (Conti, 1983). Content validity was established by field-testing and criterion validity was confirmed by comparing PALS to the Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories which also measures initiating and responsive behaviors (Conti, 1979: 9). In addition, the social desirability of each

of the forty-four items in PALS was tested (Conti, 1978: 106), as well as the clarity of item interpretation (Conti, 1978: 111-112).

PALS reliability was first established by the test-retest method (Conti, 1978: 105) and later substantiated by an analysis of data gathered from a wider sample of adult educators than the pilot group (Conti, 1982: 143).

PALS was originally designed for classroom use but it has been used in over thirty doctoral theses and by many adult educators in a variety of settings.

In an earlier study of graduate social work field instructors, minor word changes were made in eight of the forty-four items to adapt PALS to the population being studied (Clancy, 1986: 45).

The researcher in this current case study modified ten of the forty-four items with written permission from the PALS author, Gary J. Conti (Appendix B), to make it more suitable for on-site fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings. These items were: 1, 10, 13, 15, 26, 27, 28, 35, 37 and 40 (Appendix A). The modified PALS instrument's reliability was later retested. A Cronbach alpha statistical calculation found a 0.80 degree of reliability.

Demographic Data Sheet

The Demographic Data Sheet used in the survey portion of the case study (Appendix A) was an adapted version of Parts I and II of a questionnaire (Thomlison,

Watt and Kimberley, 1982) used in a previous study in a related discipline. Formal permission was received from one of the authors for its use (Appendix C). The original instrument was pilot-tested by fifteen key informant field instructors and modifications were made.

In this study the Demographic Data Sheet was used to inform the researcher on content but the language and format was changed to reflect the population. Questions oriented to social work were deemed inappropriate for this study and were deleted. The addition of two questions made the questionnaire more relevant to the study at hand: one question asked if supervision took place with adult learners and the other question asked if the training of students involved working with an elderly population.

The adapted PALS questionnaire and the adapted Demographic Data Sheet formed the case survey portion of this study. It was subjected to a peer check (Appendix H) by three experienced on-site fieldwork supervisors who at that time were not supervising students and who agreed to field test the survey. Feedback was addressed by modifying the aesthetics, the order of the sheets and by citing Conti as the author of PALS.

The Interview Guide

The instrument for the semistructured interviews with the fieldwork supervisors was a set of open-ended questions based on the seven factors related to PALS.

Each factor was broken down into subheadings (Appendix E) and questions for each subheading were derived from the literature on adult education and educational supervision in social work (Appendix F).

In another peer check (Appendix H) the content validity of the instrument was established through a field test interview with an experienced on-site fieldwork supervisor who did not otherwise participate in the case study. Feedback indicated that the topic headings were helpful organizers for the respondent, and that the questions and focus of the interview were clear. Modifications to address other feedback included: starting the interview with an invitation for general comments on the topic and adding questions about agency recognition of fieldwork supervision and about the respondents' likes and dislikes of the supervisory role. In addition, the researcher was reminded to avoid expressing judgmental expletives such as "good".

The Observation Guide

The instrumentation for the nonparticipant observations was also based on PALS because its forty-four items question behavior and because the researcher would be observing actual behaviors. Twenty of the forty-four items are negatively stated meaning that a high value for those behaviors does not uphold a collaborative mode of teaching-learning. Observations using negatively and positively stated items presented a

balanced view of behaviors both supporting and not supporting collaboration in supervision.

The researcher listed each of the forty-four items under its relevant factors (Appendix E). For example, questions 3, 9, 17, 24, 32, 35, 37, 41 and 42 apply to Factor 2. Then they were clustered by the researcher according to the subheadings already identified for the interviews. For instance, questions 3 and 24 applied to the "self-pacing" subheading of Factor 2. A checklist was developed consisting of a single coded sheet with only factor headings and subheadings allowing space for handwritten key reminder words (Appendix G). As an example:

F2	=	<u>Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction</u>
<i>F2 a</i>	=	<i>Self-Pacing</i>
<i>F2 b</i>	=	<i>Variety in Methods and Materials</i>
<i>F2 c</i>	=	<i>Individualization of Learner Needs and Objectives</i>

Using the coded sheet and a tape recorder a peer check (Appendix H) was made of the instrument. The researcher field tested it by observing and recording a supervision session with an experienced fieldwork supervisor and a student not involved in the study. For each key phrase recorded in a notebook, the researcher wrote a matching code in the left margin. Feedback from the participants indicated that they appreciated reassurances of confidentiality before and after the observation but that they were made aware of the researcher's presence by the turning of notebook pages.

Consequently, the researcher used looseleaf sheets for notations during the case study.

Data Collection

Data were gathered from three sources: 1) the survey, 2) the interviews and 3) the observations.

1. The Survey

A total of 73 survey packages were distributed to a population of on-site fieldwork supervisors and a total of 45 were returned. Of the 45 responses received by the researcher, 40 were judged usable for analysis and 5 were incomplete. Therefore, 55% of the distributed questionnaires were used for the study.

The survey packages (Appendix A) each contained a letter of introduction from the university where the researcher is studying, the Demographic Data Sheet, the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) answer sheet, the PALS questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope. In addition some packages contained a letter from the Executive Director of her place of work asking other agencies to cooperate in the study. Some packages were hand delivered for convenience with the first few distributed at a regular meeting of the Geriatric Activity Coordinators. Others were mailed for expediency from the end of November, 1991, to the beginning of January, 1992.

Many follow-up telephone calls were made and the

researcher was able to pick up completed questionnaires that had not been returned by mail. The researcher set a return deadline of January 31, 1992.

By February 1992, four people meeting most of the characteristics of a "typical" fieldwork supervisor had agreed to be interviewed and observed. Letters of permission were obtained for entry to the sites from each of the fieldwork supervisors and authorities from their work places, as well as from the students being supervised and their educational institutions (Appendix D).

2. The Interviews

A one-hour to two-hour interview was held with each of the selected fieldwork supervisors. The choice of time and place was at the discretion of the supervisors and varied according to personal tastes. Although they were conducted in a conversational mode (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984: 131) to promote rapport between the researcher and supervisors, the interviews were guided by a prepared set of questions based on PALS seven factors.

The supervisors maintained some control over the interviews: their permission was sought for audio taping the interviews, at the beginning and ending they were asked for general thoughts and comments on their supervisory roles, they could refer to the question sheets if they wished, they were asked to choose topics

for discussion from the subheadings relating to the seven PALS factors and they were invited to contribute additional thoughts about instructional processes in fieldwork supervision at the end of the interviews and during member checks.

Each interview tape was transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The transcripts were returned to the respective supervisors for member checks (Appendix I) to verify that the data was what they intended to communicate (Guba and Lincoln, 1989: 239) and to ascertain their comfort level with their public pronouncements. Two of the supervisors added information and clarified the thoughts they had recorded in the transcripts.

3. The Observations

Following the interviews, the researcher unobtrusively observed supervision sessions held at the supervisors' work places over the period of one month. Two supervisor-student pairs were observed twice and two were observed three times. All but one of the observed supervision sessions used a discussion format and all were audio taped with permission from each supervisor-student pair. One long observation included interactions between the supervisor, the student and some elderly people with whom the student was training to work. It was also recorded on audio tapes but was not used because apriori consent from all participants

had not been obtained. For this session coded notes were made throughout the session. During the other sessions coded notes were also made concurrently with the tapings. The notes included written descriptions of the times, places, people and activities within and around the observed settings (Merriam, 1988: 98). The researcher's comments noted in the margins consisted mainly of initial interpretations in coded form. The coding system was based on PALS seven factors and related subheadings as described in the instrumentation section of this paper.

The tape recordings were all transcribed verbatim by the researcher.

Data Analyses

Data analyses consisted of two main sections: 1) statistical analyses of PALS and the Demographic Data Sheet provided data for the first triangulation strategy, the survey, and 2) analyses of the transcribed versions of the interviews and observations supplied data for the second and third triangulation strategies.

Statistical Analysis of the Survey

Data were collected initially from the forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors who responded to the case study. Group statistics were calculated for PALS using descriptive analysis of frequencies including the mean and standard deviations for both the total PALS score

and the seven factor scores. Because of the word changes in ten of the PALS items, at the suggestion of its author, Gary Conti, (Appendix B) a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was calculated to verify that the internal consistency of the reliability of PALS had not been threatened.

Analysis using descriptive statistics provided demographic information in order to establish a profile of this population so as to better select four (N=4) typical fieldwork supervisors for further study. Information included the supervisors' gender, age, educational background, description of work setting, years of fieldwork supervision experience, numbers of students currently being supervised, educational category and foci of supervised students, and supervision trainings.

Analysis of the Interview and Observation Transcripts

Data were analyzed from interviews and observations, the second and third triangulation strategies used in this research. Data analysis in case studies is a process of making data meaningful to the researcher (Merriam, 1988: 127) and, it is hoped, to a wider audience.

The raw data collected during interviews and observations were grouped into four separate case studies, one for each of the four fieldwork supervisors. For each individual case study a coding system derived

from the seven factors of PALS was applied to reduce the data to manageable units of categories for further analysis. The coding was a shortened way of noting the presence of a behavior which supported or not a collaborative mode of instruction processes among fieldwork supervisors.

Two criteria were applied to each unit of categories (Merriam, 1988: 132). First, the information yielded by a unit had to be relevant to the study. Second, the unit had to stand on its own as pertinent information that was understandable with only broad references to the context of the study. The units were coded in the margins of the transcripts.

Before each case study was analyzed, transcripts were read several times to regain and review general impressions originally obtained at the setting. Then, the transcripts of the interview and each observation were separated for analysis. For each transcript a line-by-line inspection allowed for initial selection and coding of units of analysis. Continuous cross-checks of the coding were carried out with the original forty-four PALS units separated into seven factors and also with the interview guide sheet (Appendix F). Instances of difficult coding decisions were dealt with by referring again to the conceptual basis of the seven factors of PALS. Units that were suitable for more than one category of code were noted with the all appropriate

codes.

When the coding was completed for each section of a case, a brief summary was made of salient factors and issues and the frequencies of the codes were tallied. This yielded the number of times any one of the behaviors in PALS was present in the actions observed. All coded transcripts of a case study were then assembled and compared for code frequencies and for possible identification of emergent findings.

When the case studies of all four fieldwork supervisors were analyzed, they were contrasted and compared in order to search for any overall patterns and to supply possible alternative interpretations of the data.

The data analysis formed the basis and organization for writing the case studies using Conti's conceptual framework of central principles of adult learning.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter data are presented and analyzed, and findings are interpreted.

This case study consisted of three methodological strategies for exploring instructional processes of fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings: a survey, interviews and observations. Through triangulation the case study examined a collaborative teaching-learning mode based on central principles of adult learning identified by Knowles, Houle, Kolb, Knox and Brookfield, developed by Conti into the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS), and supported by Kadushin's views on educational supervision in social work.

The objectives of the research were to establish a broad base of on-site fieldwork supervisors in an urban area who were able to examine their instructional practices through the lens of central principles of adult learning, to identify characteristics of typical on-site fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings from this broad base of supervisors, to select four of the typical fieldwork supervisors for further study, to involve the selected supervisors in an investigation of their instructional practices with adult students in fieldwork, and to

provide insights about instructional processes with adult students that may be helpful to on-site fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings.

The analysis of this study has been divided into two major sections for the sake of clarity. The first section contains analyses and interpretations from the two-part questionnaire used in the study: the Principles of Adult Learning Scale and the Demographic Data Sheet. In the second section, the case study was separated into four cases, one for each selected fieldwork supervisor and analyses and interpretations are made of interview and observation transcripts. Finally, each of the four cases was examined for emergent findings.

Survey Analysis and Findings

A total of 73 survey packages containing the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) and a Demographic Data Sheet were distributed and 40 usable responses were received.

The Principle of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) Data

Conti's PALS survey instrument enabled the researcher to create a broad base of forty (N=40) on-site fieldwork supervisors who were able to respond to behavioral questions about a collaborative mode of teaching-learning processes based on adult learning principles.

The descriptive statistical analysis of PALS

provided group scores for the 40 supervisors. Out of a possible range of total scores from 0 to 220, the range of scores for the fieldwork supervisor respondents (N=40) was from 134 to 196.50 with a mean of 155.2 and a standard deviation of 15.3. The PALS normed mean is 146 and normed standard deviation is 20 (Conti, 1983: 6). In this study the fieldwork supervisors' mean was 8.8 points and .46 standard deviation units ($8.8 \div 20 = .46$) above the normally expected mean for PALS. The score of 155.2 was at the 68th percentile of the highest possible score of 220 suggesting that the group of fieldwork supervisors (N=40) responding to the questionnaire supported a collaborative mode of teaching-learning to a moderately greater extent than the PALS originally normed group. Table 1 compares the scores of fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings with the normative scores for PALS.

Table 1
Fieldwork Supervisor (N=40) Scores
and Normative Scores for PALS

	Fieldwork Supervisor Scores	Normative Scores
Mean	155.2	146
Standard Deviation	15.3	20

PALS overall score can be reduced to seven factors which are the basic components of a collaborative teaching-learning mode. They are: Factor 1, learner-

centered activities; Factor 2, personalizing instruction; Factor 3, relating to experience; Factor 4, assessing student needs; Factor 5, climate building; Factor 6, participation in the learning process; and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development.

Factor 1, learner-centered activities, was the highest ranked factor compared to the normative mean scores. With a highest possible score of 60, the normally expected mean for this factor was 38 and the standard deviation was 8.3. The fieldwork supervisors' mean score was 44.5 with a standard deviation of 7.6 which was .78 standard deviation units above the normally expected mean. This was at the 78th percentile rating indicating that the fieldwork supervisors practiced learner-centered teaching activities to a fairly greater extent than the normative group.

Factor 2, with a highest possible score of 45 for personalizing instruction, had a normative score of 31 and a standard deviation of 6.8. The fieldwork supervisors mean score of 32.4 and standard deviation of 4.1. was .21 standard deviations above the normed mean at the 58th percentile. This showed that slightly more fieldwork supervisors than the normed group were likely to personalize instruction for individual students.

Factor 3, relating to experience with a highest possible score of 30, had a normally expected mean of 21 and a standard deviation of 4.9. The fieldwork

supervisors had a mean score of 19.1 with a standard deviation of 5.5 which was .39 standard deviations below the mean of the normative group. A score of 19.1 was at the 35th percentile indicating that the fieldwork supervisors were moderately less likely than the normative group to relate new learnings to prior experiences or to problems of everyday life.

For Factor 4, assessing student needs, with a highest possible score of 20, the normed mean was 14 and the standard deviation was 3.6. The fieldwork supervisors' mean score was 15.7 with a standard deviation of 2.9 which was .47 standard units above the normed mean. This 68th percentile score indicated that moderately more fieldwork supervisors than the normed group utilized activities for assessing student needs.

Factor 5, climate building with a highest possible score of 20, had a normative mean score of 16 with a standard deviation of 3. The fieldwork supervisors had a mean score of 15.0 with a standard deviation of 2.5. This was .33 standard deviation units below the norm. This 37th percentile score indicated that moderately fewer fieldwork supervisors than the normed group practiced climate building activities.

For Factor 6 with a highest possible score of 20 for participation in the learning process, the normed mean was 13 and the standard deviation was 3.5. The fieldwork supervisors' mean score was 14.9 and the

standard deviation was 3.0. This was .20 standard deviation units above the mean of the normative group. This 70 percentile score indicated that moderately more fieldwork supervisors than the normed group allowed students to participate in choosing topics, identifying problems and evaluating performances.

Factor 7, flexibility for personal development with a highest possible score of 25, had a normative mean score of 13 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The fieldwork supervisors had a mean score of 13.5 and a standard deviation of 3.5 which was .05 standard deviations above the normed mean. At the 55th percentile, slightly more fieldwork supervisors than the normed group allowed for flexibility for personal development.

The seven factor results are summarize' in Table 2.

At the suggestion of Gary Conti, the author of the Principles of Adult Learning Scale, a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was also run on the final data to assure that minor word modifications made by the researcher did not threaten the internal consistency of the reliability of PALS. The result was an alpha of 0.80, supporting the stability of the PALS reliability.

Table 2
Fieldwork Supervisor Factor Scores and
Normative Factor Scores for PALS

Factors	Fieldwork Supervisor Scores	Normative Scores
F1: Learner-Centered Activities		
Mean	44.5	38.0
Standard Deviation	7.6	8.3
F2: Personalizing Instruction		
Mean	32.4	31.0
Standard Deviation	4.1	6.8
F3: Relating to Experience		
Mean	19.1	21.0
Standard Deviation	5.5	4.9
F4: Assessing Student Needs		
Mean	15.7	14.0
Standard Deviation	2.9	3.6
F5: Climate Building		
Mean	15.0	16.0
Standard Deviation	2.5	3.0
F6: Participation in the Learning Process		
Mean	14.9	13.0
Standard Deviation	3.0	3.5
F7: Flexibility for Personal Development		
Mean	13.5	13.0
Standard Deviation	3.5	3.9

Demographic Data

Descriptive data from the Demographic Data Sheets helped the researcher to identify typical on-site fieldwork supervisors and to select four (N=4) of them for further study in geriatric and gerontological settings.

Analysis of the data showed that 38 of the 40 fieldwork supervisors were women and that 35 percent of the supervisors were 30 years of age or younger.

Table 3 is a summary of the ages of the fieldwork supervisors.

Table 3
Summary of Ages of the On-site Fieldwork Supervisors

Age	Number	Percent
30 or younger	14	35
32 - 40	10	25
41 - 50	8	20
51 - 60	4	10
More than 60 years	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>
Total	40	100

The academic background of the responding fieldwork supervisors ranged from the high school level to the master's level with several receiving specialized training in their own field. Forty-five percent of the supervisors held a bachelor of arts degree or equivalent and 20 percent of them had obtained a master of arts degree or equivalent.

Table 4 summarizes the educational background of the fieldwork supervisors.

Table 4

Summary of Fieldwork Supervisors' Academic Levels

Level	Number	Percent
High School	1	2.5
College	6	15.0
Some University	4	10.0
Bachelor of Arts or equivalent	18	45.0
Master of Arts or equivalent	8	20.0
Other	<u>3</u>	<u>7.5</u>
Total	40	100

Fieldwork supervision occurred in a variety of public and private places providing services to an elderly population. Of the 40 (N=40) supervisors, 40 percent worked in community social agencies and 27.5 percent worked in hospitals. This may have been a consequence of the selection and distribution process. The hospital and community social agencies were the largest of the agencies approached which served an elderly population in the region where the research took place. These large agencies also employed the most people whose functions included fieldwork supervision.

The settings are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Summary of the Fieldwork Supervision Settings

Setting	Number	Percent
Hospital	11	27.5
Health Care (not hospital)	3	7.5
Residence	3	7.5
Day Center	3	7.5
Community Social Agency	16	40.0
Other	<u>4</u>	<u>10.0</u>
Total	40	100

The years of fieldwork supervision experience among the forty (N=40) supervisors ranged from less than 2 years to more than eleven years. Sixty-two and a half percent had between 2 to 5 years of experience. Table 6 summarizes the years of experience in fieldwork supervision.

Table 6
Summary of Years of Experience in Fieldwork Supervision

Years	Number	Percent
Less than 2	5	12.5
2 - 5	25	62.5
6 - 10	6	15.0
11 or more	<u>4</u>	<u>10.0</u>
Total	40	100

The data also revealed that 22 of the 40 supervisors had not received training directly related to fieldwork supervision, that 38 of the 40 supervisors instructed adult students, that 75 percent of the supervisors trained the students to work mainly with elderly people, and that 72.5 percent currently supervised from 1 to 15 students. The students were from a variety of educational backgrounds including 23 students in Special Care Counseling, 18 students in Gerontology, 5 students in Social Services, 16 students in Social Work, 10 students in Leisure Studies, 4 students in Exercise Science, 2 students in Family Life Education, 7 students in Adult Education and 9 students in others disciplines. All students were at a post-secondary level of education.

Summary of Survey Analysis and Findings

The two-part questionnaire provided a basis for a more extensive case study of a collaborative mode of teaching-learning processes based on adult learning principles. In the first part, the data from the PALS questionnaire yielded a broad base of forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings whose group scores supported collaborative educational practices in supervising adult students.

The demographic data from the second part of the questionnaire enabled the researcher to identify ten characteristics of an on-site fieldwork supervisor who

would be representative of the larger group of fieldwork supervisor respondents (N=40). For this study, the typical fieldwork supervisor 1) would be a woman 2) thirty years old or younger 3) with a bachelor of arts or equivalent academic degree. She would be 4) working in a community social agency and 5) training students to work mainly with an elderly population. She would be 6) currently supervising at least one 7) adult student but 8) would not have had training directly related to fieldwork supervision. She would have had 9) two to five years of experience as a fieldwork supervisor instructing 10) Special Care Counseling students.

The researcher was then able to select four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors who were mainly representative of the larger group of respondents in seven of the ten categories: gender, age, educational background, fieldwork supervision experience, current instruction of students who were adults, and training students to work mainly with an elderly population.

The four (N=4) selected fieldwork supervisors were not typical in three areas. First, they *had* received fieldwork supervision training unlike the 22 survey respondents who had not. Second, only one of the students participating in the observation sessions during the third phase of the triangulation strategy was a Special Care Counseling student. Third, only one selected supervisor worked in a community social agency

but because the researcher preferred to have a variety of work settings represented in the study, the three other selected supervisors worked in other settings named in the survey: a hospital, a residence and a day center.

The four selected supervisors were women. Three were under 31 years of age and one was 40 years old. Three of them had obtained a bachelor of arts degree and the other one had a master of arts degree. All of the selected supervisors had 2 to 5 years of supervision experience and all were currently training adult students to work mainly with an elderly population.

Analyses and Findings of the Four Cases

Introduction

For purposes of analyses the case study was separated into four cases, one for each selected fieldwork supervisor. For each case the data were obtained from transcripts of an interview and observations relating to that particular supervisor and were reduced to manageable, relevant, independent units of analysis as described in the data analysis section of this study. Then the data were examined and coded through the lens of the seven factors of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS). Only pertinent data were selected for coding on the basis of their relevance to collaborative teaching-learning concepts found in the literature in adult education and social work supervision. When all the data were coded, they were subject to a frequency count and those coded units of analysis most frequently accentuated were chosen for interpretation in this section of the study. Interpretations were also made of emergent findings not amenable to categorizing into units of analysis.

Each case is a study that can stand independently but data were also drawn together from all the cases for interpretations in a conclusion (Merriam, 1988: 127). The names of the fieldwork supervisors and the agencies were changed to respect confidentiality.

*Case A: Fieldwork Supervision in a Seniors'
Community Service Agency*

The Setting

Kayla, one of the four selected fieldwork supervisors, worked at a community social-cultural center focusing on wellness among its more than 8,000 senior members. The forty-five staff at the center were assisted by over 800 senior volunteers in designing and implementing a wide variety of creative programs. Kayla had been working for four years in a department providing individual services to its frailer members including Meals on Wheels, a daily telephone check-in, a job matching service and friendly visiting to isolated elderly people. The nine workers in the department were aided by senior volunteers, agency interns and students from local colleges and universities.

The Fieldwork Supervisor

Kayla, a young woman in her mid-twenties, had been an on-site fieldwork supervisor for about four years, having led group supervision sessions for a former employer and more recently supervising individual students. At the time of the study she was supervising a university undergraduate social work student whose fieldwork involved two full working days a week for two semesters or a full school year. Kayla had earned a bachelor of arts degree in social work four years previously and clearly recalled her own supervision experience as a student. A few years ago she spent two

hours a week for three and a half months in a training course in fieldwork supervision at a local educational institution.

The Interview Data Analysis

There were twenty-five coded units of analysis of the interview transcript which showed four of Conti's seven factors were highly valued by Kayla, the fieldwork supervisor. They are: Factor 2, personalizing instruction, coded four times; Factor 3, relating to experience, coded five times; Factor 6, participation in the learning process, coded six times and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, coded five times. Factor 6 was coded most frequently and occurred throughout the interview.

Under Factor 2, Kayla reported her support of the concept of personalizing instruction by allowing students to learn at their own pace and by using a variety of methods and materials in instructing students (Knox, 1986: 156-158; Houle, 1980: 224; Kadushin, 1976: 144). One of the methods was a social work technique called "tuning in". Kayla told how it enabled the student to understand rather than judge an elderly person with whom she was working:

I'm always focusing them on "let's really focus on this person. This person is alone. This person has no family, let's say they're a widow or widower. Tune in. What do you think are some of the things they're feeling? This person is very sick. How do you think they feel?" So that this way they're walking in knowing. There was somebody that one of the

students had a little difficulty with because she thought she was complaining all the time and just had nothing good to say. But I really tuned her into "why" and made her think "why is this person like that?" And so that helped her. She went in with a better attitude.

Kayla spoke of learning contracts which personalize instruction as in Factor 2, which encourage students to take responsibility for their learning objectives, schedules and evaluations (Knowles, 1980: 243) and which are useful as educational "roadmaps" (Wilson, 1981: 50). Kayla and the student collaborated in using a learning contract required by the university's department of social work as a guide throughout the educational process:

It (the learning contract) has to be handed in by a certain date. So we do it together, usually by the third week of placement. We work on it together. We both sign it. . . . So we clearly write it out. What are they expected to learn from it. And we did go over it during evaluation time. We went over it and we looked and said "did we do these things? Did we accomplish those goals?"

Factor 3, relating to experience, was important to Kayla as she discussed nurturing a student's growth from dependence to independence (Knowles, 1980: 30):

She (the student) is in her second year, so it really is her first year of being with clients. She's really at the beginning stage, so I do a lot of feeding. But as time progresses I obviously expect her to be more independent and I don't give her as much. I really leave it up to her. . . . If she needs any assistance, I'll help her. I give her feedback. But I know now, now she's in her second semester, she's much more independent than she was at the beginning because she's caught on. She knows what to do and she's

using her skills.

New learning was made comprehensible by links to practical everyday situations (Knowles, 1980: 50) as in Factor 3. Problems encountered and likely to be encountered by social workers were examined jointly:

They'll come to me and we'll discuss it (a problem) together. Like I mentioned before, we'll brainstorm together. I really like them to. I don't like to just feed but I sort of give (a hint). I'll throw in a little hook and get them to take off on some of the things I'm trying to say. . . . And when they do the process recordings, we're looking at the different skills and we're naming them and (I say) "how did you respond? How could you have responded in this situation?"

Factor 6, participation in the learning process, was stressed most by Kayla during the interview. Brookfield (1986: 10) sees such cooperation as effective in the facilitation of learning. Kayla talked of collaborating with the student in re diagnosing and rearranging learning needs and content when planning activities to be undertaken with an elderly population. She explained:

Something is not working out for whatever reasons. So you'll come together, look at why and together decide what can we do. What are some new goals that we have since the old ones were not met or could not be met for whatever reasons. And together we decide on some more objectives and goals. And, yes, we'll do that together. We'll look at why she wasn't able to meet them and what can we do instead.

Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, was discussed by Kayla as she referred to her own social work student experience as a personal guide for

supervising students. Kayla deliberately created a relaxed, comfortable relationship with students and saw herself as a facilitator of learning who modelled behavior from which her students could learn. In this role according to Knowles (1980: 58) and Kadushin (1976: 148), the supervisor can act as a resource person, exposing students to new ideas and enabling them to refine aims for changing behaviors.

All the time I really try to make the student feel very comfortable. When she doesn't like something or something's not right, she can tell me. So we're very open with each other that way.

She modelled behavior for the student's learning:

I know at the beginning I let the student come in with me when I would have people who would be "walk-ins" or if I had "intake" she would watch. And her office is right across from mine so she hears and she sees my interactions with them (the elderly population).

And she placed both herself and the student in learning roles:

I also have learned not to make a real distinction between supervisor and student. I like to show that we're both learning. We all make mistakes. We're human. And, you know, I go through a lot of the same feelings that she may go through, so just to identify with her.

Summary

Kayla stressed Factors 2, 3, 6 and 7 in the interview which indicate support for a collaborative teaching-learning mode in fieldwork supervision of a social work student in a gerontological setting, a seniors' community service agency.

The Observation Data Analysis

The interview was Kayla's self-report of her perceptions and opinions of educational processes within her supervisor-student relationship. The two subsequent observations revealed behavioral support of a collaborative mode of teaching-learning in fieldwork supervision.

Both observations took place on busy weekday mornings during regularly held supervision sessions in Kayla's office. Constant disturbances by telephone and at the door, as well as eruptions of noise outside the door somewhat unsettled the observer but seemed to be taken in stride by Kayla and the student.

The data from the coded units of observation mainly concurred with the interview findings. All of Conti's seven factors of central principles of adult learning were present during the course of the two observed supervision sessions. There were fifteen coded units of analysis made of the first observation transcript and sixteen coded units of analysis for the second observation transcript. Factor 3, relating to experience, was stressed and coded five times for the first one. Factors 2 and 6, personalizing instruction and participation in the learning process, respectively, were emphasized and each coded four times for the second observation.

However, Kayla had stressed Factor 7, flexibility

for personal development, during the interview but it was only moderately employed during the two observations and, therefore, was not discussed further in this part of the study.

The first observed supervision session centered on the student's experiences of the past week in working with an elderly population which Kayla had not observed. Factor 3, relating to experience, was most evident as Kayla and the student collaborated to make learning relevant by linking it to everyday experiences and problem solving (Knowles, 1980: 50; Kadushin, 1976: 137). In one instance, the supervisor and student mutually worked toward solving a common social work problem, dealing with pressures of time:

Student: It's going okay. I did a lot of visits on Tuesday and I still have a lot more to do. So I'm hoping to get it done in the time that I have. But there's still a lot more that I have to do. And I have to make all those phone calls. So it's really going to be a big job and with not so many days left . . .

Kayla: Let's look at the schedule together. How many do you have left or how many have you done, I should say.

Student: I have my list. Okay, I have about twenty more visits to go on.

Kayla: Are you able to do them?

Student: It's pretty, it's pretty hectic.

Kayla: Okay. How can I help you in that? How can we . . . Let's look at your day today.

And they proceeded to make alternative arrangements for contacting the remaining elderly people. Later on,

Kayla asked the student to suggest ways that future social work students might deal with this particular project. And the student disclosed her learning with reference to her own experience:

Student: So it's also good in terms of time management and how a student is going to have to learn to get finished by a certain point and get things done.

Fieldwork epitomizes the practical application of learning to everyday experiences of learners. And the student in her self-report related her learning specifically to her own experiences.

The first observed supervision session was based on the social work student's self-report. In contrast during the second observed supervision session, the context shifted to the supervisor's first-hand observations of the student interacting with an elderly person in the community center.

Factor 2, personalizing instruction, occurred more frequently as Kayla attempted to individualize the student's learning needs and abilities (Kadushin, 1976: 147) by remaining problem-centered (Knowles, 1980: 54). At one point, Kayla explored with the student the concept of uncovering a client's masked requirements:

Kayla: But I just wanted to bring to your mind that this happens very often in meetings. When we come in as social workers with our agenda. Your agenda was . . .

Student: To do Project Shalom.

Kayla: Right. And you knew specifically you had to get the contacts. You had to get this, you

had to get that. And unfortunately what happens sometimes is that we're so, and this has happened to me, we're so preoccupied with the "okay, this is the work I've got to get done", that we have our agenda. We don't listen to her concerns because maybe she's come in with something totally different. Maybe this is just a mask for what is really needed. So I was wondering whether you were going to focus in on her other stuff. But you did. So that was good.

Also in the second supervision session Factor 6, participation in the learning process, was evident as the student and supervisor collaborated to evaluate outcomes and to rediagnose learning needs (Brookfield, 1986: 10). Rather than substituting for the student's thinking, Kayla often supplemented it (Kadushin, 1976: 142) through verbal prompts and leading questions:

Kayla: Why do you think that could have been?
Why do you think she could be that way?

Student: What, anxious and so on?

Kayla: Yes, before meeting you.

Student: Because I don't necessarily think she knew what she was doing here.

Kayla: Uh, huh. Uh, huh.

Student: And she didn't know what it was all about. She just heard a little bit about it and she didn't understand. So she didn't know if I was going to ask her private questions or things like that.

Kayla: Yes, that's right. Okay. Alright, so maybe I'll just give you some feedback on it.

And later on the student responded to Kayla's verbal prompt:

Kayla: I don't think she really knows what she wants, but in your opinion, S____, do you think, what do you think she needs?

Student: Well, I definitely think that Project Shalom is going to be a big help for her because I think she feels lonely. I think she's a little bit scared because she doesn't have anyone and she's feeling that she's deteriorating. And what if, what if, what if. And she has all those questions and she's never had, she still doesn't have, anybody here to look after her.

The student continued to identify some of the elderly person's needs and suggested an array of possible community support for her.

Of note during both observations was Factor 1, learner-centered activities, which had not been extensively explored during the interview. The centrality of an active student in learning situations was dispersed throughout the observations but not often codable into distinct units. Learning was "proactive" (Brookfield, 1987: 11) with the student required to initiate responses to and to take responsibility for her everyday social work experiences among an elderly population. Learning objectives were shaped by the student's contacts with elders during home visits, by telephone and directly at the center. Kayla ensured that the learning was centered on the student by collaborating with her in a learning cycle of diagnosing problems, setting new objectives, trying new behaviors, and reflecting on the effectiveness of changes (Kadushin 1976: 169).

Other uncodable evidence also surfaced during the observations. A climate conducive to learning was

manifest in Kayla's verbal and non-verbal behavior. Both observations were replete with supportive remarks made by the supervisor:

I know it's really a lot of work.
That's a good idea.
Perfect.
I like your notes.
I understand. With school, it's probably a lot
of pressure right now.

Non-verbal clues to a warm psychological climate were apparent in Kayla's smile, tone of voice, amount of eye contact and attentiveness to the student's remarks. An air of mutual respect permeated the meetings with the student cooperating to accomplish agency tasks and the supervisor acknowledging the value of the student's work to the agency. Kayla provided the student with many opportunities to reflect on her work and her self-concept as a social worker:

Kayla: So, how do you feel about the rejection when that lady hung up on you?

Student: Well, I think that it's just really hard for them to understand what I'm doing I don't take it personally.

Summary

The analysis of the observations of this case show that the fieldwork supervisor, Kayla, was aware of and based her supervision skills upon some of the main concepts of a collaborative mode of teaching-learning among adult students. Factor 3, relating to experience, was accentuated during the student's self-report in the first session. Factors 2 and 6, personalizing

instruction and participation in the learning process, respectively, were stressed during the second session which included feedback from the supervisor's direct observations of the student in action.

Emergent Findings

Analysis of this case reveals fieldwork supervision that took place in a textured real-life setting surrounded by ambiguous, complex situations involving an elderly population. Through regular planned supervision sessions Kayla, the supervisor, helped the social work student perceive the intricate interplay of personalities, time and context (Gitterman and Miller, 1978: 113) bound to occur in the everyday experience of a practicing social worker in a gerontological setting.

All of Conti's seven factors related to the central principles of adult teaching-learning were manifest in the two observed supervision sessions. Of note were some variations in the analyses of the observations and the interview.

Factor 3, relating to experience, was coded as an outstanding factor of the first observation which centered on the student's self-report of her learning experiences. However, for the second observation Factor 3 was only moderately coded while at the same time Factors 2 and 6, personalizing instruction and participation in the learning process, respectively, were accentuated. The second observed supervision

session included feedback from the supervisor's direct observations of the student interacting with an elderly person. From the first supervision session to the second one, the supervisor and student intuitively adjusted the focus of their supervision to match the student's learning experiences.

Kayla's style of supervision was based on her own unforgettable experience as a student receiving supervision. To her, facilitation of learning (Brookfield, 1987: 23) included challenging the student to critically reexamine and reinterpret her experiences with and her assumptions about an elderly population. Kayla encouraged the student to develop a professional stance by thinking concurrently on two separate levels in social work conditions (Houle, 1980: 209). With such a dual mindset the social worker attentively notes all the complexities in a situation with a client while maintaining a detached appraising perspective.

Kayla relied on formal methods of contracting and evaluation in conjunction with the educational institution. When she was unable to observe the student's interaction with the elders, Kayla regularly used the student's process recordings for ongoing assessments of the student's learning needs.

Formal contracting methods have some drawbacks. Knowles (1984: 222-223) eschews traditional formal methods in fieldwork in favor of the development of a

learning contract based on a particular learner's needs because a student is empowered through a process of diagnosing needs, deciding on objectives and strategies and evaluating outcomes. Wilson (1981: 50) also points out that students just beginning fieldwork may not be capable of contributing to a personalized contract.

However, formal methods do have their benefits. They can be most effectively used as educational guides or "roadmaps" (Wilson, 1981: 50). The formal contract provided by the university was personalized by Kayla and the student as they collaborated in planning, implementing and evaluating learning activities that were meaningful to both of them. The process recordings offered concrete material for ongoing formative evaluation (Wilson, 1981: 118). And because of the physical separation from the educational institution, the contract and evaluation forms served as reminders of the social work school's expectations, ideology and professional terms.

Case B: Fieldwork Supervision in a Seniors' Residence

The Setting

At the time of the study Sheila was the Coordinator of Recreation and Volunteers for an agency operating four subsidized apartment residences for 750 seniors averaging 80 years of age. She worked closely with the agency's social services department and her office was in one of three neighboring residences. The fourth apartment residence in an adjacent community housed mostly older tenants who were gradually deteriorating physically and mentally. The fourth residence also provided support services such as mandatory apartment cleaning and prepared meals. Sheila regularly contacted approximately fifteen to twenty percent of the elderly population from all four residences. Because not all residents wished to participate in recreation activities, programs such as organized shopping trips during the winter months were designed to suit the varying needs of the elders.

The Fieldwork Supervisor

Sheila, in her mid-twenties, had a bachelor of arts degree in Recreation Science and had been a fieldwork supervisor for two years. Over this short period of time she trained students in Special Care Counseling, Leisure Studies and Gerontology to work with an elderly population. While the study was underway she was supervising a part-time university undergraduate student

in family life education. The student, a middle-aged woman, was employed part-time elsewhere. The student's fieldwork training of one or two days weekly for three to five hours included regular supervision sessions. Sheila's supervision training was obtained through courses with a local volunteer bureau. She expressed a wish to develop her evaluation skills and to continue taking courses related to training and supervising workers in the field of gerontology.

The Interview Data Analysis

The coded units of analysis of the interview transcript totalled thirty-two with Factor 2, personalizing instruction, identified eleven times compared to two, three and four times for Conti's six other factors. Sheila's remarks fit under Factor 2's three subheadings: student self-pacing, use of a variety of methods and materials by the supervisor and individualization of learner needs and objectives.

In discussing self-pacing Knox (1986: 157) points to the effectiveness of learning when adult students can proceed at their own pace and Kadushin (1976: 137) describes learning as an irregular process requiring supervisors to make adjustments for students' differing rates and ways of learning. Sheila said she encouraged students to proceed at their own pace:

I usually start the student off very slowly depending on if they've been exposed to seniors or have done group work. I'd like to integrate them and usually I start off with

something very simple, like a Bingo. . . . Everybody has different needs and also, yes, they do have certain requirements that have to be met. So depending on which course they come from, if it is their "stage" and if they've been exposed then I can usually let them go in and do more in the beginning.

For the second subheading under Factor 2, variety in instructional methods and materials, according to Houle (1980: 224) learning can be stimulated by the selection and development of a wide diversity of learning materials. And learning content is made more meaningful when presented in a variety of ways (Kadushin, 1979: 144). Sheila reported encouraging learning by varying instructional methods and materials:

Her (the student's) prime interest is to work more one-on-one with an individual. And I like to expose them to both, to groups and one-on-one. Because I feel working in this population one really needs the experience of all kinds of different things. . . . And that way I feel she'll be learning a lot more as well.

Later on she explained:

And at the same time I have reading material. So that's number one, I like to do that with them (students). And I suggest readings to them. A lot of times I find the learning process is really the supervision time when we sit and we talk. And I'll use different experiences and talk about what I've done in the past, different situations that arose in the buildings. So I like to fill them in on my position as well. I find, yes, we can sit and we can discuss, of course, the one-on-one and their group work. But I also like to include them in what I do, you know, and fill them in on what's going on in the buildings. I think that's also very key. I tell them about weekly events, tell them about different things that I'm working on. So they're aware of my role. I think they need to learn from me and where I'm at, what I'm doing with them, where are my goals.

Instruction is personalized when instructors actively engage students in assessing their learning needs and objectives (Houle, 1972: 47; Knowles, 1984: 132) and when supervisors recognize the uniqueness of each student (Kadushin, 1976: 147). Sheila supported the third subheading under Factor 2 by explaining how she tried to match instructional objectives to the individual abilities and needs of the student:

And she (the student) is very good with seniors, loves seniors and children which is a really nice mix. But she's the type of person I don't have to worry about, like she's come to a few different evenings we've had. I've tried to expose her in front of the seniors and feel them out. And she's just very natural. I mean she's delved into it very well and can handle herself. So there's some people who are just ready to take the jump. And she's certainly one of them.

Some issues discussed by Sheila during the interview were not codable under Conti's seven factors. At the time of the study Sheila was a novice fieldwork supervisor whose enthusiasm for the process and outcomes of supervision surfaced throughout the interview. She desired more feedback on her supervision skills and valued her role for its opportunities for learning:

I think that's the bottom line: I'm still learning. And there's a lot to learn to make my skills a little bit better and to fine-tune them. And that's what I'm looking for. For me it's a challenge, actually. I not only learn from my students but from other supervisors. And I think that's something it would be interesting to have. A workshop on supervision and to hear how other supervisors conduct their

businesses. Usually we hear only supervisor-client. It would be nice to hear from other supervisors.

As a fieldwork supervisor Sheila had encountered a problem with some students who were unable to make a commitment of a consistent time frame for their fieldwork even though they were given guidelines by their educational institutions. When asked about students being actively involved in their own learning, she said:

Well, I would say active is, first of all, showing up. It's very active. And being there because you want to be there. That's something that I think is very vital. I mean if you are going back to school and you are a mature student you're going there because you want to be there. Mature students don't have to be there. They're going to school because they want to better themselves usually. So somebody active is somebody who's there for the right reasons.

In talking about the advantages and disadvantages of having adult fieldwork students, Sheila gave a possible reason for problems of commitment:

The disadvantage could be if they are a full-time worker during the day, then you're getting a student, a night student. Then a lot of times, they're tired, they're fatigued, they're working during the week. They may have kids and they want to switch into another career. So there may be sort of previous engagements or appointments they have to go to with their children. And I think that the fatigue is probably number one.

Sheila's concern over students' time commitment was associated with her views on discipline under Conti's Factor 1. When asked about learner-centered activities she said:

I'm not that formal yet I like to stipulate what I expect. Especially in the beginning, I like to give them (pause) usually I put together a few pages on what I expect from them (students). But it's also something that comes from the institution as well. So they have their expectations as well. But I feel that it's important because it does lead to discipline if you don't stipulate, basically, what's in there. For instance we did have some students this year that missed quite a few days. Unfortunately, they were working and a lot of them had other responsibilities or became ill. There's nothing you can do when somebody's sick but I felt there was probably too many times that they missed.

In this context and interpreted positively, discipline to Sheila meant providing students with boundaries for behavior and for a time frame within which they were expected to fulfill their fieldwork obligations.

A corollary to the issue of discipline was Sheila's demand to be consulted about all events and issues the student might encounter, and her need to intercept potential problems prompted by her concern for the well being of the seniors:

So once a week I meet with them and we discuss any problems that they're having. . . . Some of them will try and deal with the problem, yes, by themselves. I don't encourage them because I think it's very important that I'm aware of what's going on because there may be a certain way that it wasn't handled right. So I try to from the beginning tell them how available I am.

Summary

The interview with Sheila told of a fieldwork supervisor in a seniors' residence whose concerns for

the well being of the elderly population with whom she worked shaped her approach to fieldwork supervision. She reported collaborating with students to enhance the teaching-learning process and using disciplinary action positively to help students set appropriate behavior and time limits. She greatly valued personalizing instruction, Factor 2, by respecting students' self-pacing, by intensifying learning through a variety of methods and materials, and by attempting to match instructional objectives to individual needs and abilities of students.

The Observation Data Analysis

Sheila's interview described a worker in a gerontological setting whose perception of fieldwork supervision supported a collaborative mode of teaching-learning. The two following observations which occurred at the beginning and ending of a month enabled the researcher to denote outstanding factors associated with Conti's central principles of collaborative teaching-learning and to identify several emerging patterns.

Both observations took place late on busy weekday mornings in Sheila's office in one of the residences. Of note was the bright, spacious lobby somewhat like a town square with neighbors exchanging greetings and pausing to chat.

Both supervision sessions observed by the researcher referred to the student's self-report of issues but they also included Sheila's direct observations of the student interacting with the elderly population. All of Conti's seven factors occurred during the two observations. The first observation transcript had thirty-eight coded units of analysis and the second observation transcript was coded into twenty-eight units of analysis. Most frequently coded were Factor 2, personalizing instruction, Factor 3, relating to experience, Factor 6, participation in the learning process, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development. The pattern of the most frequently coded units for the first observation was: Factor 2 eight times, Factor 3 six times, Factor 6 nine times and Factor 7 six times. For the second observation, the units most often coded were as follows: Factor 3 seven times, Factor 6 five times and Factor 7 six times. Factor 2 was coded only three times.

The emphasis on Factor 2, personalizing instruction, showed an outstanding difference between the two observations. It was coded eight times for the first supervision session with the focus almost entirely on individualization of learner needs and objectives. For the second supervision session the coding for Factor 2 was reduced to three times under the subheading, variety in methods and materials.

Learning is personalized as in Factor 2 if the uniqueness of the student is taken into account when identifying learning needs and objectives (Houle, 1972: 47; Kadushin, 1976: 147; Knowles, 1984: 132). Many times in the first session Sheila tried to match instructional objectives with the student's abilities and needs, and the student's learning objectives with her motives for participation:

Sheila: . . . Do you think that it's realistic to start a group at this time with the Russian and Polish people that we do have in the building? I mean realistic in the point where you can come once a week and can commit yourself to, let's say, six weeks or so. Four to six weeks on a regular basis.

Student: I can make it at random. For example, different interest groups. Once we can meet with the Russian group, one the Polish group, once with crafts and things like that.

Sheila: We can do that. What would be your objective, let's say, if we started a group with the Russians or the Polish people? You would like to do different things? Is that what you're saying?

Student: (Gives an affirmative nod of her head)

Sheila: You would. Would you like to focus in on, the Russian people are new in those buildings and new in the country. Would you like to give them a sort of seminar? I wouldn't say a seminar. It would be informal but some kind of a life skills course, because you are also an immigrant coming to Montreal.

Student: Sure, I can prepare something in that.

Factor 3, relating to experience, was apparent throughout both observed supervision sessions and was the most frequently coded unit of analysis for the second session. To Knowles (1980: 56) the learner's

experience is central to the learning process and to Kadushin (1976: 137) learning is enhanced when the student's prior experience is affirmed and used in the learning process. Sheila's collaboration with the student arose from her own experience of everyday problems in working with an elderly population. In discussing why some elders tended to socialize in apartment lobbies but did not go into one another's apartments, both supervisor and student exchanged ideas from their own experience:

Student: Watching my mother, I came to understand this problem. Because they don't want to go to extra trouble preparing their apartment and preparing meals. Maybe that's why.

Sheila: Perhaps. And maybe some of them I guess don't feel proud of their home which could be another reason. And maybe it's become a norm, something that they're used to, just meeting in the hallway.

Factor 6, participation in the learning process, was coded fourteen times for both observed supervision sessions. Significant learning is more likely to occur when learners are involved in decisions about learning content (Brookfield 1987: 258; Kadushin, 1976: 142). Sheila and the student collaborated throughout both sessions to identify problems and to make decisions about the learning content. During the first session, Sheila worked extensively with the student to identify a problem of over-dependency by one particular elderly person:

Sheila: . . . she (the elderly woman) may become to

the point where I'm worried she may be too demanding on you. When I thought about one-on-one work, now I'm just thinking to see her on a once a week basis is probably the best. To put you shopping and to come see her, I'm just wondering now if we're going to be setting yourself up. Because if you're not going to be continuing all through, this lady is at a point where (pause)

Student: She could be dependent on (pause)

Sheila: Yes, she could be dependent.

Student: She could be disappointed.

Sheila: Yes, it could be a real loss for her because she's looking for something. She needs somebody very, very badly in her life right now.

Conti's Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, was also manifest throughout both sessions with an accent on the first subheading, the instructor as facilitator. Knowles (1980: 57-58) points to a facilitator as one who helps learners identify problems, involves learners in formulating objectives, exposes learners to novel ideas, enables learners to apply new learnings to their experience, involves learners in self-evaluation and helps learners refine their own aspirations for changing behavior. And in supervision Kadushin (1976: 148) states that a comfortable teaching-learning relationship heightens participation, reduces anxiety and facilitates student learning. Sheila took a facilitator's role as she helped the student to explore an issue:

Sheila: Did anybody (any elderly tenant) ever tell you that they lived during the holocaust or that they lost people in the holocaust?

Student: Yes, some of them but I didn't get to that.

Sheila: Yes, because this is something we see in our buildings. Sometimes in life things trigger things off and it's a very painful thing for anybody who has lived through it (the holocaust) and lost loved ones. What we're finding is the slightest thing or something traumatic can set it off and you're opening a whole bag, like a can. And if you don't deal with it correctly, that's why we leave it up to the professionals. And a lot of them should seek professional guidance, perhaps psychotherapy or whatever the need is. Because once you open something up and don't finish it, it's left hanging. And at times they can feel it through a physical way . . .

Continuing with the topic, Sheila challenged the student to reexamine her own behavior with reference to the elderly population in the residences:

Sheila: A lot of the people feel so overwhelmed. They keep it (their pain) in and they think it's protection. They're going to protect themselves. And in the end it's just not the case. They're not protecting themselves by keeping it a secret.

Student: I try to deal with it by giving them support, by encouraging their self-worth. I try to give them my love, my understanding and that's how we deal with it.

Sheila: Uh, huh. And do you also feel that sometimes that may not be enough? Like, do you feel sometimes that, it's hard to find the right words, but you're there to support and you feel that you have a lot to offer but did you ever feel that it's not enough?

Student: It's only their experience that they can tell. I can only do what I can with the tools that I have.

Later on Sheila reiterated her concerns for the elderly tenants and made clear her availability for identifying problems:

Sheila: So anyway, as long as you feel comfortable with me and you feel you can come to me I think that is something that is very important. Because along the way if there's anything that you're not sure how to handle, and I may not have all the answers, too, we may have to think about it and work it out. If the situation comes up where somebody is pouring out their life to you and you think perhaps they need real help, come to me and let me know because that's our job here. My supervisor, I make the referral to her that this person should be visited and that's her position as coordinator of the services to look after the tenants.

The student did not communicate that she understood Sheila's point about the possible dangers of playing a role best left to trained professionals. Later on, acting as a resource person, Sheila gave the student some literature to be discussed at a later supervision session.

Several issues of note were not codable under Conti's seven factors. The issue of time commitment and setting boundaries by the student was a recurring theme in both supervision sessions. The beginning of the first session included:

Sheila: . . . I know you don't know exactly your agenda for the next couple of months. The only thing is, I'm just wondering when we do start the group, if you could donate a certain amount of weeks and say contract it. Because I'm just wondering if we start something and then stop in the middle, these people they'd feel not just short-changed but they may come to trust you and all of these people they'll feel (pause).

And about half way through the second observation, Sheila and the student tentatively agreed:

Sheila: I don't know if Tuesday is good for you. Wednesdays? Because we may do the social club Tuesdays, every second Tuesday. If you want to come every second Tuesday or if you want to come every Tuesday, then we could more or less make a schedule. . . . It could be every second Tuesday but I just wanted to check it out with you. How do you feel about that?

Student: Whenever I can I will. I'll come every Tuesday, but there will be times when I will be at work and I'm taking some dance courses from May to June. So there will be times that I will be in class full-time.

Sheila: So would this Tuesday be okay?

Student: Yes.

Another issue also not codable according to Conti's seven factors but of note was the amount of control Sheila exerted over the student's activities. In both supervision sessions Sheila extended the student's ideas by giving other perspectives from her own experiences. But she was more resolute in exerting her influence during the first supervision session than during the second session. In the first session:

Sheila: I guess why I'm so adamant about doing it that way (pause) usually I like to let you explore. But it just saves a lot of time also because when you do call people over the phone and tell them there's a meeting, they forget a lot of the time. Especially in this group, this population group. So I think that's what keeps on coming back to me is that there's been so many times they just forget. Like even tonight there's a social club and they come down. But they have to be reminded all the time.

During the second supervision session when the student suggested inviting residents from one building to attend special events at another building, Sheila was less

staunch in offering another viewpoint:

Sheila: . . . And then they may feel "well, I didn't know there was a group going on for the last month. Why didn't anybody tell me". And then if they're only invited to special occasions they may feel a little bit left out. So once you start something, if you're going to open it, you're going to have to carry it through. You have to open it for everybody or make the two groups. I think to invite them at certain times, it's nice but some may feel offended.

Student: It's a good point.

Sheila: So I would just think that over. I don't want to discourage you. . . .

Summary

Outstanding features of the two observation transcripts were four of Conti's seven factors: Factor 2, personalizing instruction, Factor 3, relating to experience, Factor 6, participation in the learning process, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development. In addition, noncodable issues of note in the observation transcripts were of the student's time commitment and behavior boundaries, and of the supervisor's control over the student's activities.

Emergent Findings

Analysis of the two observations did, indeed, confirm Sheila's portrait as a fieldwork supervisor issuing from the interview. They did underline her collaborative method of teaching-learning as a fieldwork supervisor in a recreation department of a large complex of subsidized seniors apartments. Over time the two observations testified to all of Conti's seven factors

relating to the Principles of Adult Learning Scale. However, there were variations between the interview and observations.

One outstanding discovery was that during the interview, Sheila greatly favored Factor 2, personalizing instruction, which also was observed to be more accentuated in the first supervision session but not in the second supervision. During the first supervision session, Sheila was conscientious in trying to individualize the student's learning needs and objectives by taking into account the uniqueness of the student who was an older learner as well as an immigrant. To Sheila such a combination of characteristics augured well for matching the student's learning activities with the needs of this particular elderly population many of whom were also immigrants.

Another area diminished in emphasis in the second supervision session; Sheila's control over the student's forthcoming projects lessened during the second supervision session compared to the first one. At the same time, however, Factor 3, relating to experience, was coded most often for the second supervision session. As the supervisor's control lessened, more attention was given by both the supervisor and the student to the role of experience in learning which is a central antecedent of learning (Knowles, 1980: 56; Kadushin, 1976: 137).

The last emergent finding of note was that in this case study the student's fieldwork was not strictly overseen by her educational institution. The student was given guidelines from the department in her university for her fieldwork but she also had a great deal of latitude in setting the amount of time and the schedule for undertaking her out-of-classroom learning. As well, the classroom instructor did not have frequent contact with the on-site fieldwork supervisor. Sheila had previously experienced similar difficulties with other part-time adult students who also were employed. She tried to compensate for the uncertainties accompanying these situations by creating her own student learning contracts and by asking students to make specific time commitments.

*Case C: Fieldwork Supervision in an Adult
Day Center*

The Setting

Amy, one of the selected fieldwork supervisors, was one of two on-site staff persons operating a day center for frail elderly people on behalf of a large social-cultural community center. The day center was situated about ten minutes away by car from the parent agency. It provided stimulating programs for approximately fifteen mentally and physically frail elders a day and it offered respite to their caregivers. Students, agency interns and volunteers played a vital role in assisting the day center staff.

The Fieldwork Supervisor

Amy, around forty years old, was a university graduate with a bachelor's degree in social work. She had been working in social services for about twelve years and had three years fieldwork supervision experience. She had received sixty hours of training in fieldwork supervision provided by one of the local colleges with fieldwork students. Amy had supervised up to four students concurrently from local colleges studying Social Services, Gerontology and Special Care Counseling. At the time of the study Amy was supervising two students and an intern from the agency. The student selected for observation in this study was in her second year of a three-year Special Care Counseling Program. Due to the intimacy of the small

setting, Amy was able to observe the student in action almost continuously throughout the student's fieldwork two days a week for a full semester.

The Interview Data Analysis

Amy's interview transcript yielded thirty-three coded units of analysis with five of Conti's seven factors often stressed as follows: Factor 2, personalizing instruction, coded six times; Factor 4, assessing student needs, coded five times; Factor 5, climate building, coded six times; Factor 6, participation in the learning process, coded six times; and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, coded five times. Less frequently coded were: Factor 1, learner-centered activities, coded twice and Factor 3, relating to experience, coded three times.

Amy personalized instruction, as in Factor 2, through the use of learning contracts she devised herself and guidelines established by educational institutions. According to Knowles learning contracts are effective tools for encouraging collaboration between instructor and learner (1984: 223), for dealing with variations in students' backgrounds, experiences, needs and abilities, and for empowering students (1984: 137). The development of a contract in fieldwork supervision is a collaborative learning process for both supervisor and student, and sets the parameters for student, educational institution and agency expectations

(Bogo and Vayda, 1987: 48). When determining goals of the learning contract, Amy allowed students to proceed at their own pace:

Sometimes it (a goal) is not specific but perhaps after they feel more comfortable and they observe the members and they observe us (staff), then through the process of supervision they come up with specific goals (for the learning contract).

Under Factor 4, assessing student needs, Amy encouraged students to actively participate in a needs assessment and the development of specific learning objectives (Knox, 1986: 35) associated with the learning activity expectations of the educational institution (Bogo and Vayda: 1988, 51):

Especially, when they do their individual program, one-on-one with a member for a specific period of time, or a small group program, they really do need to identify their objectives. Although some students need more help than others but definitely I encourage them to identify their objectives.

And she urged them to take responsibility:

I ask them. First, "what are your objectives? Have you thought of the objectives?" And then it's a discussion. "Well, what do you think?" And sometimes I'll ask and (they reply) "well, I'm not quite sure." I really try and encourage them to come up with their own objectives as much as possible.

As in Factor 5, climate building, Amy tried to create a supportive climate fostering a sense of trust which encouraged students to take risks and to make decisions (Knowles 1980: 223; Kadushin, 1976: 136):

They need to take, to learn to take risks. I try and encourage that as much as possible. It's hard because there are times when you're not quite sure if the student is passive or is it that they need more direction. So I think (pause) it's important to have good communication, open communication between the supervisor and the student so they are comfortable enough to take risks.

And in a psychologically safe environment, students may engage in a process of self-diagnosis. Central to effective facilitation of learning is a cycle of action, followed by reflection and the mutual engagement of learner and instructor in analysis, and then new action (Brookfield, 1987: 10). As in Factor 6, participation in the learning process, Amy liked to actively involve students in a learning cycle by adding to, rather than replacing, their thinking during discussions (Kadushin, 1976: 142):

I think that's really the crux of our role, isn't it. Because I think that sometimes it could be easier to substitute as opposed to supplement (a student's thinking). And that's where the challenge comes in when there is a student who also requires direction. But you want to encourage the student to think, to make their own, to make their decisions, to think for themselves and not rely so much on the supervisor. The supervisor should be a guide, ideally, to guide them and not just to feed information.

Under Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, Amy discussed her role as a resource person in responding to the needs of the student. Advocating independent use of resource materials is one way a flexible facilitator can meet needs of learners

(Knox, 1986: 200):

Then at that point the supervisor could suggest "well, have you thought of perhaps looking in the library". And then the student and the supervisor could share that information. But, you know, the supervisor does not have all the answers. . . . It should not be a one-way situation where the supervisor is feeding all the knowledge to the students. I don't feel comfortable in that type of role to begin with. And that's on a personal note. And also I don't think it's the ideal learning situation.

Several other issues surfaced that were noteworthy. Amy saw herself working in tandem with educational institutions to teach students to work with a frail elderly population. When asked about her views on discipline Amy linked her concerns to the well-being of the elderly members and to her responsibility to the educational institution. From her own supervision experience she had learned that:

. . . if they (the students) are responding in what I view as a harmful way to the member, then right then and there I would take the student aside and clarify what occurred. So on the point of discipline I feel it is disciplinary action. Now from there if the person is not learning, if there doesn't seem to be a learning process involved, if they're not aware of what they're doing, for whatever reason they're not able to learn, they're not able to model after the staff to see how they interact appropriately with a member, at that point I would have to take disciplinary action. In terms of the student I would have to discontinue their internship at the center after discussion, of course, with the co-worker and the (school) supervisor if their actions are detrimental to the members.

Amy appreciated the role students played in the daily functioning of the day center and she was earnest

in her responsibility for training them to work with a frail elderly population. When asked about her likes and dislikes of fieldwork supervision she responded:

What I like most about supervision is when the student succeeds. And especially if I encourage them to do an activity, for example, and they weren't sure of themselves initially and with encouragement they were able to lead the activity independently. And they're successful and they feel good about themselves. And when you see the progress, that's really, that's a very positive aspect.

And negative aspects included:

There are times when I question myself. "Well, why didn't I do it this way? Could I have done it another way? Could I have helped them? Maybe I didn't help them enough." If a student is marginal, well (pause) it's very, very difficult.

Summary

The interview revealed that Amy embraced a collaborative mode of teaching-learning for adult students in fieldwork supervision which was shown by her support of Factor 2, personalizing instruction, Factor 4, assessing student needs, Factor 5, climate building, Factor 6, participation in the learning process, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development. She enjoyed her role and felt rewarded when students succeeded. And as a flexible facilitator, Amy believed in supporting students as they engaged in the learning process. However, she did take responsibility for disciplining students in extreme cases when the well-being of the members were at stake. Students that proved to be inappropriate and were unable to learn to

work with frail elders were dismissed from fieldwork in the day center.

The Observation Data Analysis

The interview was followed by three observations over the period of a month by the researcher of Amy in supervision sessions with the student. The three supervision sessions took place in the supervisor's office in a day center for frail elders. They occurred in the morning, once while the elderly members were in the adjacent main room and twice before the members arrived. They included the student's self-reports as well as the supervisor's feedback related to her direct observations of the student interacting with elderly members.

The day center, situated in a quiet residential community, comfortably accommodated a maximum of fifteen members daily. It had a large activity room, a kitchen and washroom facilities. Amy worked closely with the another staff person, volunteers and students.

Over the course of the three observations Conti's seven factors were evident for a total of twenty-nine coded units of analysis. All factors were manifest during the first and longest supervision session in which there were fifteen coded units of analysis with Factor 6, participation in the learning process, coded four times and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, coded five times. The remaining factors

were coded one or two times.

The second observed supervision session yielded six coded units of analysis with two coded units each for Factor 2, personalizing instruction, and Factor 6, participation in the learning process. There was one coded unit each for Factor 1, learner-centered activities, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development.

The third observed supervision session had eight coded units of analysis with three for Factor 3, relating to experience, two for Factor 4, assessing student needs, two for Factor 6, participation in the learning process and one for Factor 7, flexibility for personal development.

Two factors are discussed in this part of the study because they were most frequently coded across all three observed supervision sessions. They are: Factor 6, participation in the learning process, coded 8 times altogether, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, with a total code count of seven times.

The Factor 6 subheading, learning content, was stressed frequently. Brookfield (1987: 10) refers to meaningful learning when instructor and student are engaged in rediagnosing learning needs and content. And fieldwork students gain from increased self-esteem and heightened commitment when they can participate in the learning process (Wilson, 1981: 93). Amy involved the

student in identifying problems that needed to be solved and in making decisions about the learning content:

Student: I feel more confident and relaxed but not so much as I'd like to be. I've still got a way to go, I think. I sometimes don't talk loud enough. Uh, I've been told I hold back. I don't know why I do it. I have to correct it. I still have some, quite a way to go before I will have gotten to where I want to be. As for my role, I'm really not sure. I know I'm supposed to be part of the team - a leader as well. So I'm not assertive enough that way. So I think that's something I'm going to have to (pause).

And the supervisor offered her support:

Amy: Uh, huh. Is there anything that you feel that I could help you with to achieve your goals?

Later on as in Factor 6 subheading, evaluating outcomes, the supervisor and student participated in rediagnosing gaps in the student's learning and identifying directions for further growth (Knowles, 1980: 46). Regarding an elderly member with short-term memory loss:

Student: Because last week when I asked her (the member) to come to the office, I didn't give her clear enough instructions because she went to the bathroom.

Amy: I saw. I observed.

Student: When she came out I thought "okay, now she's done what she needs to do and now she's out". I didn't say anything about it. I just acted like it was very normal and okay to do that. I figured if I said anything (pause).

Amy: Exactly. What purpose would that serve.

Student: That's right. I just didn't worry about it.

Amy: Well, she knew she was going into a room but she ended up in the wrong one (pause). So,

okay, you won't forget that. That's how you learn, right?

Student: I must have remembered something because I was a little clearer with Mrs X. I could see she was getting (pause) I wasn't clear and I had to correct myself.

Amy engaged the student in a process of self-evaluation following an activity, again as in Factor 6:

Amy: . . . tell me how you felt leading the exercises. Did you feel it worked, it didn't work, what you could have done, what you didn't do?

Student: It was so, so.

Amy: So, so. What happened?

Student: It didn't (pause) well, there wasn't (pause) there wasn't enough activities. It wasn't long enough. When the exercises are going I don't memorize the ones that are already done.

Under Factor 7, throughout the three supervision sessions Amy assumed a facilitator's role as she established a comfortable, relaxed atmosphere and acted as a resource person. She often served as a role model for leading activities which is an effective way to enhance learning (Knox, 1981: 47):

Amy: So you could practice, then, projecting your voice when you, for example, present the current events in the morning. And you know what I found helpful for me? When I first started I found I was able to project my voice further when I was standing up. And I think maybe standing up also gives a feeling of being in control.

Another time, Amy purposefully directed the student to observe her:

Also when you return what I would like to do is for you to observe me closely when I lead

the exercises. See what I do and see how I get people involved. Okay? And then maybe gradually from there you'll start to feel more comfortable leading activities and maybe you can do a small part like the warmup.

Although Conti's Factor 1, learner-centered activities, was not often codable it was manifest throughout the three supervision sessions. The focus was on learning as an active, as opposed to passive, process and it was centered on specific situations requiring initiating action by the student (Brookfield, 1987: 11).

There were no incidents requiring disciplinary action during the three observed supervision sessions. However, throughout the three observed sessions Amy did support the student by giving many verbal prompts which were not codable into units of analysis. According to Kadushin (1976: 148), an accepting, supportive supervisor-student relationship is essential to learning by reducing anxiety and increasing student consideration of new ideas. Some of Amy's remarks were:

Okay, so how are you doing S _____?
Yes, that's a problem, isn't it?
It must have been a surprise.
The process, what part of it is the most difficult?
It was an excellent idea and we'll go for it and see how it works.
I liked when this afternoon you took initiative.
Well, that comes with practice.
Okay. So you have a few things to consider . . .

Summary

The analysis of the three observations show that all of Conti's seven factors relating to the Principles

of Adult Learning Scale were observed and coded into units of analysis. Factors 6 and 7, participating in the learning process and flexibility for personal development, which Amy emphasized in the interview were most apparent in the supervision sessions. Additional noteworthy issues were the active role expected of the student and the supportive remarks made by the supervisor.

Emergent Findings

Analysis of the three observed supervision sessions concurred with Amy's description of herself during the interview. The observations did reveal a collaborative mode of teaching-learning used by a fieldwork supervisor in an intimate setting of a small day center for frail elderly people.

The setting where fieldwork occurs plays a vital role in shaping the student's learning experience particularly when the student is included in the total functioning of a fieldwork milieu (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 46) as in this case study. The intimacy of the day center allowed Amy, the supervisor, to have ongoing contact with the student and enabled her to observe the student's level of preparation, participation, reflection, flexibility and general attitude (Kadushin, 1976: 145) in working with a population of frail elderly people.

As a result of Amy's regular observations of the

student interacting with the elderly members and other workers, she was able to provide vital feedback (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 54) for the student's reflection, rediagnosis of needs and new behaviors.

Amy expressed an awareness as a fieldwork supervisor of her responsibility to the student, the educational institution, the agency for which she worked and the frail members of the day center. One of her concerns resulting from prior experiences with a few former students revolved around discipline of students who were unable to interact appropriately with the frail elderly members. This type of situation can be especially difficult for social workers due to their training which focuses on helping people realize their potential (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 76). Nevertheless it is incumbent upon fieldwork supervisors not to allow such "marginal" students to continue their fieldwork.

Amy relied on some formal methods in her fieldwork supervision. The learning contracts, both Amy's and the educational institution's, also established a framework for a collaborative supervisor-student approach to the fieldwork experience and formed a basis for systematic learning and continued evaluation (Knowles, 1984: 137; Wilson, 1981: 50; Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 54).

*Case D: Fieldwork Supervision in a
Hospital*

The Setting

Donna, one of the selected fieldwork supervisors, was an Art Therapist working with elderly patients in the Psychosocial Therapies and Activities Department of a large urban general hospital. She worked in three units in the hospital, one acute care and two long term care, with about sixty of the ninety elderly patients. She worked alongside nine other non-medical workers including physiotherapists, social workers, a dietician, an occupational therapist, a recreation therapist and a music therapist. The patients who were physically or mentally frail stayed up to two months in one acute care unit or up to a year in one of two long term units. As a teaching hospital associated with a local university, it was a place for training many medical and non-medical students.

The Fieldwork Supervisor

Donna, around thirty years old, had a Master of Arts degree in Art Therapy. She had been supervising fieldwork students for over six years. The students from local colleges and universities represented programs in Gerontology, Leisure Studies, Special Care Counseling, Exercise Science and Adult Education. At the time of the study Donna was supervising a college student in recreation leadership training who was also a recent immigrant to Canada. The student's fieldwork

consisted of eight hours a week for fifteen weeks and included regular supervision sessions with Donna.

Donna had received training in supervision during a weekend workshop in her own discipline, Art Therapy. But she reported experiencing the best training during her own internship where she had many different supervisors and where she modelled her style after one particularly effective supervisor.

The Interview Data Analysis

There were twenty-six coded units of analysis of Donna's interview transcripts. Two of Conti's factors were stressed. Factor 2, personalizing instruction, was coded six times, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, was coded five times. The five remaining factors were each coded two, three or four times.

Throughout the interview Donna referred to personalizing instructor, Factor 2. Knox (1986: 50) suggests that learning can be enhanced when the attributes of both instructor and student are taken into account. Donna talked about adapting her instructional techniques to suit the student's characteristics:

It's harder to supervise the student who has what I'll call "a slower pace". Sometimes I find I need to be a teacher. Like last week, for example, I was literally "teacher" to a student, handing her the sentences of what to say next. And coaching, really coaching, like "talk louder, okay. Now go speak to Mr. So and So, and see what he says. Now that you got what he said, come back and report it to the others. He didn't hear you." . . . I've never been so demonstrative for the sake of guidance.

As in Factor 2, Donna reported collaborating with the student in trying to match the learning objectives with the individual needs and abilities of the student. Student participation in this process helps to place the onus for learning on the student (Knowles, 1984: 223).

Donna explained:

If we're reviewing a student's ability to lead a discussion group and the student is not doing well with the topic of discussion or the style in which the topic is being presented I'll say, "then you must come up with an alternative approach that you feel comfortable with. Come up with a topic that you know about already". We'll brainstorm on their interests, hobbies, skills, topics they know of, books they like to read, etc., and then we'll try to work from there.

As in Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, Donna clearly saw herself in the role of facilitator. To Brookfield (1987: 146) facilitation that extends learning also challenges students and helps them become self-critical in learning situations. And action followed by feedback and critical self-examination permits students to identify areas for change (Kadushin, 1976: 142). Students in a hospital setting are often exposed to new experiences and may have to redefine their own behavior with help from the supervisor:

Learning doesn't have to be limited to what the student is expected to learn for school. Even when they see other professionals, family members and other people intervening if your ears are open you hear a lot. The student will come back to the supervisor and say, "you should have heard what I just heard down the

hall" or "what I just saw someone do" and talk about whether they thought it was effective or not. I often ask "well, what would you have done differently?"

Donna also saw herself as a flexible, sensitive fieldwork supervisor, again as in Factor 7, who was willing to respond to the needs of students. Knowles (1984: 53) explains how effective instructors purposefully decide on procedures in helping adults learn and how a flexible approach can increase the student's confidence in learning. Donna's approach was:

I think I'm prepared to adapt to each kind of student. In other words, I'll say to them "what do you need from me? What kind of a supervisor do you think you need?" I think I've often said to them, "you've got to let me know if there's something that I've said that you don't like, or that you want more of, because you do like it."

The interview with Donna provided other noteworthy issues regarding fieldwork supervision in a geriatric wing of a large hospital. For Donna the setting created the greatest impact and challenge for both supervisor and student in fieldwork. She returned to the topic frequently:

. . . Somebody who's shy can get lost in the shuffle here. This is a very overwhelming setting. They (the students) have to go into each station of each unit and meet the staff. They have to go into a patient's room and literally introduce themselves. They have to initiate. If they're shy and can't get past that then they will have difficulty running their programs. So, for some students their "stage" can be about learning how to speak to people and coming out of their shell.

And from the supervisor's point of view:

This affects the way you supervise because you have to gauge your own skills according to what the student's prepared to be able to handle or prepared to accept. And if you have hopes that are way beyond theirs, then after a couple of times of meeting them you realize you have to adjust yourself completely. You need to slow down and really try to evaluate where the student's at. And what's going to make for a good experience for them, not for me.

Student orientation in fieldwork is an essential step for students, supervisors, educational institutions and agencies in establishing policies and procedures (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 46). Donna remembered her own experience as a student and tried to ease the difficulty of the student's integration into the large hospital setting:

It's almost like when you first get hired for a job. I try to take the students around and introduce them to other staff. I show them where things are, show them where books are and give them an orientation so that they can become comfortable in the setting. This helps the student cope and become independent.

She compared supervision in the small setting where she formerly worked to her supervision experience in the hospital:

At the adult day center the student was part of everything, all programs, all day, and everyone worked together. Here even if it was an art therapy student, they're not going to be part of my work, of my work that I'm hired to do. In other words, I have individual clients where our work is private. No students will work with me during this time. . . . At the day center there was only one room. There was nowhere else to go to work with patients. Here, there's a multitude of places you can be. So you can be physically separated, completely.

To Donna a major drawback in the hospital setting was the fact that eighty percent of the time the student was not in her view at all. Preferring to directly observe students in action, she believed that feedback resulting from observations were vital to student learning in fieldwork. Bogo and Vayda (1988: 58) refer to a balance of positive and negative feedback as a "key concept" of fieldwork supervision. Donna elaborated:

I think I can offer better quality supervision for these students if I can witness the little things. For example, the way they word something to somebody or the way they approach somebody. Or just watching the patient's reaction to the student. The way they set up their program and their thinking. Then I can see their thinking for myself rather than hearing about it afterwards.

Later on she returned to the topic of direct observation and feedback:

I think what's really important is to have a good sampling of what students are actually doing. You have to see them in action because if you are watching them you can pick up on things that you're witnessing rather than just relying on what the student's reporting. And then you can be both supportive and find areas that need improvement.

Donna appreciated the formal and informal connections with students' educational institutions in providing frameworks for supervision. And she saw performance evaluations as essential in making fieldwork meaningful to all participants (Wilson, 1981: 164). The completion of evaluation forms required by educational institutions were also occasions for further collaborating with students:

It's good to have these evaluation forms because it makes you respect the school's specific goals. . . . I'll go through it with the student before handing it in to the teachers at the school. I'll ask the student if they agree or disagree with what has been written down on paper. And discuss what it is they want to work on next. We'll review their strengths and weaknesses.

To Donna fieldwork supervision was personally rewarding. She felt responsible for instilling high standards in future workers with an elderly population and she enjoyed the opportunities for honing her own skills:

It (fieldwork supervision) is educational. It helps me pay attention to what I'm doing. And then it helps me to know that someone's watching me and that they're learning from this, and that they might leave this place and apply what they've learned somewhere else. It means helping students find their strengths, explore their own creativity and why and how they can help others in a meaningful way. It also means helping a school make their program work. It keeps you informed and it lets you know where the field is heading.

The interview showed that Donna utilized a collaborative teaching-learning method as a fieldwork supervisor in the demanding setting of a large urban hospital. She incorporated all of Conti's seven factors but accentuated Factor 2, personalizing instruction, and Factor 7, flexibility for personal development.

The Observation Data Analysis

The interview was followed by three observed supervision sessions over a month. The first, lasting about three and a half hours, included the researcher

viewing the student leading an activity with a group of patients while the student was observed and assisted by Donna, the fieldwork supervisor. This was immediately followed by an individual supervision session. Then, the researcher returned over the next two weeks to observe two more regular fieldwork supervision sessions. Over time all of Conti's seven factors relating to the Principles of Adult Learning Scale emerged. But the most frequently observed were Factor 2, personalizing instruction, Factor 3, relating to experience, and Factor 6, participation in the learning process.

For coding the units of analysis the first observed supervision session presented a challenge to the researcher. An audio tape recording had been made of the session but it was not used in the study because patient consent had not been obtained. But even with permission the tapes could not be transcribed verbatim due to the overlapping of many voices. However, the researcher's impressions were submitted in writing to Donna for a member check and adjustments. They were then coded into units of analysis in keeping with the other case studies. Factor 3, relating to experience, and Factor 6, participation in the learning process, were most stressed during the first supervision session.

For the second supervision session the transcript showed that of the fourteen coded units of analysis Factor 6, participation in the learning process, was

coded five times compared to none, one, two or three times for the six other Conti factors.

The transcript for the third supervision session was coded fifteen times with Factor 2, personalizing instruction, coded five times. The remaining six factors were each coded once or twice.

The observations took place in an activity room located in the acute care geriatric wing of the hospital. They all took place during early to mid-afternoon. The large activity room brightly lit with sunshine was decorated with patients' art projects.

The first observation began with the student preparing for her activity with Donna for about twenty minutes before bringing in the elderly patients. Then as the activity took place there was a constant flow of patients, some with companions, in and out of the room. The activity, lasting about an hour and a half, started with six people but at one point there were sixteen participants. The atmosphere was friendly and relaxed. The patients wore regular street clothing and were sometimes difficult to distinguish from their companions.

The outstanding feature of the first observation was Donna's role as a coach giving brief instructions before and during the student's activity: making bracelets with the patients. Before the activity, Donna asked:

What is the goal of your activity?
And how do you intend to introduce it?

During the activity, Donna gave a number of verbal prompts, such as:

Do you know everyone's name?
Now you can introduce me to everyone.
Speak louder.
Keep on going.
Can we pass around the charms (stones)?
S___, can you show them your other idea, the
 backup plan?
S___, take a pencil and draw right on it.
They can follow it.
We can just look at them (the results of
 the project) and talk about them when they're
 up on the wall. You can lead a little
 discussion.

The student worked very quietly alongside individual patients. Donna assisted throughout the activity but at one point she directed several participants in making an intricate braid for a bracelet. Then she modelled encouraging behavior by saying "that's it. You've got it." The student afterwards became more vocal and made encouraging comments to the patients.

About an hour into the activity, almost half the participants had stopped trying to make bracelets and were simply sitting at the table. A few others had picked up an ongoing project and had commenced work on it. When a patient asked what else could be done, Donna allowed the supervisee to respond:

Donna: I'm going to wait for S___ to solve what
 to do next. (pause)

Student: When I was in school all the students had
 to learn to do this, origami, with paper.

Do you want to try it? (long pause)

Donna (quietly to the student): Go around and check with each person. Show him an example.

Student: (held up a paper animal and then demonstrated folding and cutting another sheet of paper)

This incident illustrated Conti's Factor 3, relating to experience, in which the supervisor used the student's experience to foster growth from dependence on others to greater independence. To Knowles (1980: 30) the movement towards autonomy in learning is an essential adult need that can serve as a learning guide for instructors.

The group activity with the patients was immediately followed by a supervision session. Donna asked the student how she felt about the incident when many participants discontinued making bracelets. Again, as in Factor 3, the student was encouraged to relate this experience to everyday problems likely to be encountered in this particular setting. According to Brookfield (1987: 16) meaningful adult learning occurs when students grasp the significance of insights and new skills within the context of their unique experiences. Donna initiated the discussion:

Donna: Tell me what you think about when they stopped working on the bracelets.

Student: I noticed they found it hard. They don't know how to switch hands. (pause)
And I think maybe it is too hard to do this bracelet.

Donna: Yes, it was uncomfortable for a while.

Many of these patients don't have the fine motor control. But it was good that you had your backup plan and then everybody worked together. But to get back to your goals, what is it that you want to accomplish with these people? And what are some alternatives?

During the supervision session following the activity, Donna gave the student feedback based on her observation of an incident. Specific feedback given immediately after an event can facilitate learning (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 58). Again as in Factor 3, relating to experience, Donna linked the student's learning to her self-concept as a responsible, independent learner:

Donna: S___, in your introduction today, I heard you say that you are volunteering here at the hospital.

Student: I am a student, not a volunteer.

Donna: You're right. Volunteers are not allowed to read the patients' charts. And volunteers do not have to be here. But as a student, you must be here to do the fieldwork expected by your school. You are allowed to look at charts so you can follow what's happening to the patient. And it can affect your work with them. As well as that you're here to do training. Volunteers are not training.

Also during the first supervision session, under Factor 6 subheading, learning content, Donna and the student participated mutually in the learning process. Effective facilitation of learning involves the collaborative engagement of both facilitator and learner in a constant rediagnosis and rearrangement of learning needs and learning content (Brookfield, 1987: 10):

Donna: How did your program go with Mrs. X?

Student: She forgot I was coming and was in bed.

She didn't want to get out when I got there. I told her three times the day before that I was coming and the next day she said, "I forgot. I forgot again."

Donna: So what are you planning to do next week with Mrs. X?

Student: She used to read a lot. Maybe she can read a book and we can discuss it. She used to play bridge. If I brought a book on bridge maybe I can learn and maybe we can discuss it.

Donna: Have you observed that Mrs. X in a group with many people seems to function alright. But she always does the easiest thing in a group. She doesn't draw attention to herself. But working with her alone, she always says "no" to any suggestions. Individually, she is always putting herself down. Why do you think this might be?

Student: I think she is acting confused.

Donna: Good observation. And it may be too confronting to work alone with one of us. So what are you going to do next week?

Student: I tried to get her to read poetry. It didn't work out.

Donna: Do you think she'd look at magazines?

Student: No, she just wants to lie down all the time.

Donna: Do you think it's worth continuing with her? You do have a choice. You can continue with her and struggle and see if you get anywhere. That's a valid learning experience in itself. Or do you want to switch people and try again to do something else with somebody new?

Throughout the second observed supervision session a week later, Donna and the student discussed a variety of issues concerning patient behavior and care. Regarding the student's individual program with a new patient, again Donna encouraged the student to participate in making decisions about the learning

content, as in Conti's Factor 6:

Donna: And then we'll do program planning next week because you have to come up with some ideas first. First you talk to Mrs L. You're going to have to come up with some ideas as to how you're going to use the time you spend with her. The main thing, though, is that the ideas could also be based on what you think she needs.

Student: Okay.

Donna: Okay, so you keep the question in mind "what does this lady need?" Not like a new sweater. I mean while she's here in the hospital. What seems to be the areas where she shows weakness? What are some of her weaknesses and also what are some of her strengths? In other words, you were saying she likes to talk and she likes to talk about her past.

During the last observed supervision session, Factor 2, personalizing instruction, was again stressed with the focus on the supervisor's attempts to match the instructional objectives with the student's needs and abilities and on student self-pacing. As Kadushin (1976: 147) explains, an awareness of the uniqueness of the student's needs facilitates the process of learning. Donna and the student discussed a sample craft the student had prepared for the day's activity. They decided to develop an activity plan, a written record. Donna guided the student in organizing the plan, allowing plenty of time for her to write as her mother-tongue was not English.

Donna: You know what we're going to do exactly with that activity. We're going to set up a plan, an activity plan, so that you'll have a way of keeping it organized all the time. So take your notebook because you'll write down the structure. (long pause) Okay. When I teach

students how to set up activities, this is the same like when they're doing a homework assignment. This is the way they fill out their homework assignment.

Summary

The three observations disclosed that Donna and the student used a collaborative teaching-learning mode in fieldwork supervision before, during and after planned activities in a large hospital setting. Conti's seven factors relating to the Principles of Adult Learning Scale all surfaced in support of Donna's self-report during the interview. Particular emphasis was placed on Factor 2, personalizing instruction, Factor 3, relating to experience and Factor 6, participation in the learning process.

Emergent Findings

The analysis of the observations uphold Donna's self-report during the interview of a collaborative mode of teaching-learning during fieldwork supervision in a geriatric wing of a large hospital. Donna especially favored Conti's Factors 2, 3, 6 and 7: respectively, personalizing instruction, relating to experience, participation in the learning process and flexibility for personal development.

Donna referred to the influence the setting had on her supervision experience. Because the hospital was too large to allow her to observe the student's interactions with many of the patients, Donna relied most on self-reports and issues disclosed by the

student. But she also occasionally observed the student in action which enabled her to selectively give feedback that not only supported the student but challenged her as well.

Effective feedback also involves discreet timing and specificity (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 58). When given immediately after an event, feedback increases the chances of both student and supervisor to accurately recall specific examples and details for a reciprocal, open discussion. Negative feedback immediately given also tends to stop non-productive behavior and enables the student to reflect on and plan for changes.

Donna varied her style of supervision. At times she was a directive coach (Houle, 1972: 101; Knox, 1986: 85) attempting to move the student in a new role along a sequence of clear steps related to a particular setting. At other times she was a flexible facilitator ready to engage the student in critical self-awareness (Brookfield, 1987: 17) by presenting alternative interpretations of the student's learning experiences.

Donna also collaborated with students in using formal performance evaluations provided by educational institutions as a guide for setting learning objectives as well as for assessing outcomes (Bogo and Vayda, 1988: 54). In addition, the contact with the educational institutions helped to maintain in Donna a sense of playing an integral role in the development of skilled

future workers in a geriatric wing of a large hospital.

Conclusion

The data for the analysis and interpretation of this study were derived from three sources: the survey, the interviews and the observations. For the sake of clarity the data was grouped into two parts: the survey made up of the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) and the Demographic Data Sheet, and four separate cases each consisting of an interview and several observations with one of the four selected fieldwork supervisors.

The survey findings show that the forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors upheld a collaborative teaching-learning mode of instruction in their diverse settings. The four (N=4) case study fieldwork supervisors also indicate support for a collaborative mode of instruction but with variations in the degree of support for each of Conti's seven factors.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study investigated adult education practices in fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings. Through the first step of the triangulation methodology which used a two-part questionnaire, a broad base of forty fieldwork supervisors was identified. Four individuals were selected from the pool of forty supervisors as representing typical supervisors. They were subjected to more extensive inquiry through interviews and observations, the second and third triangulation methods.

In this section of the study research findings will be discussed including their implications for educational processes in on-site fieldwork supervision, particularly in geriatric and gerontological settings. Also, the use of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) to implement qualitative research methodologies such as interviews and observations will be discussed.

Discussion of Findings

Survey Findings: The Principles of Adult Learning Scale

The data from Conti's PALS mainly showed that the forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors who responded to the survey did uphold a collaborative mode of teaching-learning to a moderately higher degree ($\bar{X}=155.2$;

SD=15.3) than the normative group for PALS (\bar{X} =146; SD=20). This represented .46 standard deviation units above the normally expected mean for PALS indicating that the fieldwork supervisors were at the 68th percentile rating.

In the survey the fieldwork supervisors adhered to five of the PALS seven factors which are the basic elements of a collaborative teaching-learning mode. They were Factors 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7.

The greatest support was for Factor 1, learner centered activities, with the fieldwork supervisors' mean at .78 standard deviation units above the normally expected mean. This indicated that the fieldwork supervisors practiced behaviors more often than the normative group which encouraged students to initiate actions and to take responsibility for their own learning. Also, the fieldwork supervisors were less likely to emphasize formal tests or to maintain control of the learning environment than the normative group.

The greater adherence of fieldwork supervisors for Factor 1 than the normative group may be explained by the non-traditional educational setting of fieldwork. Students are expected to actively apply theoretical knowledge in actual work settings and learning is centered on the learner rather than on subjects. In fieldwork learning processes are equally as important as learning content.

PALS Factors 4 and 6 were both supported moderately more by the fieldwork supervisors than the normative group. Factor 4, assessing student needs, with a mean of .47 standard units above the normed group mean indicated that the fieldwork supervisors were more likely than the normative group to use formal and informal conferences to help students identify learning gaps and to develop objectives to address the learning needs. The greater adherence to this factor in fieldwork supervision may have been influenced by the fact that fieldwork settings lack the formality of traditional classrooms. Fieldwork supervisors may have preferred to use the structure of conferences to provide ongoing opportunities for identifying learning gaps.

Factor 6, participation in the learning process, with a mean of .54 standard deviations above the normed mean showed that the fieldwork supervisors were moderately more likely than the normed group to involve students in determining the nature and evaluation of the content material and in identifying problems in the learning process. A possible explanation for greater support of Factor 6 among fieldwork supervisors may have been due to the intimacy of the supervisor-student tutorial dyad (Houle, 1973: 97). The dyadic relationship in fieldwork is built on the involvement and interdependence of both supervisor and student.

Factors 2 and 7 were both upheld by the fieldwork

supervisors to a slightly higher degree than the mean of the normative group. Factor 2, personalizing instruction, with a standard deviation of .21, indicated that the fieldwork supervisors were similar to the normative group in designing the learning environment to suit the individual needs of each student with an emphasis on self-paced learning, cooperation rather than competition, and variations in methods, materials and assignments.

The mean score for fieldwork supervisors on Factor 7, flexibility for personal development, indicated similar behaviors to the normed group with .13 standard deviation units above the normed group mean. Fieldwork supervisors supporting this factor would be less likely to take disciplinary action, to rigidly conform to original learning objectives, to avoid controversial topics, and to view themselves as providers of knowledge rather than facilitators.

The survey mean scores for the fieldwork supervisors (N=40) were lower in PALS Factors 3 and 5 than for the normative mean scores.

Factor 3, relating to experience, with a mean of .39 standard deviation units less than the normed group mean indicated that the fieldwork supervisors were less likely than the normative group to utilize prior experiences of the students and to relate activities to everyday life. An explanation may be that fieldwork

supervisors working in geriatric or gerontological settings may have difficulty in helping students to link prior experiences to the daily work with and problems of an elderly population. One of the first issues of concern to supervisors in gerontological fieldwork is to help students overcome commonly held societal myths and negative stereotypes on aging. Age prejudice, also known as ageism, has become part of our social fabric, especially in employment, finances and laws dealing with "competency" as adults (Barrow, 1992: 17). Many of the problems encountered by older people are due to institutionalized social policies and attitudes of others. However, studies show (Novak, 1988: 11) that negative attitudes decline with increased education in general and with information about aging in particular. Debunking of embedded ageism requires time, patience and confrontational skills on the part of fieldwork supervisors.

Factor 5, climate building, showed a mean score for fieldwork supervisors of .33 standard deviation units less than for the normed group mean. This score indicated that the fieldwork supervisors were less likely than the normed group to create an environment where students were encouraged to interact with others, to use their existing abilities, to take risks and to accept errors as beneficial to learning. Rather than being a measure of a fieldwork supervisor's teaching

method, this score may reflect several situational factors such as the secondary occupational role that fieldwork supervision has for supervisors or the needs of agencies to serve clients quickly.

Survey Findings: Demographic Data Sheet

The demographic data from the forty (N=40) survey questionnaire responses enabled the researcher to select four (N=4) individuals who were representative of the larger group of fieldwork supervisors in seven of ten categories: gender, age, educational background, fieldwork supervision experience, current instruction of students who were adults, and training students to work mainly with an elderly population. The four (N=4) selected fieldwork supervisors were not characteristic of the larger group of respondents in three areas:

1) the four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors had received supervision training, unlike the 55% majority of respondents; 2) only one of the four supervisors was supervising a Special Care Counseling student like the 58% majority of respondents; and 3) only one of the four supervisors was working in a community social agency like 40% of the respondents. The other three selected fieldwork supervisors worked in other settings identified in the survey: a hospital, a residence and a day center.

A noteworthy finding issuing from the demographic data is the fact that less than half of the forty (N=40)

survey respondents received supervision training yet their support for Conti's PALS was slightly higher than the normative group. Perhaps these supervisors intuitively engaged in collaborative teaching-learning methods or perhaps their training in human service fields was transferred to their fieldwork supervision situations.

The implication of this finding for further education among fieldwork supervisors is that a practical, but currently informal, foundation already exists for linking theoretical knowledge and for developing the professional role of fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings. As in social work supervision (Lowy, 1983: 6) adult education may provide processes for incorporating professional philosophies, ethics, knowledge, behaviors and skills for fieldwork supervision in geriatric and gerontological settings.

Discussion of Findings: The Four Case Studies

The four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors were interviewed and observed in four separate case studies. The data from the four case studies supported and contrasted with the PALS survey data.

In the PALS survey the forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors supported in descending degree of strength Factors 1, 6, 4, 2 and 7, respectively, learner-centered activities, participation in the learning process,

assessing student needs, personalizing instruction, and flexibility for personal development.

According to the interview and observation coded units of analysis, the collaborative elements most often stressed by the four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors in descending order of frequency were Factors 6, 2, 3 and 7. These findings showed that the four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors acted in ways which encouraged students to participate in the learning process, which personalized instruction according to the needs of individual students, which related student experiences to everyday problems, and which facilitated the personal development of students.

Factor 1, learner-centered activities, while not coded frequently was evident throughout the four cases and supported the results of the PALS survey. According to Conti (1985:9) Factor 1 is the main factor in the PALS instrument. Adherence to this factor implies that supervisors favor students taking responsibility for their learning and initiating action.

In each of the case studies the focus was on the student and learner-centered experiences to varying degrees, as in Factor 1. The student in Case A's community service agency fulfilled a work role with designated tasks such as home visits to isolated elders, but she chose when and how to complete the tasks. Case B in a seniors' residence showed the student taking

increasing responsibility and the supervisor relinquishing control as the student made a commitment to pursue her fieldwork goals. The student in Case C in an adult day center not only was required to initiate actions but her vital role in the center's daily functioning provided many learning experiences. In Case D in a hospital's geriatric wing the abilities and readiness of students determined their level of initiating action. Shy students often used a major portion of their fieldwork learning to initiate communication with patients but more outgoing students were required to take such actions earlier in their fieldwork experience.

The strong support for Conti's PALS Factor 1, learner-centered activities, in both the survey and the case studies implies that it is possible for fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings to empower students in a variety of settings and in a variety of ways.

The case study data based on Conti's seven factors also showed that the four (N=4) selected fieldwork supervisors least upheld Factor 4, assessing students needs, and Factor 5, climate building. One explanation is that the researcher's gathering, coding and interpretations of the data was subjective. The same data scrutinized by and filtered through the perceptions of other investigators probably would yield other

findings.

Another explanation is that the behaviors related to some of Conti's factors may have been present but were not evident in precisely identifiable units of codable evidence.

The lack of support by fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings for Factor 5, climate building, as shown by both the survey data and the case study data, is an unexpected finding. This is especially surprising when considering the intimate nature of the supervisor-student dyad.

Further explanations for the four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors' low support of Factors 4 and 5 are made when examined along with the emergent findings indirectly related to Conti's central principles of adult learning. Seven emergent findings which varied according to the settings and individual supervision styles were:

- 1) the influence of the settings, especially as described in Cases C and D;
- 2) direct observation as a technique used in each of the four cases;
- 3) feedback as a vital component of fieldwork supervision across all the cases;
- 4) the style of supervision and the modelling of supervision behavior from personal experiences as receivers of supervision, particularly in Cases A and D;

- 5) the professional attitude among the four selected supervisors toward their own work with elders, toward the educational institutions and toward the preparation of future workers in geriatric and gerontological settings;
- 6) in all cases, the use of and reliance upon formal contracts and evaluations in lending a framework for student expectations, including time commitments and behaviors;
- 7) the use of discipline for dealing with problems arising from students, as in Cases B and C.

A noteworthy finding of the study was a contradiction between self-reports of the survey results and behaviors revealed during the interviews and observations. The survey showed moderately greater self-reported support by the forty (N=40) respondents ($\bar{X}=15.7$; $SD=2.9$) for Conti's Factor 4, assessing student needs, compared to the normative mean for that factor ($\bar{X}=14$; $SD=3.6$). The case study results revealed behaviors by the four (N=4) selected supervisors that least upheld Factor 4. This factor concentrates on formal and informal conferences for supervisors and students to identify gaps between existing and desired levels of performance, and to address the rediagnosed learning needs by developing short and long-range learning objectives.

The examination of one of the elements of Factor 4,

identifying learning gaps, illustrates the influence of the different settings and the various supervision styles on educational processes in fieldwork supervision.

In experiential learning a crucial component for exposing learning gaps which leads to rediagnosing learning needs is feedback information based on "goal-directed action and evaluation of the consequences of that action" (Kolb, 1984: 22). According to Bogo and Vayda in a 1992 seminar at McGill University School of Social Work, observation and evaluative feedback are essential skills for the enhancement of a fieldwork supervisor's educational role. Effective feedback is reciprocal, ongoing, and specific. It centers on behavior, invites dialogue, is given both formally and informally immediately after an event, and is given systematically within the framework of a learning contract and outcome expectations. Balanced feedback (Bogo and Vayda, 1987: 58) includes discussions of competencies as well as learning gaps.

The emergent findings of the four case studies disclosed that direct observations and feedback were perceived by the four (N=4) fieldwork supervisors as vital components of their educational practices but that they varied according to the different settings. In the seniors' community social center, the seniors' residence and the hospital, deliberate direct observations were

occasionally and inconsistently made by the fieldwork supervisors in this study and feedback information was often based on students' issues and self-reports. This was partly due to the secondary nature of the fieldwork supervision roles and partly the result of inherent physical distances between supervisors and students in such large settings.

According to Conti and Wellborn (1986: 23), situational factors vary according to agency needs and can modify the effects of a collaborative mode of teaching and learning. Contrasted to the other three case settings, Case C's agency relied heavily on students to assist staff in their daily functions. In the intimate setting of the small day center feedback based on direct observations was given formally and informally on a regular basis. Both the agency's need for student support and the small size of the setting were mitigating situational factors.

The four case studies also showed that the personal styles of supervision affected the educational practices of the four fieldwork supervisors. In these four settings where adult education was an allied function (Boshier, 1985: 6) fulfilling only part of the agency's mandate, the supervisor's primary duty was not as an educator. Criteria for assuming and evaluating the role may or may not have existed, although each of the supervisors had obtained supervision training either

formally or informally. Furthermore, their training may not have emphasized some of the elements central to a collaborative mode of teaching and learning such as Conti's Factor 4, assessing student needs, and Factor 5, climate building.

Two other findings emerged from the four (N=4) cases studied as meaningful to adult education practices. The first was the professional attitude of the four fieldwork supervisors toward educational institutions providing students and toward the development of competencies among students as future workers in geriatric and gerontological settings. The second was the fieldwork supervisors' reliance on formal contracts and evaluations to furnish boundaries for both students and supervisors. The collaborative use of these tools enabled students and supervisors to develop learning objectives and to deal with problems arising from students' personal issues such as time commitments, and behaviors requiring disciplinary action.

The two issues can be examined as a function of fieldwork settings which are found beyond traditional classroom boundaries. The implicit and explicit authority of most educational institutions are often discerned by students in rules and regulations governing daily operations within classrooms. Although adult students are encouraged to become self-directed especially in the matter of decision-making (Brookfield,

1987: 56), they may respond negatively or with anxiety to the ambiguity of "real" work settings. Formal contracts and evaluations ensure that the expectations of educational institutions are central to students' learning and provide an overall structure for the fieldwork experience (Wilson, 1981: 50).

These two emergent findings support the view that concepts of adult education contain components of design which are "purposeful, organized and of consequential duration" (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982: 6).

Implications of Fieldwork Supervision as Adult Education

The practical or clinical component of any profession relies on experiential learning in an actual professional work setting. Adult education practices within the specific contexts of the four case study settings illuminate the influence of experiential learning on both fieldwork supervisors and students in geriatric and gerontological settings. Each of the four supervisors cited prior and ongoing experiences as sources for new layers of learning in their roles as adult educators. Their styles of supervision had been developed and continued to be honed from prior personal experiences as students, and previous and current professional experiences as fieldwork supervisors. The spin-off benefit for students was the supervisors' modelling behaviors and the active participation expected of students in practical fieldwork settings.

In Dewey's view (1938: 39-42) experience in education has a double meaning, referring to internal and external circumstances of a learning occurrence. In his words:

Experience does not go on simply inside a person. It does go on there, for it influences the formation of attitudes of desire and purpose. But this is not the whole of the story. Every genuine experience has an active side which changes in some degree the objective conditions under which experiences are had

The word "*interaction*" assigns equal rights to both factors in experience - objective and internal conditions. Any normal experience is an interplay of these two sets of conditions.

Internal and external factors were blended by Kolb (1984: 33) in his perception of a "holistic adaptive process" of experiential learning, learning that refers to human adaptation across all settings and in all developmental stages of life. According to Kolb:

performance, learning, and development . . . form a continuum of adaptive postures Performance is limited to short-term adaptations to immediate circumstance, learning encompasses somewhat longer-term mastery of generic classes of situations, and development encompasses lifelong adaptations to one's total life situation.

Kolb's explanation further clarifies the context of this study's four cases of fieldwork supervision. While each of the supervisors was concerned about present evidences of competent performance and longer-term learning among the students across a variety of situations, they were also committed to a larger view of continued personal and professional growth.

This suggests that adult education has a role to play in the professionalization of gerontological fieldwork supervision in the provision of standards and the provision of continuing professional development.

Implications of the Study for Fieldwork Supervision in Geriatric and Gerontological Settings

As stated at the beginning of this study, a major concern of Canadian gerontologists and councils advising government policy is a need for educators to recognize their role in preparing future professionals and paraprofessionals from a variety of fields of study to work directly with elderly people (Matthews and Stryckman, 1988: 2; National Advisory Council on Aging, 1991: 5).

This study shows that in the Montreal Island area a group of fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings intuitively adhered to central principles of adult learning in a collaborative mode with adult fieldwork students. Education in fieldwork supervision was adult-oriented, purposeful, experiential and learner-centered. The study also shows that this occurred across a variety of settings and fields of study. Fieldwork supervision was provided by workers whose primary gerontological occupations were non-educational and by agencies whose educational responsibilities were secondary to other community functions.

Boshier (1985: 6) points out that in most countries

there are many more adult educators than there are primary, secondary or post-secondary educators. Most adult education providers are primarily affiliated with roles or occupations other than education and do not identify themselves with a world-wide group of practitioners of adult education. The diversity of settings and occupations poses a challenge in examining the training needs and "career paths" of these educators.

Further implications for fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings revolves around the professional development and recognition of their work. In most other professions such as medicine, law, engineering and accounting, there is a practical or clinical component to the training. As shown by this study the field of gerontology in the Montreal Island area already has its clinical component in place, although informally. Initial and continuing professional development as well as standards of professionalism in gerontology fieldwork supervision may be realized through utilizing adult education concepts to examine philosophies, purposes, methods, theoretical knowledge, and skills for working with elderly people and their families.

The professionalization of gerontological fieldwork supervision has implications for the four groups involved: fieldwork supervisors, their agencies,

students and their educational institutions.

Agencies would benefit by having criteria for assigning and evaluating fieldwork supervision roles. With recognition of the professional role taken by their fieldwork supervisors agencies may reduce some of the functional drawbacks of the settings. For example, they may allot more time and space to specific elements of teaching and learning processes such as direct observation and feedback, or climate building as in Conti's Factor 5. In this way fieldwork supervisors would have more opportunities to practice their skills. Professionalization would also mean that the number of fieldwork hours for students would be predetermined and liaison with educational institutions would be formalized, creating clear boundaries for everyone involved.

Continuing development is a distinguishing feature across professions and would become an important area for professionalized gerontological fieldwork supervision. Boshier (1985: 3) comments about a general assumption that "trained adult educators are better than untrained ones" and that "professional workers, such as doctors and engineers, have clear adult education functions and thus are candidates for training". This study shows that less than half of the forty (N=40) fieldwork supervisors responding to the survey had received supervision training. If fieldwork supervisors

wish to become professionalized, now is the time for them as a group to begin to identify a suitable knowledge base and a definite career direction.

Louis Lowy (1983: 61) discussed the generic use of a social work supervision model in other human service professions in Europe. In a similar manner, the framework of adult education may provide a unifying link for the professionalization of fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings.

Contributions of the Study

Extending the Use of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale

This study applied Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) to a specific group of adult educators in specific contexts: fieldwork supervisors in geriatric and gerontological settings. It contributed to the understanding and extension of the scale's application in three ways:

- 1) Conti's PALS provided the conceptual framework for the triangulation methodology used in the case study. The multiple strategies employed a survey, interviews and observations to balance the limitations of each method (Merriam, 1988: 69).
- 2) PALS generated both quantitative descriptive data and qualitative data which furnished counterchecks to allow the most pertinent data to emerge (Merriam: 1988: 69).
- 3) The forty-four behaviorally stated items of the

scale were clustered under appropriate factors identified by Conti (Appendix E) and formed coding criteria amenable to both the interview guidelines (Appendix F) and the observation guidelines (Appendix G). The coding criteria may assist readers to better understand specific behaviors identified in the analysis of this study.

The literature review showed that Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale has its foundation firmly entrenched in adult education concepts which have evolved from Dewey's philosophical thoughts on education to more current adult education proponents such as David Kolb and Stephen Brookfield. The literature review also revealed that these central principles of adult learning have been espoused by leaders in the field of educational supervision in social work. Perhaps a future study will show that adult education concepts are used generically across a wide variety of professions.

Future Research

Regarding the extension of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale, a further step in the analysis of data was omitted by this researcher to maintain the manageability of the study. If future researchers do replicate this triangulated application of Conti's PALS they may wish to compare and contrast the transcript analyses of the interviews and observations with PALS total questionnaire scores and seven factor scores of

each interviewed and observed participant. This would ascertain the congruency between the participants' self-reports and behavioral adherence to a collaborative mode of teaching and learning. Future researchers might also wish to make further modifications to the coding criteria for interviews and observations.

In this study the different fieldwork settings were an important variable in determining the transactive nature of teaching and learning. Adult education practices beyond classroom boundaries might also be investigated in other settings which provide clinical or practical training. In future research other professions or fields of study may be discovered as fertile ground for further development and linkages with philosophies, theories and processes of adult education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barth, Richard P. and Eileen D. Gambrill. "Learning to Interview: The Quality of Training Opportunities." In Supervising Student Internships in Human Services, edited by Carlton E. Munson. New York: The Haworth Press, 1984, 3-14.
- Barrows, Georgia M. Aging, the Individual and Society (fifth ed). St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company, 1992.
- Bogo, Marion and Elaine Vayda. The Practice of Field Instruction in Social Work. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Bogo, Marion and Elaine Vayda. Workshop "Field Instruction in Social Work". Montreal: McGill School of Social Work, March 20, 1992.
- Boshier, Roger. "Conceptual Framework for Analyzing the Training of Trainers and Adult Educators", Convergence, Vol 8, 3-4, 1985, 3-21.
- Boydston, Jo Ann, ed. Guide to the Works of John Dewey. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. The Skillful Teacher. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1991.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. Editor. Training Educators of Adults. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. Developing Critical Thinking. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986.
- Brookfield, Stephen D. Adult Learners, Adult Education and the Community. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 1983.
- Brundage, Donald H. and Dorothy MacKeracher. Adult Learning Principles and their Application to Program Planning. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.
- Chambers, Donald E. and Richard Spano. "Integration of Learning in Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W.

- Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 226-234.
- Chappell, Neena L. The Aging of the Canadian Population Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1990.
- Clancy, Catherine A. An Investigaion of the Use of the Collaborative Teaching-Learning Mode by Graduate Social Work Field Instructor. University of Houston: Unpublished doctoral thesis, 1986.
- Conti, Gary J. "Assessing Teaching Style in Continuing Education", Effective Teaching Styles, editor E.R. Hayes, New Directions for Continuing Education. 43. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989, 3-16.
- Conti, Gary J. "Assessing Teaching Style in Adult Education: How and Why." Lifelong Learning. 8, 1985, 7-11.
- Conti, Gary J. Principles of Adult Learning Scale: Follow-up and Factor Analysis. Proceedings of the 24th Annual Education Research Conference, (ERIC No. ED 228 424), 1983, 63-68.
- Conti, Gary J. Principles of Adult Learning Scale. Proceedings of the 20th Annaul Education Research Conference, (ERIC No. ED 179 713), 1979, 1-19.
- Conti, Gary J. Principles of Adult Learning Scale: An Instrument for Measuring Teacher Behavior Related to the Collaborative Teaching-Learning Mode. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1978.
- Conti, Gary J. and Ruth B. Welborn. "Teaching-learning Styles and the Adult Learner", Lifelong Learning, 9, 8, 1986, 20-24.
- Darkenwald, Gordon G. and Sharan B. Merriam. Adult Education: Foundations of Practice. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Dastyk-Blackmore, Rose. "Is Field Teaching Supervision?", Canadian Journal of Social Work Education Vol 8, 1982, 74-80.
- Dea, Kay L., Marah Grist and Ruth C. Myli. "Learning Tasks for Practice Competence", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W. Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 237-261.

- Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1938.
- Dychtwald, Ken and Joe Flower. Age Wave. New York: Bantam Books, 1990.
- Fry, Ronald and David Kolb, "Experiential Learning Theory and Learning Experiences in Liberal Arts Education", New Directions for Experiential Learning, 6, 1979, 79-92.
- Gelfand, Bernard, Sandy Rohrich, Pat Nevidon and Igor Starak. "An Andragogical Application to the Training of Social Workers", Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol 11, 3, 1975, 55-61.
- George, Aase. "A History of Social Work Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W. Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 37-59.
- Gitterman, Alex. "Comparison of Educational Models and Their Influences on Supervision", Issues in Human Services, edited by Florence Whiteman Kaslow. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1972, 18-38.
- Gitterman, Alex and Irving Miller. "Supervisors as Educators", Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions, edited by Florence Whiteman Kaslow. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1977, 100-114.
- Goetz, Judith Preissle and Margaret Diane LeCompte. Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press, 1984.
- Groombridge, Brian. "Adult Education and the Education of Adults", Education for Adults, edited by Malcolm Tight. Kent, England: Crom Helm, 1983, 3-19.
- Guba, Egan G. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Fourth Generation Evaluation. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1989.
- Guba, Egan C. "Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries", Educational Communications and Technology Journal, 29, 1981, 75-92.
- Hersh, Alexander. "Teaching Theory and Practice of Student Supervision: A Short-Term Model Based on Principles of Adult Education." Supervising Student Internships in Human Services, edited by Carlton E.

- Munson. New York: The Haworth Press, 1984, 29-44.
- Holloway, Stephen and George Brager. Supervising in the Human Services. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, 1989.
- Houle, Cyril O. Patterns of Learning. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1984.
- Houle, Cyril O. Continuing Learning in the Professions. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.
- Houle, Cyril O. The Design of Education. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- Jenkins, Lowell, E. and Bradford W. Sheafor. "An Overview of Social Work Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W. Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 3-20.
- Kadushin, Alfred. Supervision in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.
- Kadushin, Alfred. "Supervisor-Supervisee: A Survey", Social Work, 1974, 288-297.
- Kaslow, Florence Whiteman and Associates. Issues in Human Services. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- Kaslow, Florence Whiteman and Associates. Supervision, Consultation, and Staff Training in the Helping Professions. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.
- Kautzmann, Lisette N. "Clinical Teaching: Fieldwork Supervisors' Attitudes and Values", The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, Vol 44, 9, 1990, 836- 838.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. Using Learning Contracts. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species, third ed. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing, 1984.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. Chicago: Follett Publishing, 1980.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based Upon Adult Learning, Journal of

- Education for Social Work, Vol 8, 2, 1972, 32-39.
- Knox, Alan B. Helping Adults Learn. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1986.
- Knox, Alan B. Editor. Enhancing Proficiencies of Continuing Educators. *New Directions for Continuing Education*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Knox, Alan B. Adult Development and Learning. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Knox, Alan B. and Linda K. Bock, Dennis A. Dahl, Arden D. Grotelueschen, James C. Hall, Philip M. Nowlen, Ronald Szczykowski, Joy Reed Belt and Thurman J. White. Developing, Administering and Evaluating Adult Education. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Kolb, David. Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- Kolb, David A. and Ronald Fry. "Towards an Applied Theory of Experiential Learning", Theories of Group Processes, editor C.L. Cooper. London: John Wiley and Sons, 1975, 33-57.
- Lowy, Louis. "Social Work Supervision: From Models toward Theory", Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol 19, 2, 1983, 55-62.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Egon G. Guba. "Judging the Quality of Case Study Reports." Qualitative Studies in Education, 3, 1990, 53-59.
- Markiewicz, D. The Department of Applied Social Science Essential Characteristics. Montreal: Concordia University, 1984.
- Matthews, Charlotte and Judith Stryckman. "Adapting to an Aging Population through Education", revised. National Advisory Council on Aging News Release. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1988.
- Merriam, Sharan B. Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1988.
- Munson, Carlton E., ed. Supervising Student Internships in Human Services. New York: The Haworth Press, 1984.

- National Advisory Council on Aging. The NACA Position on Gerontology Education. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1991.
- Novak, Mark. Aging and Society: A Canadian Perspective. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada, 1988.
- Rotholz, Tryna and Annette Werk. "Student Supervision: An Educational Process." In Supervising Student Internships in Human Services, editor Carlton E. Munson. New York: The Haworth Press, 1984, 15-27.
- Social Work Education and Manpower Project, Progress Report. Ottawa: Carleton University School of Social Work, 1975.
- Shafer, Carl M. "Methods of Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W. Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 215-225.
- Sheafor, Bradford W. and Lowell E. Jenkins, editors. Quality Field Instruction in Social Work. New York: Longman, 1982.
- Siporin, Max. "The Process of Field Instruction", Quality Field Instruction in Social Work, edited by Bradford W. Sheafor and Lowell E. Jenkins. New York: Longman, 1982, 175-197.
- Speers, George E. Supervision in Human Service Organizations. Brantford, Ont.: Jade Publications, 1990.
- Stone, Leroy O. and Susan Fletcher. The Seniors Boom: Dramatic Increases in Longevity and Prospects for Better Health. Ottawa: Statistics Canada and the Minister of Supply and Services, 1986.
- Thomlison, B., S. Watt and D. Kimberley. "Trends and Issues in the Field Preparation of Social Work Manpower: Part III Educational Policy, Accreditation Standards, and Guidelines, Canadian Journal of Social Work Education, Vol 8, 2, 1982, 101-120.
- Wilson, Susanna J. Field Instruction. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing, 1981.
- Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research: Design and Methods, revised, in Applied Social Research Methods Series, Volume 5. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1989.

APPENDIX A

Demographic Data Sheet

Return to: Mrs. M. LeBrun
413 Vercheres
Greenfield Park, Quebec
J4V 2B7

Code No _____

Telephone: 466-8995 (home); 484-7976 (work)

Name of Respondent: _____
(optional)
Telephone (optional): _____

1. Sex: _____ Female _____ Male

2. Age: _____ Under 31
_____ 32 - 40
_____ 41 - 50
_____ 51 - 60
_____ 60 +

3. What is your educational background?

_____ High School
_____ College (CEGEP)
_____ University:
_____ Some
_____ B.A. etc
_____ M.A. etc
_____ Other (please specify) _____

4. In general, which category best describes your agency?

_____ Hospital
_____ Health Care Institution other than Hospital
_____ Residence
_____ Day Center
_____ Community Social Agency
_____ Other (please specify) _____

5. Is your agency

_____ Public
_____ Private
_____ Other (please specify) _____

6. How many years have you been a fieldwork supervisor?

_____ Less than 2 years
_____ 2 - 5 years
_____ 6 - 10 years
_____ 11 or more years

7. How many students are you supervising now?

8. What kinds of students do you supervise?
(please check all that apply)

	<u>CEGEP</u>	<u>University</u>
_____ Special Care Counselling	_____	_____
_____ Gerontology	_____	_____
_____ Social Services	_____	_____
_____ Social Work	_____	_____
_____ Leisure Studies	_____	_____
_____ Exercise Science	_____	_____
_____ Family Life Education	_____	_____
_____ Adult Education	_____	_____
_____ Other (please specify) _____	_____	_____

9. Do the students you supervise train to work in your agency with elders 60 years of age or more, compared to working with other age groups?

_____ 50% or more of the time
_____ 20-49% of the time
_____ 19% or less of the time

10. Are any of the students *adult** learners?

_____ Yes
_____ No

11. Have you had any training directly related to the process of fieldwork supervision?

_____ No
_____ Yes
If yes, approximate number of hours _____

12. If yes to Number 11, how did you train?
(please check all that apply)

_____ Agency Staff Development
_____ Professional Association
_____ Educational Institution
_____ Other (please specify) _____

* 1976 UNESCO definition: "persons regarded as adult by the society to which they belong".

PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING SCALE

ANSWER SHEET

	Always	Almost Always	Often	Seldom	Almost Never	Never		Always	Almost Always	Often	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
1.	0	1	2	3	4	5	23.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	0	1	2	3	4	5	24.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	0	1	2	3	4	5	25.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	0	1	2	3	4	5	26.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	0	1	2	3	4	5	27.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	0	1	2	3	4	5	28.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	0	1	2	3	4	5	29.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	0	1	2	3	4	5	30.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	0	1	2	3	4	5	31.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	0	1	2	3	4	5	32.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11.	0	1	2	3	4	5	33.	0	1	2	3	4	5
12.	0	1	2	3	4	5	34.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13.	0	1	2	3	4	5	35.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14.	0	1	2	3	4	5	36.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15.	0	1	2	3	4	5	37.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16.	0	1	2	3	4	5	38.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17.	0	1	2	3	4	5	39.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.	0	1	2	3	4	5	40.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.	0	1	2	3	4	5	41.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.	0	1	2	3	4	5	42.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21.	0	1	2	3	4	5	43.	0	1	2	3	4	5
22.	0	1	2	3	4	5	44.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Principles of Adult Learning Scale
Gary J. Conti

Directions: The following survey contains several things that a teacher of adults might do in a learning situation. You may personally find some of them desirable and find others undesirable. For each item please respond to the way you most frequently practice the action described in the item. Your choices are Always, Almost Always, Often, Seldom, Almost Never, and Never. On your answer sheet, circle 0 if you always do the event; circle number 1 if you almost always do the event; circle number 2 if you often do the event; circle number 3 if you seldom do the event; circle number 4 if you almost never do the event; and circle number 5 if you never do the event. If the item *does not apply* to you, circle number 5 for never.

Please use the attached answer sheet.

Always	Almost Always	Often	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. I allow students to participate in developing the criteria for evaluating their performance.
2. I use disciplinary action when it is needed.
3. I allow older students more time to complete assignments when they need it.
4. I encourage students to adopt accepted middle class values.
5. I help students diagnose the gaps between their goals and their present level of performance.
6. I provide knowledge rather than serve as a resource person.
7. I stick to the instructional objectives that I write at the beginning of a program.
8. I participate in the informal counseling of students.
9. I use lecturing as the best method for presenting my subject material to adult students.
10. I arrange the learning environment so that it is easy for students to interact.
11. I determine the educational objectives for each of my students.
12. I plan units which differ as widely as possible from my students' socio-economic backgrounds.

13. I get a student to motivate himself/herself by confronting him/her in the presence of others during group discussions.
14. I plan learning episodes to take into account my students' prior experiences.
15. I allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in their fieldwork.
16. I use one basic teaching method because I have found that most adults have a similar style of learning.
17. I use different techniques depending on the students being taught.
18. I encourage dialogue among my students.
19. I use written tests to assess the degree of academic growth rather than to indicate new directions for learning.
20. I utilize the many competencies that most adult students already possess to achieve educational objectives.
21. I use what history has proven that adults need to learn as my chief criterion for planning learning episodes.
22. I accept errors as a natural part of the learning process.
23. I have individual conferences to help students identify their educational needs.
24. I let each student work at his/her own rate regardless of the amount of time it takes him/her to learn a new concept.
25. I help my students develop short-range as well as long-range objectives.
26. I maintain a well disciplined learning environment to reduce interferences to learning.
27. I avoid discussion during fieldwork supervision of controversial subjects that involve value judgements.
28. I allow my students to take periodic breaks during fieldwork.
29. I use methods that foster quiet, productive deskwork.
30. I use tests as my chief method of evaluating students.
31. I plan activities that will encourage each student's growth from dependence on others to greater independence.
32. I gear my instructional objectives to match the individual abilities and needs of the students.

33. I avoid issues that relate to the student's concept of himself/herself.
34. I encourage my students to ask questions about the nature of their society.
35. I allow a student's motives for participating in fieldwork education to be a major determinant in the planning of learning objectives.
36. I have my students identify their own problems that need to be solved.
37. I give all my fieldwork students the same assignment on a given topic.
38. I use materials that were originally designed for students in elementary and secondary schools.
39. I organize adult learning episodes according to the problems that my students encounter in everyday life.
40. I measure a student's long term educational growth by comparing his/her total achievement in fieldwork to his/her expected performance as measured by national norms from standardized tests.
41. I encourage competition among my students.
42. I use different materials with different students.
43. I help students relate new learning to their prior experiences.
44. I teach units about problems of everyday living.

APPENDIX B

Principles of Adult Learning Scale

Directions: The following survey contains several things that a teacher of adults might do in a classroom. You may personally find some of them desirable and find others undesirable. For each item please respond to the way you most frequently practice the action described in the item. Your choices are Always, Almost Always, Often, Seldom, Almost Never, and Never. On your answer sheet, circle 0 if you always do the event; circle number 1 if you almost always do the event; circle number 2 if you often do the event; circle number 3 if you seldom do the event; circle number 4 if you almost never do the event; and circle number 5 if you never do the event. If the item *does not apply* to you, circle number 5 for never.

Always	Almost Always	Often	Seldom	Almost Never	Never
0	1	2	3	4	5

1. I allow students to participate in developing the criteria for evaluating their performance in class.
2. I use disciplinary action when it is needed.
3. I allow older students more time to complete assignments when they need it.
4. I encourage students to adopt middle class values.
5. I help students diagnose the gaps between their goals and their present level of performance.
6. I provide knowledge rather than serve as a resource person.
7. I stick to the instructional objectives that I write at the beginning of a program.
8. I participate in the informal counseling of students.
9. I use lecturing as the best method for presenting my subject material to adult students.
10. I arrange the classroom so that it is easy for students to interact.
11. I determine the educational objectives for each of my students.
12. I plan units which differ as widely as possible from my students' socio-economic backgrounds.
13. I get a student to motivate himself/herself by confronting him/her in the presence of classmates during group discussions.
14. I plan learning episodes to take into account my students' prior experiences.
15. I allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in class.
16. I use one basic teaching method because I have found that most adults have a similar style of learning.
17. I use different techniques depending on the students being taught.
18. I encourage dialogue among my students.
19. I use written tests to assess the degree of academic growth rather than to indicate new directions for learning.
20. I utilize the many competencies that most adults already possess to achieve educational objectives.
21. I use what history has proven that adults need to learn as my chief criteria for planning learning episodes.
22. I accept errors as a natural part of the learning process.
23. I have individual conferences to help students identify their educational needs.
24. I let each student work at his/her own rate regardless of the amount of time it takes him/her to learn a new concept.
25. I help my students develop short-range as well as long-range objectives.
26. I maintain a well disciplined classroom to reduce interferences to learning.
27. I avoid discussion of controversial subjects that involve value judgements.
28. I allow my students to take periodic breaks during class.

29. I use methods that foster quiet, productive d sk-work.
30. I use tests as my chief method of evaluating students.
31. I plan activities that will encourage each student's growth from dependence on others to greater independence.
32. I gear my instructional objectives to match the individual abilities and needs of the students.
33. I avoid issues that relate to the student's concept of himself/herself.
34. I encourage my students to ask questions about the nature of their society.
35. I allow a student's motives for participating in continuing education to be a major determinant in the planning of learning objectives.
36. I have my students identify their own problems that need to be solved.
37. I give all students in my class the same assignment on a given topic.
38. I use materials that were originally designed for students in elementary and secondary schools.
39. I organize adult learning episodes according to the problems that my students encounter in everyday life.
40. I measure a student's long term educational growth by comparing his/her total achievement in class to his/her expected performance as measured by national norms from standardized tests.
41. I encourage competition among my students.
42. I use different materials with different students.
43. I help students relate new learning to their prior experiences.
44. I teach units about problems of everyday living.

APPENDIX C

CASSW FIELD PREPARATION STUDY
FIELD INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Code No.

Return to: Ms B. Thomlison
28 South Kingslea Drive
Toronto. M8Y 2A4

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of Respondent: _____
(Optional)
2. In general, which category best describes your Agency?
(please check)

Personal Social Services:

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Child | _____ |
| Family | _____ |
| Aged | _____ |
| Health | _____ |
| Justice/Corrections | _____ |
| Welfare | _____ |
| Education | _____ |
| Economics/Labour | _____ |
| Recreation | _____ |
| Other | _____ Please specify _____ |

3. Approximately how many full-time social workers are on staff at your Agency?

None	___	21 - 40	___
1 - 4	___	41 - 50	___
5 - 10	___	61 +	___
11 - 20	___		

4. Is your Agency

Public	___	or Private	___
Other	___	> Please specify	_____

5. Are the students from the School on a block or concurrent placement plan?

Block	___	Concurrent	___
Other	___	> Please specify	_____

6. What kind of students do you supervise?

B.S.W.	___	Both	___
M.S.W.	___	Other	___ > Please
Specify _____			

PART II - FIELD INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

1. Sex: Female Male

2. Age: Under 31
32 - 40
41 - 50
51 - 60
60 +

3. Are you employed
by the Agency? Full-time Part-Time N/A
by the School? Full-time Part-Time N/A

4. Do you consider yourself to be:
Agency-based Faculty-based
Other >Please specify _____

5. What is your educational background? Please check.
(Degrees/Diplomas/Certificates)
D. S. W.
M. S. W.
B. S. W.
Other >Please specify _____

Degrees/Diplomas/Certificates _____

6. Are you a member of your Provincial Social Work Association?

Yes _____ No _____

7. How many years of Social Work practice experience have you had?

Less than 2 years _____

2 - 5 years _____

6 - 10 years _____

11 - 20 years _____

21 - 30 years _____

30 or more years _____

8. How many years have you been a field instructor? _____ years

9. How many Social Work students are you supervising now? _____

10. What are your roles or functions in the Agency?
(Check all that apply)

Direct service with clients _____

Community Work _____

Research _____

Supervision (not students) _____

Agency Administration/Management _____

Department/Programme Administration _____

Staff Development _____

Field Instruction _____

Other, please specify _____

11. What kinds of students do you supervise?

(Check all that apply)

Direct practice with individuals/families/groups _____

Community Development _____

Policy, Planning and Administration _____

Research _____

Other, please specify _____

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

The Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS)

Forty-Four Items Listed by Factors

Factor 1: Learner Centered Activities

Question 2
Question 4
Question 11
Question 12
Question 13
Question 16
Question 19
Question 21
Question 29
Question 30
Question 38
Question 40

Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction

Question 3
Question 9
Question 17
Question 24
Question 32
Question 35
Question 37
Question 41
Question 42

Factor 3: Relating to Prior Experience

Question 14
Question 31
Question 34
Question 39
Question 43
Question 44

Factor 4: Assessing Student Needs

Question 5
Question 8
Question 23
Question 25

Factor 5: Climate Building

Question 18
Question 20
Question 22
Question 28

Factor 6: Participation in the Learning Process

Question 1
Question 10
Question 15
Question 36

Factor 7: Flexibility for Personal Development

Question 6
Question 7
Question 26
Question 27
Question 33

PALS QUESTIONS BY FACTORS

FACTOR 1: Learner-Centered Activities (negatively stated)

11. I determine the educational objectives for each of my students.
19. I use written tests to assess the degree of academic growth rather than to indicate new directions for learning.
30. I use tests as my chief method of evaluating students.
40. I measure a student's long term educational growth by comparing his/her total achievement in fieldwork to his/her expected performance as measured by national norms from standardized tests.
2. I use disciplinary action when it is needed.
4. I encourage students to adopt accepted middle class values.
13. I get a student to motivate himself/herself by confronting him/her in the presence of others during group discussions.
29. I use methods that foster quiet, productive deskwork.
16. I use one basic teaching method because I have found that most adults have a similar style of learning.
21. I use what history has proven that adults need to learn as my chief criterion for planning learning episodes.
12. I plan units which differ as widely as possible from my students' socio-economic backgrounds.
38. I use materials that were originally designed for students in elementary and secondary schools.

FACTOR 2: Personalizing Instruction

3. I allow older students more time to complete assignments when they need it.
24. I let each student work at his/her own rate regardless of the amount of time it takes him/her to learn a new concept.
37. I give all my fieldwork students the same assignment on a given topic.

- 9. I use lecturing as the best method for presenting my subject material to adult students.
- 17. I use different techniques depending on the students being taught.
- 42. I use different materials with different students.
- 32. I gear my instructional objectives to match the individual abilities and needs of the students.
- 35. I allow a student's motives for participating in fieldwork education to be a major determinant in the planning of learning objectives.
- 41. I encourage competition among my students.

FACTOR 3: Relating to Experience

- 14. I plan learning episodes to take into account my students' prior experiences.
- 31. I plan activities that will encourage each student's growth from dependence on others to greater independence.
- 43. I help students relate new learning to their prior experiences.
- 34. I encourage my students to ask questions about the nature of their society.
- 39. I organize adult learning episodes according to the problems that my students encounter in everyday life.
- 44. I teach units about problems of everyday living.

FACTOR 4: Assessing Student Needs

- 8. I participate in the informal counseling of students.
- 23. I have individual conferences to help students identify their educational needs.

25. I help my students develop short-range as well as long-range objectives.
5. I help students diagnose the gaps between their goals and their present level of performance.

FACTOR 5: Climate Building

18. I encourage dialogue among my students.
28. I allow my students to take periodic breaks during fieldwork.
20. I utilize the many competencies that most adult students already possess to achieve educational objectives.
22. I accept errors as a natural part of the learning process.

FACTOR 6: Participation in Learning Process

15. I allow students to participate in making decisions about the topics that will be covered in their fieldwork.
10. I arrange the learning environment so that it is easy for students to interact.
36. I have my students identify their own problems that need to be solved.
1. I allow students to participate in developing the criteria for evaluating their performance.

FACTOR 7: Flexibility for Personal Development
(negatively stated)

6. I provide knowledge rather than serve as a resource person.
27. I avoid discussion during fieldwork supervision of controversial subjects that involve value judgements.
33. I avoid issues that relate to the student's concept of himself/herself.
7. I stick to the instructional objectives that I write at the beginning of a program.
26. I maintain a well disciplined learning environment to reduce interferences to learning.

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW GUIDE
BASED ON GARY J. CONTI'S SEVEN FACTORS IN
THE PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING SCALE
AND SUPPORTED BY ALFRED KADUSHIN'S
SUPERVISION IN SOCIAL WORK

Factor 1: Learner Centered Activities

Formal Evaluation Methods

In what way are formal evaluation methods used? Tests?
How are educational objectives determined? Collaboratively?

Discipline

What are your views on the use of discipline in fieldwork supervision? Confrontation?

Education as a Teaching Activity

What are your views in your fieldwork supervision experience of active and passive learning?

How can a supervisor take into account the supervisee's uniqueness as an adult learner?

How is learning centered on specific situations of the learner in contrast to predetermined topics?

Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction

Self-Pacing

What is your approach with students who learn slower than others?

Variety in Methods and Materials

How do you reinforce important new concepts?
Repetition using different ways to illustrate?
Discuss similarities and differences in a variety of experiences?

Individualization of learner needs and objectives

How might an educational diagnosis or learning contract be tailored to fit the learning needs of the student?

How are assignments decided upon? Same ones as other student

Factor 3: Relating to Experience

Learner's prior experience

How is a student's prior experience used? Acknowledged?
How is it linked to new learning?

How do you and the student benefit from his/her experience?

Problem solving

How do deliberate learning efforts help learners
attach new meanings to previous life experiences?

Factor 4: Assessing Student Needs

Informal Conferences

How are gaps in the student's goals and present level of
performance identified? Informally?

Educational or Formal Counselling

How is the student involved in assessing his/her learning
needs?

Identifying objectives, resources?
Rediagnosing learning needs?

Factor 5: Climate Building

Student Empowerment or Control

What are your thoughts on students interacting during activities or during breaks?

What do they learn from one another?

What about student initiative?

What about students making decisions?

Psychological Safety

How do you view student errors?

What do you think about students' risk-taking?

Do students analyze previously unchallenged behaviours, values?

How does a supervisor offer a balance of challenge and support to students?

Factor 6: Participation in Learning Process

Learning Content

Who selects the activities or content for learning?

How does a supervisor encourage commitment to learning?

Identifying Problems

How does a supervisor supplement, rather than substitute, for a student's thinking?

What opportunities do students have for questioning, expressing doubts, objecting and discussing?

Evaluating outcomes

How do students measure gaps in their learning and identify directions for further development?

How do supervisor and students engage in rediagnosis and rearrangement of learning needs and content? Collaboratively?

Factor 7: Flexibility for Personal Development

Instructor as Facilitator

What are your views on the importance of the supervisor-student relationship?

Do both accept each other?

Are you comfortably relaxed with each other?

How does the supervisor's relationship with the student provide a model for the student effectively relating to clients?

How does the supervisor act as a resource person?

Expose student to novel ideas?

Help student refine aspirations for changing own behaviour?

Involve student in self-evaluation?

Or does the supervisor impart his/her knowledge?

Flexibility

As a supervisor, what are your views on collaborating with students in making adjustments to original objectives?

Demographic Data

We have been discussing the EDUCATIONAL PROCESS of fieldwork supervision by the agency's worker, you. Do you have any thoughts or comments to add to this specific focus on supervision?

Now I would like to ask you how some of the following factors might influence or affect your experience as a fieldwork supervisor, in particular the teaching/coaching/tutorial part of it.

The factors are:

- a) The amount of years of experience you have had as a supervisor
- b) The number of students you supervise at any given time
- c) The students' educational focus, i.e. social work, leisure studies
- d) The setting where fieldwork supervision occurs
- e) The advantages and disadvantages of supervising adult students
- f) Your own training to do fieldwork supervision
- g) Where training for fieldwork supervision occurred

Additional questions:

What do you like most about supervision?

What are some of the difficult areas?

How do you deal with issues with students or educational institutions?

What kind of supports do we as fieldwork supervisors have from our own agencies?

How does your agency recognize fieldwork supervision as part of your role?

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

Thank you for participating in this part of my study.

INTERVIEW GUIDE
BASED ON GARY J. CONTI'S SEVEN FACTORS IN
THE PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING SCALE
AND SUPPORTED BY ALFRED KADUSHIN'S
SUPERVISION IN SOCIAL WORK

Factor 1: Learner Centered Activities

Formal Evaluation Methods

Discipline

Education as a Teaching Activity

Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction

Self-Pacing

Variety in Methods and Materials

Individualization of learner needs and objectives

Factor 3: Relating to Experience

Learner's prior experience

Problem solving

Factor 4: Assessing Student Needs

Informal Conferences - learning gaps

Educational or Formal Counselling

Factor 5: Climate Building

Student Empowerment or Control

Psychological Safety

Factor 6: Participation in Learning Process

Learner involvement in:

Learning Content

Identifying Problems

Evaluating outcomes

Factor 7: Flexibility for Personal Development

Instructor as Facilitator

Flexibility

Demographic Data

We have been discussing the EDUCATIONAL PROCESS of fieldwork supervision by the agency's worker, you. Do you have any thoughts or comments to add to this specific focus on supervision?

Now I would like to ask you how some of the following factors might influence or affect your experience as a fieldwork supervisor, in particular the teaching/coaching/tutorial part of it.

The factors are:

- a) The amount of years of experience you have had as a supervisor
- b) The number of students you supervise at any given time
- c) The students' educational focus, i.e. social work, leisure studies
- d) The setting where fieldwork supervision occurs
- e) The advantages and disadvantages of supervising adult students
- f) Your own training to do fieldwork supervision
- g) Where training for fieldwork supervision occurred

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

Thank you for participating in this part of my study.

APPENDIX G

OBSERVATION GUIDE
BASED ON GARY J. CONTI'S SEVEN FACTORS IN
THE PRINCIPLES OF ADULT LEARNING SCALE

F1 = Factor 1: Learner Centered Activities

- F1 a = Formal Evaluation Methods*
- F1 b = Discipline*
- F1 c = Education as a Teaching Activity*

F2 = Factor 2: Personalizing Instruction

- F2 a = Self-Pacing*
- F2 b = Variety in Methods and Materials*
- F2 c = Individualization of learner needs and objectives*

F3 = Factor 3: Relating to Experience

- F3 a = Learner's prior experience*
- F3 b = Problem solving*

F4 = Factor 4: Assessing Student Needs

- F4 a = Informal Conferences*
- F4 b = Educational or Formal Counselling*
- F4 c = Learning gaps*

F5 = Factor 5: Climate Building

- F5 a = Student Empowerment or Control*
- F5 b = Psychological Safety*

F6 = Factor 6: Participation in Learning Process

- F6 a = Learning Content*
- F6 b = Identifying Problems*
- F6 c = Evaluating outcomes*

F7 = Factor 7: Flexibility for Personal Development

- F7 a = Instructor as Facilitator*
- F7 b = Flexibility*

APPENDIX H

Peer Check Schedule

November 18, 1991 - Survey Field Test

Three experienced fieldwork supervisors, not currently supervising, were asked to field test the survey. They were each given a package containing the modified Principles of Adult Learning Scale and answer sheet, the modified Demographic Data Sheet, and a covering letter. They were each asked to comment on the length of time for completion of the survey, the difficulties in responding, the clarity of the format and content, and to make any additional remarks or suggestions.

Modifications were made for aesthetic purposes and to recognize Gary J. Conti as The Principles of Adult Learning Scale author.

February 19, 1992 - Case Study Interview Field Test

An experienced fieldwork supervisor not participating in the case study was asked to participate in a field test interview. The researcher had constructed an interview guide based on the seven factors of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale which she used in this audio taped interview lasting one hour. Feedback was requested on the process and content of the interview.

Modifications included additional general questions on fieldwork supervision and additional time for extraneous comments by the interviewee. The researcher was also cautioned not to bias the study with value laden remarks such as "good".

March 3, 1992 - Case Study Observation Field Test

An experienced fieldwork supervisor field tested the observation portion of the case study with a student not involved in the project. The researcher had constructed a coded observation guide which she used to observe and tape record a one hour long supervision session. Feedback was requested on the demeanor of the researcher and on any distractions.

The researcher modified her behavior by using looseleaf sheets to avoid the distraction of turning pages in a notebook.

APPENDIX I

Member Check Schedule

1. By the end of March 1992 the interviews for each of the four cases had been transcribed by the researcher. Each of the four selected fieldwork supervisors who had been interviewed received a transcript of her own interview for a perception check. Two supervisors did not make any changes while the other two supervisors changed some of their own words to help clarify their statements.
2. By the third week in April, 1992, the researcher had transcribed all the observations and had made an initial analysis of the interview and observation data using the framework of the seven factors of Conti's Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS). Each of the four selected fieldwork supervisors received a copy of the initial analysis of her own study for a perception check. Two supervisors did not make modifications while the other two made some minor changes for further clarification of their intentions.
3. By early February, 1993, each of the four selected supervisors was asked to examine the final analysis and interpretation of the study as it applied to her own involvement. Minor adjustments made the language more precise.