

RELATIONSHIP OF SUPERVISOR-STUDENT RATIO TO
PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF LEVEL II
FIELDWORK SUPERVISION

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

BY
SANDRA J. JARRAD, B.S., OTR/L

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST 1987

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
DENTON, TEXAS



July 7, 1987

To the Provost of the Graduate School:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Sandra J. Jarrad entitled "Relationship of Supervisor-Student Ratio and Perceived Effectiveness of Level II Fieldwork Supervision." I have examined the final copy of this Thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Occupational Therapy.


Nancy L. Griffin Ed.D., OTR
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and
recommend its acceptance:

Accepted:


Provost of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to gratefully acknowledge the following persons:

-The members of my research committee for their time, encouragement, and expert assistance.

-The Denton faculty of the Texas Woman's University School of Occupational Therapy for providing the scholarly atmosphere in which to pursue this endeavor.

-My family and friends, for their continued assurance and inspiration.

-Mr. Richard C. Durham III, for his endless patience, support, and optimism throughout the past year.

Relationship of Supervisor-Student Ratio to Perceived
Effectiveness of Level II Fieldwork Supervision

Sandra J. Jarrad

August, 1987

In designing and implementing fieldwork education, it is important for the occupational therapist to be aware of the optimum supervisor-student ratio to employ for student supervision. This study investigated the relationship of the use of three different supervision ratios to students' and supervisors' perceptions of satisfactory supervision. Perceptions of satisfaction were also investigated according to type of fieldwork, supervisor experience level, and student placement sequence.

A descriptive research methodology employing a mailed questionnaire was used with 45 occupational therapy students and their supervisors. Data were analyzed using chi-square, point biserial, and Pearson r statistical procedures.

No significant correlation was found between supervisor-student ratio and the perceptions of satisfaction of supervisors or students. Physical dysfunction supervisors were less satisfied than those in psychiatric or pediatric settings. Students in the third fieldwork placement were

less satisfied than those in the first or second.
Implications for occupational therapy education are
discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	1
Statement of the Purpose.	4
Limitations of the Study.	5
Definitions	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Supervisor-Student Ratio.	7
Measurement of Supervisory Effectiveness.	13
III. METHODOLOGY.	18
Sample Selection.	18
Instrumentation	21
Data Collection Procedures.	22
Treatment of the Data.	23
IV. SUPERVISOR RESULTS	25
Satisfaction with Supervision	27
Descriptive Findings Related to Supervisory Phenomenon	32
V. STUDENT RESULTS.	36
Satisfaction with Supervision	37
Descriptive Findings Related to Supervisory Phenomenon	43
VI. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.	48
Implications for Occupational Therapy Education.	55
Recommendations for Future Research	56

REFERENCES.	58
---------------------	----

APPENDIX

A. Supervision Questionnaire Carleton E. Munson, DSW.	66
B. Correspondence	77
C. Questionnaires	80
D. Questionnaire Cover Letters and Instructions . .	96
E. Text of Reminder Cards	100
F. SPSSX Commands	102
G. Variables and Questionnaire Item Numbers	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Descriptive Characteristics of Student Sample.	19
2	Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisor Sample.	20
3	Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisors. . .	26
4	Correlation of Supervisor-Student Ratio with Satisfaction Measures--Supervisors.	27
5	Correlation of Type Fieldwork with Satisfaction Measures--Supervisors	28
6	Correlation of Supervisor Experience with Satisfaction Measures	28
7	Supervisor Mean Scores on General Satisfaction Variables	30
8	Supervisor Mean Scores on Communication Variables	31
9	Supervisor Mean Scores on Administrative Satisfaction Variables.	32
10	Supervisor Mean Scores on Supervisory Skills Variables	33
11	Supervisory Conference Content by Mean Percentage of Time--Supervisors	35
12	Descriptive Characteristics of Students	37
13	Correlation of Supervisor-Student Ratio with Satisfaction Measures--Students	38
14	Correlation of Type Fieldwork with Satisfaction Measures--Students	39

Table		Page
15	Correlation of Supervisor Experience with Satisfaction Measures--Students.	39
16	Correlation of Student Placement Sequence with Satisfaction Measures	40
17	Student Mean Scores on General Satisfaction Variables.	41
18	Student Mean Scores on Communication Variables.	42
19	Student Mean Scores on Administrative Satisfaction Variables	43
20	Student Mean Scores on Supervisory Skills Variables.	44
21	Supervisory Conference Content by Mean Percentage of Time--Students	47

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginnings of occupational therapy as a profession, the role of fieldwork education has been valued highly as part of the necessary educational preparation of the occupational therapy student. The first educational standards included "not less than three months of hospital training, under supervision" ("Minimum Standards", 1924, p. 296). Although variations in duration, content, and supervision were contained in subsequent standards, the fieldwork education experience continues to be a vital part of the educational program for the occupational therapist (American Medical Association [AMA], 1935, 1938, 1944; American Medical Association and American Occupational Therapy Association [AOTA], 1950, 1975, 1983; AOTA, 1965).

Statement of the Problem

As the health care world rapidly changes, the process of fieldwork education presents some unique problems to both students and educators. Increasing attention to reimbursement, cost containment, and productivity in the clinical center have caused conflict with the traditional method of providing fieldwork, i.e.; full-time, daytime,

with each student maintaining a one-to-one relationship with his or her instructor (Crist, 1986; Bell, 1985). This view is supported by a recent survey of fieldwork educators who indicated a particular concern with inadequate time for student supervision ("Study Shows", 1986).

Changes within the profession of occupational therapy have also impacted negatively on traditional methods of fieldwork education. According to the Commission on Occupational Therapy Manpower (1985), an increasing shortage of occupational therapists exists. In order to address this need, the occupational therapy educational system must be expanded; yet, some uncertainty exists as to the ability of the present fieldwork system to accommodate this expansion. Crist (1986) reiterated this position by stating that current supervision methods of Level II fieldwork severely limit the number of spaces available, consequently limiting program expansion.

Trends within higher education itself have also determined a need for change within the fieldwork system. Each year a growing number of "non-traditional" students enter occupational therapy curricula; some institutions have already developed classroom options to meet the needs of these students (Christiansen, 1987). In order to further respond to their needs, modifications of current patterns of fieldwork are a necessity (Teske & Spelbring, 1983).

Decreasing financial resources in educational institutions have resulted in decreased collaboration between academic and fieldwork educators. Supervision of students is often subject to much variation, which may cause conflict for the student (Presseller, 1983).

Supervisor-student ratio in occupational therapy.

When considering ways in which fieldwork education patterns could be changed to address the above problems, the issue of supervisor-student ratio surfaces. In its simplest terms, supervisor-student ratio refers to the number of therapists and students engaged in a supervisory relationship during the fieldwork education experience.

The one-to-one ratio has been defined as one fieldwork educator matched with one student during the entire fieldwork experience. Also named "single supervision", this arrangement has been perceived as the best method of providing supervision for occupational therapy students (Crist, 1986; Tiberius & Gaipman, 1985). However, other supervisor-student ratios can be conceived.

In designing and implementing fieldwork education, it is important for the fieldwork educator to be aware of the optimum ratio for both the student and the facility; yet, only one study has been published in occupational therapy comparing the use of various ratios (Tiberius & Gaipman, 1985). The recommendations of the American Occupational

Therapy Association (AOTA) are also few. Rather than suggesting a specific ratio, the current educational standards state that "the ratio of fieldwork educators to students shall be such as to insure quality experience and maximal learning" (AMA and AOTA, 1983, p. 821). So the question remains: does one supervisor-student ratio achieve this goal more effectively than another?

Statement of the Purpose

This study will address the above question by investigation of the correlation between supervisor-student ratio during Level II fieldwork and the participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of supervision. In addition, differences in perceptions of supervision will be investigated on the basis of type of fieldwork placement, students' sequence of fieldwork experiences, and experience level of fieldwork educators. Research questions include:

1. Is there a significant correlation ($p \leq .05$) between the supervisor-student ratio used and the degree to which a student or supervisor perceives satisfaction with supervision?
2. Is the perception of supervisory satisfaction associated with supervisor experience level, student placement sequence, or type of fieldwork site?
3. What supervisory techniques and models are being used in Level II fieldwork supervision?

Limitations of the Study

In accordance with descriptive research technique, the study does not attempt to establish causality or directionality; it merely supposes to establish a relationship between variables. In using a perception of effectiveness as a variable, the assumption must be made that the perceptions given are true perceptions and not deliberate misconceptions on the subjects' part. In analysis of the data, no attempt was made to match the responses of supervisors with those of students. The intent of the study is not to determine the possible combinations of variables which may impact on perceptions of satisfaction, but examines the relationship of each variable alone. Finally, the use of a small sample limits predictive value of the results.

Definitions

The following terms are operationally defined for use in this study:

Single individual supervision--is provided by only one supervisor who assumes all daily supervisory tasks for the student during the fieldwork experience.

Multiple rotation supervision--is provided by two or more supervisors to one student, each supervisor assuming all supervisory tasks in sequence during the fieldwork experience.

Multiple concurrent supervision--is provided by two or more supervisors, all supervisory responsibilities within a specific time frame are divided among the supervisors.

Group supervision--an arrangement of a single therapist providing supervision to two or more students as a group (Kadushin, 1976).

Peer supervision--occurs as part of a group setting, in which students supervise each (Brunside, 1971; Wessler & Ellis, 1980).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Occupational therapy and related literature was reviewed by referencing current indexes, tracing citations, and obtaining current bibliographies from the AOTA. Occupational therapy literature was not date-restricted; related literature was confined to post-1960 publications. All literature was confined to English language publications. The literature has been divided into studies dealing with supervisor-student ratio and studies dealing with measurement of supervisory effectiveness in student internships. Within each division medicine, nursing, psychology, counseling, social work, and allied health disciplines were included in addition to occupational therapy.

Supervisor-Student Ratio

Occupational therapy. A review of occupational therapy literature revealed only two publications dealing

specifically with supervisor-student ratio. A recent article in the Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy compared and contrasted the traditional one-to-one ratio with a one-to-two ratio in a descriptive study. Advantages to the alternative ratio included support of another student, opportunity to compare one's own performance with that of a student peer, and experience in social interaction with other students. Disadvantages listed were competition between students, having to share resources, and excessive dependence of students upon one another (Tiberius and Gaipman, 1985). In the second publication, Crist (1986) proposed a "fieldwork sharing" model. This arrangement structured students in a rotation through a collaborative network of fieldwork centers. The author did not state that this alternative was actually being implemented, and no other studies were found to substantiate its use in occupational therapy education.

The second group of occupational therapy publications reviewed consisted of reports and guidelines developed by various subgroups of the AOTA. The most recent manual on fieldwork education mentioned the possibility of a student having more than one fieldwork supervisor, but no further

attention is given to the topic (AOTA, 1984). Perhaps recognizing this oversight, one year after the manual's release, AOTA adopted guidelines for clinical supervisors' use in Level II fieldwork. Included in this document was a recommendation that supervision be provided at a one-to-one ratio; justification for this guideline was not stated in the document (AOTA, Commission on Education, 1985).

Contrary to this stance, the 1971 guidelines and the 1977 manual on fieldwork education recommended that supervision be provided at either a one-to-one or a one-to-two ratio. Again the reason for this recommendation is not stated in either publication (AOTA, Commission on Basic Professional Education, 1971; AOTA, Commission on Education, 1977).

The last group of occupational therapy publications reviewed included two articles and one paper documenting the use of various supervisor-student ratios during fieldwork. In a cost/benefit study conducted at the University of Michigan Hospitals, Burkhardt (1985) stated that group supervision and multiple supervision were methods used for Level II students. In a paper presented to the Commission on Education, Shalik (1987) also considered the possibility of single and multiple supervision use. In the methodology

for documenting supervisory time in a cost/benefit study, instructions noted that two or more supervisors may instruct a student, or a group of students may be supervised by one therapist. In the discussion of implications of cognitive style research to fieldwork education, Gaipman (1985) asserted that a single student may be supervised by two fieldwork educators with differing cognitive styles.

Allied health disciplines. A total of four resources were found in this group of publications. Two studies were found in speech pathology-audiology, one study in physical therapy, and one study in medical laboratory science. Dowling (1983) defined the traditional supervisory method in speech pathology education as the one-to-one ratio. In a quasi-experimental study this ratio was compared with a one-to-five ratio with regard to development of self-supervisory skills in student interns. Results showed support for the one-to-one ratio. Crichton and Oratio (1984) conducted a retrospective study of clinical fellowship students to investigate characteristics of effective supervision. The authors proposed that in order to provide adequate monitoring of the speech pathology intern, multiple supervisors could be used. A major study

of clinical centers in physical therapy revealed that beginning students were assigned using a one-to-one ratio, but senior physical therapy students were assigned using a one-to-two ratio (Moore and Perry, 1976). Finally, a structured rotation model involving a ratio of up to thirty supervisors per student was documented as being very useful for both the student and the facility in a medical laboratory setting (Hallahan, 1984).

Medical and nursing education. Clinical teaching in medical education was defined by Stritter, Hain, and Grimes (1975) as occurring in either an individual or a small group setting. Documentation of the small group method -- essentially group supervision -- was found in a study by Cotsanas and Kaiser (1963) addressing evaluation of clinical education by medical students. Nursing education also revealed variation in the use of supervisor-student ratio in clinical teaching. In addition to individual supervision, group supervision, peer supervision, and multiple supervision were found to be alternative models used by the clinical nursing instructor (Burnside, 1971; Carozza, Congdon, and Watson, 1978; Cosper, 1976; Saxon, 1975; Strohmann, 1977).

Counselor and psychology education. Hart (1982)

described individual, group, and peer supervision in a text on supervision, but stated "it is advised that individual supervision be used as the primary modality" (p.209). Conversely, Lanning (1971) compared individual with group supervision with regard to perceived differences in the supervisory relationship. He advocated that, due to insignificant differences, group supervision was a reasonable alternative. Halloway and Hosford (1981) also advocated this position, listing several advantages of group supervision in the aquisition of counseling skills. A recent study by Davis and Arvey (1984) compared a single supervision model with a multiple supervision model in addressing the perceived effectiveness of supervision. Significant differences were found in three of the sixteen measures in the quasi-experimental design.

Social work. Several studies were found documenting various supervisor-student ratios for clinical supervision of students. Many publications listed two primary methods of supervision, single supervision and group supervision, with support listed for each approach (Hale, 1969; Kadushin, 1976; Munson, 1983; Rose, Lowenstein, and Fellin, 1969). As

Munson states, "a positive outcome [of group supervision] is highly dependent upon how it is presented, set up, and carried out" (Munson, 1983, p.130). An alternative model to these two ratios was documented in the assignment of social work students to in-discipline teams for supervision in a hospital setting (Robinovitch and Nash, 1983).

Measurement of Supervisory Effectiveness

The second aspect of the study which warranted literature review is the methods by which the effectiveness of supervision has been measured in fieldwork education. Again, studies have been organized according to discipline.

Occupational therapy. The earliest documentation of an attempt to measure satisfaction of fieldwork supervision was found in a descriptive article by Gallagher and Watwood (1941). The authors personally contacted students from three schools who had participated in clinical training, using open-ended questions to ask the students for feedback. While this method is not sophisticated, it does indicate that student feedback was a method used early in the profession to evaluate the effects of supervision.

Eight years later, Willard and Gleave (1949) wrote an open letter to all fieldwork supervisors, stating that the new educational standards had required clinical centers to report the facility's evaluation of students' reactions to training. In order to facilitate this process, a reporting form for student input was being developed. At the present, students' reports of their fieldwork experiences continue to be recommended by AOTA (1984).

Recent literature also cited student input for evaluation of supervision, and included input from supervisors as being equally valid. Christie, Joyce, and Moeller (1985, Part II), addressed effectiveness of supervision in a national survey of both students and supervisors. This resulted in identification of "effective" and "ineffective" supervisory behaviors during fieldwork. Tiberius and Gaipman (1985), when investigating the use of the one-to-two ratio, again used a survey method, choosing a structured interview format for students and an informal interview format for supervisors.

Medical and nursing education. Two studies addressed evaluation of clinical teaching in medical education. Stritter, Hain, and Grimes (1975) identified and categorized

77 clinical teaching behaviors using a questionnaire composed in a five-point scale format. Third and fourth year medical students were asked to respond to the survey. In a more recent survey, Irby (1978) measured perceptions of medical students, residents, and faculty members using a seven-point scale format to respond to 61 listed teaching behaviors.

Four studies were found in the nursing literature, all of which documented the use of questionnaires of various types to assess perceptions of clinical supervision. O'Shea and Parsons (1979) used an open-ended questionnaire, asking students and faculty members in a baccalaureate nursing program to list perceptions of effective and ineffective teaching behaviors. The authors categorized the responses into evaluative, instructive/assistive, and personal characteristic behaviors. Coles, Dobbyn, and Print (1981) assessed perceptions of Australian nursing students regarding clinical teaching by devising a 32 item questionnaire containing both scale and open-ended items. Results showed that equal percentages of students were satisfied and dissatisfied with teaching in the clinical area. Morgan and Knox (1983) used a short, three item

questionnaire containing open-ended questions. Results showed a very skewed distribution toward positive ratings, indicating the need to use a more structured format. In developing an instrument for the measurement of effective teaching behaviors in clinical instructors, Zimmerman and Waltman (1986) used behaviors previously identified through surveying student perceptions.

Psychology and counseling education. Five studies were located listing satisfaction with supervision as the dependent variable subject to influence by variables such as cognitive style match, expectation match, student perception of supervisory traits and behaviors, and supervisor-student ratio. In all studies a questionnaire was used. Three studies used scale-type items to determine the students' satisfaction with supervision, while two studies utilized one question directly addressing the students' perception of satisfaction. Three of the above studies assessed only student perception with satisfaction, while the remaining two studies assessed both student and supervisor perceptions (Davis and Arvey, 1984; Handley, 1982; Heppner and Handley, 1981; Newton, 1977; Worthington and Roehlke, 1979).

Social work. Again, several studies listed satisfaction with supervision as an independent variable. Measurement of the results of those studies was often listed as documentation of case studies (Kadushin, 1976; Robinovitch and Nash, 1983). One particular study using a more structured measurement was by Munson (1979), who investigated social workers' satisfaction with supervision on the basis of sex of the supervisor. Both a questionnaire and a structured interview were used.

To summarize this review, very few studies were found in the occupational therapy literature dealing with the issue of supervisor-student ratio. A more extensive presentation of this topic was found in the related disciplines of allied health, medicine, nursing, counselor education, and social work. Regarding assessment of the effectiveness of supervision, the most frequently documented measurement was a survey format using a questionnaire. Effectiveness was defined both by frequency of specified supervisory behaviors and by assessment of the participants' satisfaction with supervision.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to implement the investigation of the research questions, a descriptive survey methodology was selected, using a sample of Level II fieldwork students and their respective supervisors.

Sample Selection

Variables considered in the sample selection were supervisor-student ratio, type of fieldwork experience, sequence of the students' fieldwork placements, curriculum format in which students received didactic training, students' previous experience in clinical internship situations, and the experience level of the fieldwork educators.

In order to obtain some degree of accountability for variance in results, the desired student sample was drawn from undergraduate occupational therapy students enrolled for Level II fieldwork at Texas Woman's University during 1986-1987. Selection of this population achieved control for curriculum format and also some degree of control for previous experience in internship situations. A listing of the population was obtained from the fieldwork coordinator

of the program, and 45 students and their supervisors were selected to receive questionnaires regarding supervision in a targeted Level II experience. The descriptive characteristics of the student sample are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics of Student Sample

Characteristic or Descriptor	<u>n</u>
Placement type	
Physical dysfunction	15
Psychosocial dysfunction	15
Pediatrics	15
Placement sequence	
First placement	9
Second placement	11
Third Placement	25
Sex	
Male	2
Female	43

Following selection of students, consideration was given to fieldwork educator selection. In order to avoid duplication of data collection by one fieldwork educator supervising more than one student from the sample, each

fieldwork center was selected to be used only once during the data collection period. This resulted in some slight adjustments in the time of data collection for eight students. Descriptive characteristics concerning supervisors and their facilities are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisor Sample

Characteristic or Descriptor	<u>n</u>
Type fieldwork	
Physical dysfunction	15
Psychosocial dysfunction	15
Pediatrics	15
Facility type	
General hospital	17
Psychiatric hospital	9
Children's hospital	3
Rehabilitation center	8
Outpatient clinic	3
School system	4
Long term care facility	1

Instrumentation

In order to measure the degree to which the supervisors and students perceived satisfaction with the supervisory process, a self-report questionnaire was chosen. The instrument selected was the "Supervision Questionnaire" developed by Munson (1983). This instrument was created for use in assessing the effect of male versus female supervisors on subordinates' satisfaction with supervision. The original questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to 70 social workers during an interview. The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and t-tests were used to compare differences in subordinates' scores of male and female supervisors. Reliability was reported to be .91 ($p < .01$) using the split-half method comparing odd to even items. No validity studies were reported.

Selection of this instrument was made due to the scale of items it contained and its generalizability to occupational therapy education. Permission was obtained from the author to use the questionnaire with slight grammatical changes. The variables of supervisor-student ratio, placement sequence, placement type, and supervisor experience were substituted for the variable of sex in the original questionnaire. See Appendix B for copies of correspondence. Following these minor changes, the

questionnaires were pilot-tested on two students and two supervisors, representative of the desired sample, for clarity and readability. Minor changes were again made in format and grammar. Copies of the final questionnaires may be found in Appendix C.

Data Collection Procedures

Following sample selection and instrument modification, questionnaires were prepared for mailing to each subject. Questionnaires were sent to the fieldwork center with an enclosed cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix D). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included to increase the potential for return of each survey (Babbie, 1973). Each questionnaire was assigned a number to assist in tracking non-returned copies. Student forms were sent separately from supervisor forms to insure that response to the questionnaire would not be perceived as being related to the student's performance in fieldwork.

Mailing of the questionnaires was done in two groups, to coincide with the tenth week of the targeted fieldwork experience. Four weeks after the first mailing, reminder cards were sent to students who had not returned the survey. Supervisors who had not returned the survey were sent reminder cards five weeks after the first mailing (see Appendix E). Total response rate for supervisors was 64%,

for students 56%. Four questionnaires were designated as unusable due to large amounts of missing data, resulting in a 51% return rate for students and a 60% return rate for supervisors.

Treatment of the Data

Following receipt of the questionnaires, each was coded for computer entry according to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences X (SPSSX) (Hedderson, 1987; Jendrek, 1985). For consistency in coding, the following guidelines were established:

1. "Other" responses to Question 3 were placed into one of the three ratio categories on the basis of content of the response.
2. If more than one response was circled for Questions 5-43 Student Form or Questions 4-40 Supervisor Form, data were coded as missing rather than arbitrarily selecting one response.
3. If two numbers were given as a response to items requesting a ranking (Questions 62, 63 Student Form and Questions 56, 57 Supervisor Form), the mean of the two responses was entered as the ranking.
4. Non-answered questions were coded as missing data.
5. In order to achieve an overall score for satisfaction with supervision, scale variables (Questions

4-40 Supervisor Form, Questions 5-42 Student Form) for each item were coded with "6" being the most positive response and "1" being the most negative response.

Commands for the SPSSX program were adapted slightly from the original program obtained from Munson (1986). In accordance with the intent of the study, separate command programs were established so each group's responses were not matched, but analyzed individually.

CHAPTER IV

SUPERVISOR RESULTS

The final sample differed somewhat from the selected sample due to the uneven response rate of the subjects. Descriptive data for the sample are presented in Table 3. Experience levels of the supervisors were condensed into two categories. Those therapists who had supervised fewer than four students were designated as "inexperienced" and those who had supervised four or more students were classified as "experienced" supervisors.

In order to explore significant relationships between descriptive variables, cross-tabulations with appropriate Chi-square tests were performed with all pairs of variables. A significant relationship (value= 9.13442; $p < .05$) was discovered between the type of fieldwork site and the supervision ratio used. Physical dysfunction and psychiatric sites tended to use a multiple rotation format, while pediatric sites were evenly distributed among single supervision and multiple concurrent supervision. Other relationships among descriptive variables were not significant.

Table 3

Descriptive Characteristics of Supervisors

Characteristic or Descriptor	<u>n</u>
Type fieldwork	
Physical dysfunction	10
Psychosocial dysfunction	8
Pediatrics	9
Supervisor Experience Level	
Inexperienced	11
Experienced	16
Supervision Ratio	
Single individual	11
Multiple rotation	9
Multiple concurrent	7
Facility type	
General hospital	8
Psychiatric hospital	5
Children's hospital	1
Rehabilitation center	4
Outpatient clinic	2
School system	2
Long term care facility	1

Note: n = 27

Satisfaction with Supervision

In addressing the primary research question, three measures of satisfaction from the questionnaire were correlated with the variable of supervisor-student ratio using Pearson r procedure. Results are presented in Table 4. The satisfaction score was derived by the summing of all responses to Questions 4-40 of the questionnaire. The supervision ranking was obtained from the responses to Question 56, and the self-ranking was obtained from Question 57.

Table 4

Correlation of Supervisor-Student Ratio with Satisfaction Measures--Supervisors

Measure	r	p
Satisfaction score	.16248	<.20
Supervision ranking	-.13102	<.26
Self ranking	.06733	<.36

Exploring the association of other descriptive variables, type of fieldwork setting and supervisor experience level were each correlated with the three satisfaction measures. Results are presented in Tables 5 and 6. Results of the correlation between satisfaction

Table 5

Correlation of Type Fieldwork with Satisfaction Measures--
Supervisors

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Satisfaction score	.36501	<.03
Supervision ranking	-.23975	<.11
Self ranking	.07833	<.34

Table 6

Correlation of Supervisor Experience with Satisfaction
Measures

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Satisfaction score	.26325	<.09
Supervision ranking	-.11083	<.29
Self ranking	.26720	<.08

score and type of fieldwork reached significance ($r = .36501$; $p < .03$), indicating that supervisors in physical disabilities sites were slightly less satisfied than those in psychiatric or pediatric settings.

Analysis of selected variables. When analyzing responses to individual satisfaction variables, the

variables were categorized according to general satisfaction, supervisor-student communication satisfaction, administrative satisfaction, or satisfaction with supervisory skills. Mean scores for each of the variables in the four divisions are presented in Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10. Variable names and matching questionnaire numbers are presented in Appendix G.

General satisfaction variables were consistently positive, with mean response scores falling above 5.0 (see Table 7). Communication variables were also highly positive with the exception of two variables, giving directions and clarity of communication (see Table 8). In order to analyze these further, each was subjected to Chi-square analysis with the descriptive variables of ratio, experience level, and type of fieldwork. Results showed no significant associations.

The variable of giving direction was also tested using correlation with the satisfaction score to investigate the possibility of misinterpretation of the question by the subjects. Results showed a correlation of .32734 ($p < .05$), indicating that the subjects who were generally satisfied with the supervisory experience did respond positively to this question, thus indicating the question was interpreted fairly.

Table 7

Supervisor Mean Scores on General Satisfaction Variables

Variable	\bar{x}
	(n=27)
Help professional growth of student	5.63
Student respected as a professional	5.48
Fairness of supervision	5.48
Associated with good feelings	5.22
Facilitate student self-awareness	5.30
Develop student efficiency	5.37
Help student effectiveness	5.44
Rigidity of supervision	5.26
Agency limited supervision	5.52
Satisfied with supervision	5.33

Administrative satisfaction variables in Table 9 showed slightly more variance in mean response scores, yet all variables exhibited positive ratings with the exception of facility standards. This variable was also correlated with the satisfaction score to investigate possible misinterpretation. Results indicated a correlation of $-.04967$, indicating that the interpretation of the question could not be determined.

Table 8

Supervisor Mean Scores on Communication Variables

Variable	n	\bar{x}
Supervisor friendliness	27	5.41
Supervisor openness	27	5.74
Student openness	27	5.37
Giving directions	26	4.77
Ease of communication	27	5.67
Expression of appreciation	27	5.41
Value of confrontation	27	5.59
Feelings toward conferences	27	5.48
Clarity of communication	27	3.06

Supervisory skills also exhibited some variation in mean scores, with seven of eight variables exhibiting positive ratings (see Table 10). The variable of overestimating student knowledge was analyzed according to experience level, type of fieldwork, and ratio using appropriate Chi-square procedures. Results indicated a significant relationship (value= 9.32727, $p < .02$) with experience level, indicating that inexperienced supervisors were found to overestimate the student's knowledge more frequently than experienced supervisors. Noting this result,

Table 9

Supervisor Mean Scores on Administrative SatisfactionVariables

Variable	<u>n</u>	<u>\bar{x}</u>
Agreement on quantity of work required	26	5.08
Emphasis of theory versus application	27	4.56
Agreement of treatment values	27	5.26
Size of student caseload	27	5.11
Focused on facility standards	27	2.30
Amount of freedom for student	26	4.15
Supervision rule oriented	27	4.82

the variable of underestimating the student's knowledge was associated with experience level using a Chi-square; results were not significant.

Descriptive Findings Related to Supervisory Phenomenon

A secondary purpose of this study was to document the patterns and techniques of supervision currently being used in Level II fieldwork. Included in this section are results documenting the choice of supervision ratios, techniques and models of instruction, and logistics and content of supervisory conferences.

Table 10

Supervisor Mean Scores on Supervisory Skills Variables

Variable	\bar{x}
	(n=27)
Organization of work	5.07
Priority-setting	5.16
Clinical Competence	5.33
General teaching competence	5.22
Technical teaching competence	5.04
Performance evaluation	4.96
Overestimating student knowledge	3.37
Underestimating student knowledge	3.97

When analyzed using Chi-square, a significant association (value= 12.94249; $p < .01$) appeared between the ratio of supervision being used in a given setting and those responses stating a particular supervision preference. Results indicated that the supervision ratio currently being used at the facility was the ratio supervisors preferred.

The second phenomenon explored was the use of observational techniques and instructional models. When tabulated, it was found that 85.2% of the sample stated that the student was allowed to "frequently" observe the

therapist treating patients. The remaining 14.8% stated that the student was allowed to observe "sometimes". None of the supervisors in the sample responded "never" or "infrequently". Closely related was the extent to which the supervisors used observation of the student treating patients as a means of gathering data for use in supervision. Eighty-one and one-half percent of the supervisors used this technique "frequently", with the remaining 18.5% using observation "sometimes".

The third phenomenon investigated was the teaching model used by the supervisors. Of the three models presented, 7.4% stated that questioning techniques were used as the primary instructional method, 11.1% responded that instruction is centered on development of the student's self-awareness, and 81.5% stated that instruction is focused upon whatever experiences emerge from the patient treatment demands.

Supervisory conferences. The last aspect of supervision explored was the supervisory conference. Most of the supervisors perceived that a conference regarding the student's performance was usually held daily (42.5%) or weekly (38.8%), but some supervisors responded that conferences were held biweekly (24.8%) or monthly or less (3.7%).

Regarding initiation of student conferences, a large number of supervisors (48.1%) stated that they initiated supervisory conferences, while 29.6% indicated that the student initiated meetings. Another 22.2% stated that requests for conferences were made equally by both the supervisors and students.

Supervisory conference content was also explored. Table 11 presents the mean percentage of time that supervisors perceived they spent in discussing selected topics. It was found that approximately half of the supervisory conference time was spent discussing students' patients, while the remaining time was divided among the other six topics.

Table 11

Supervisory Conference Content by Mean Percentage of Time--Supervisors

Subject	\bar{x}
Student's patients	49.26
Student's growth	23.70
Administrative matters	9.82
Supervisor's patients	9.07
Small talk	3.78
Student problems	3.52
Supervisor problems	.67

CHAPTER V

STUDENT RESULTS

The final student sample differed significantly from the selected sample again due to the distribution of the returned surveys. For purposes of data analysis, experience levels were once again collapsed into two categories, experienced and unexperienced. Two categories were also used for supervision ratio due to the small sample size. Multiple rotation supervision and multiple concurrent supervision responses were reclassified as "multiple supervision," and single individual supervision responses remained. Descriptive characteristics of the sample appear in Table 12.

In addressing relationships among variables, Chi-Square procedures were used to examine the degree of association between the variables of type of fieldwork, supervisor experience level, student placement sequence, and supervision ratio. No significant associations were found, indicating that each variable distribution was relatively independent.

Table 12

Descriptive Characteristics of Students

Characteristic or Descriptor	<u>n</u> (n=23)
Type fieldwork	
Physical dysfunction	7
Psychosocial dysfunction	5
Pediatrics	11
Fieldwork sequence	
First placement	4
Second placement	4
Third placement	15
Supervisor experience	
Inexperienced	8
Experienced	15
Supervision ratio	
Single supervision	12
Multiple supervision	11

Satisfaction with Supervision

Addressing the main research questions, results of correlations of supervisor-student ratio with the satisfaction score, supervision ranking, and self ranking

of students is found in Table 13. Tables 14, 15, and 16 display results of correlation of type fieldwork, supervisor experience level, and placement sequence with the satisfaction measures. As noted in Table 16, only the correlation between placement sequence and supervision ranking reached significance. This finding indicated that students in third placements ranked their supervisors lower than those in the first or second fieldwork placement. In examining the relationship more closely, it is noted that the frequency distribution for the variable of placement sequence was highly loaded with third placement students (see Table 12 for reference).

Table 13

Correlation of Supervisor-Student Ratio with Satisfaction Measures--Students

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Satisfaction score	.01432	<.47
Supervision ranking	-.13354	<.27
Self ranking	-.12562	<.28

Table 14

Correlation of Type Fieldwork with Satisfaction Measures--
Students

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Satisfaction score	-.05621	<.39
Supervision ranking	-.10334	<.31
Self ranking	-.03751	<.43

Table 15

Correlation of Supervisor Experience with Satisfaction
Measures--Students

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Satisfaction score	.29734	<.08
Supervision ranking	.22541	<.15
Self ranking	.13663	<.26

Analysis of selected variables. In order to examine individual satisfaciton variables more closely, the variables were once again grouped into general satisfaction, supervisor-student communication satisfaction,

Table 16

Correlation of Student Placement Sequence with Satisfaction Measures

Measure	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Supervision score	-.30023	<.08
Supervision ranking	-.36547	<.04
Self ranking	-.21951	<.15

administrative satisfaction, and student satisfaction with supervisors' skills (see Appendix G for matching variables to questionnaire numbers).

Mean scores on all general satisfaction variables were positive, with all scores falling at or above 5.0. Results are presented in Table 17. Although consistently positive, the mean scores in this sample were very slightly lower than those of the supervisor sample.

Communication satisfaction variables, presented in Table 18, ranged in mean scores from 3.36 to 5.48, with eight of ten variables above the 5.0 score. Again the variable of giving directions was noted to be lower than the other variables. It was further analyzed with supervision ratio, placement sequence, experience of supervisor, and type of fieldwork using appropriate Chi-square procedures. Results showed no significant associations for any of the

Table 17

Student Mean Scores on General Satisfaction Variables

Variable	\bar{x}
	(n=23)
Help professional growth of student	5.57
Student respected as a professional	5.26
Fairness of supervision	5.44
Associated with good feelings	5.00
Facilitate student self-awareness	5.04
Develop student efficiency	5.22
Help student effectiveness	5.39
Rigidity of supervision	5.13
Agency limited supervision	5.35
Satisfied with supervision	5.00

descriptive variables. This variable was again correlated with the satisfaction score to test for possible misinterpretation. Correlation value was $-.41266$ ($p < .02$), indicating the question could have been misinterpreted.

Administrative satisfaction variables again showed variation in mean scores among students (Table 19), yet all scores fell into the positive range. The variables of agreement of quantity of work and size of student caseload

Table 18

Student Mean Scores on Communication Variables

Variable	\bar{x} (n=23)
Supervisor friendliness	5.35
Supervisor openness	5.44
Student openness	5.48
Giving directions	3.36
Ease of communication	5.22
Expression of appreciation	5.00
Value of confrontation	5.39
Feelings toward conferences	5.09
Clarity of communication	4.61
Supervisor receptiveness	5.22

were tested using Chi-square with type of fieldwork, placement sequence, and experience ratio. Results revealed no significant association for size of student caseload. A significant association (value= 15.99545; $p < .04$) was found between agreement of quantity of work required and placement sequence. Students in the third fieldwork placement were more frequently inclined to respond negatively to this question than students in the first or second placements.

Again the variable of fieldwork placement loaded with very high frequencies for the third experience.

Table 19

Student Mean Scores on Administrative Satisfaction Variables

Variable	\bar{x} (n=23)
Agreement on quantity of work required	4.44
Emphasis of theory versus application	5.48
Agreement of treatment values	5.22
Size of student caseload	4.83
Amount of freedom for student	5.04
Supervision rule oriented	5.22
Focused on facility standards	5.09

When supervisory skills variables were examined, mean scores showed little variance (Table 20). All scores were noted to be within the positive range. Students rated their supervisors as not over- or under-estimating their knowledge, while the supervisors rated themselves less positively on these variables.

Descriptive Findings Related to Supervisory Phenomenon

Students' preference for supervision ratio was crosstabulated with the ratio of supervision that was

Table 20

Student Mean Scores on Supervisory Skills Variables

Variable	\bar{x}
	(n=23)
Organization of work	4.83
Priority-setting	5.04
Clinical competence	5.48
General teaching competence	5.26
Technical teaching competence	4.83
Technical teaching competence	4.83
Performance evaluation	5.00
Overestimating student knowledge	5.04
Underestimating student knowledge	5.04

provided. Results of Chi-square analysis revealed a significant association (value 8.57273; $p < .01$). Students who had a single supervisor definitely preferred this arrangement, but students who had more than one supervisor were more divided concerning their preferences. This variable was analyzed further to investigate this division on the basis of type of fieldwork, supervisor experience level, and placement sequence. All Chi-Square values were non-significant.

Instructional techniques and models were then examined. When students were asked how frequently they were allowed to observe the therapist, 87% responded "frequently", 4.3% responded "sometimes", 4.3% responded "infrequently", and 4.3% listed "never" as a response. When students were asked how often they were observed by their supervisors, 43.5% stated "frequently", 39.1% responded "sometimes", 8.7% indicated "infrequently" and 8.7% stated "never". When three alternative teaching models were presented, the vast majority (91.3%) of students responded that instruction was centered around whatever experiences emerged from the patient treatment demands; only 8.6% listed one of the other two models.

Supervisory conferences. The supervisory conference was also investigated from the student's point of view. Much variation in the frequency of student conferences was reported. Thirteen percent stated conferences were held monthly or less, 13% stated "bimonthly", 41.3% responded "weekly", and 32.6% responded "daily". Comments were also varied. Some students reported that conferences were scheduled at the beginning of the fieldwork experience, but some conferences were cancelled by the supervisors. One student commented that conferences were not needed because her performance had been satisfactory.

Conference initiation was also examined. Students reported that the supervisors initiated conferences 30.4% of the time. Comments concerning this question included that supervisors scheduled conferences on a pre-determined basis. Another 43.5% stated that they initiated conferences, and a small percentage (4.3%) stated that conferences were determined by the clinical fieldwork coordinator. Combinations of the above variables were also reported; 17.4% stated that conferences were scheduled equally by both the supervisor and student, and 4.3% indicated that the student and the clinical fieldwork coordinator requested conferences on an equal basis.

Table 21 lists the mean percentage of time students perceived they spent discussing selected topics during supervisory conferences. Three topics--student's patients, student's growth, and administrative matters--were listed as consuming 80% of the time, with the remaining 20% divided among the other four topics.

Table 21

Supervisory Conference Content by Mean Percentage of
Time--Students

Subject	\bar{x}
Student's patients	51.44
Student's growth	18.26
Administrative matters	10.83
Supervisor's patients	9.96
Small talk	3.96
Supervisor problems	2.78
Student problems	2.35

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

From the results presented in previous chapters, it can be concluded that no significant correlation exists between supervisor-student ratio and perceptions of supervisory effectiveness. Correlations of satisfaction measures and ratio with both students and supervisors failed to reach significance. Speculation can be made that a Type II error was made due to the small sample size (Ottenbacher, 1984). While this error is a possibility, it is an improbable one because all significance values are substantially below the 95% confidence level. Another possible explanation is the inability of the satisfaction measures to adequately discriminate the degree of satisfaction perceived. In order to test this conclusion, validity studies of the questionnaires are warranted. Since no studies currently exist in occupational therapy literature dealing with the use of single versus multiple supervision, it is impossible to either support or refute previous conclusions.

In investigating perceptions of supervision on the basis of descriptive variables, two of the fifteen correlation procedures reached significance.

Supervisors' degree of satisfaction as measured by the satisfaction score was associated with fieldwork type. Less satisfaction was perceived by supervisors in physical dysfunction settings than supervisors in other settings. In light of the recent changes in the Medicare system (Scott, 1984) and the increased emphasis on cost containment in hospitals, the lower level of satisfaction with supervision may be a reflection of a decreased level of general job satisfaction. This interpretation is supported by the results of an AOTA survey which specifically stated that fieldwork educators felt that the demands of treatment under the Prospective Payment System were limiting the time available for student supervision ("Study Shows", 1986). Since the Prospective Payment System is not yet in effect for psychiatric facilities and the impact of the System on pediatric facilities is minimal, this line of reasoning is appropriate.

In contrast to this interpretation is a study by Kautzman (1986), which acknowledged that time in supervision/instruction was changed following implementation of the Medicare Prospective Payment System. The subjects, composed of 21 hospital-based occupational therapy directors did not attribute the changes in time available for students to the new Medicare system.

Another conjecture for the cause of decreased satisfaction in physical disabilities supervisors is that the combination of fieldwork type and ratio used contributed to decreased satisfaction scores. It was found in the analysis of descriptive variables that multiple rotation supervision was used more frequently in physical dysfunction settings. This pre-determined association between ratio and fieldwork site may be cause for further study concerning combinations of variables.

Looking at the variable of experience level and its influence upon supervisor satisfaction, the absence of significant associations may indicate that experience level does not have an impact on current perceptions of effectiveness. Christie, Joyce, and Moeller (Part II, 1985) proposed that the student supervisor progresses through a series of stages in developing effectiveness in the supervisor role. The experienced supervisors in the 1985 study reported that over time, they were able to differentiate the supervisor and student responsibility in the supervisory process. The only variable which did support this conclusion was overestimating student knowledge. The finding that inexperienced supervisors tended to report overestimation more frequently indicates that in this aspect of supervisory skills, the supervisors' perceptions did change over time.

In discussing the association of descriptive characteristics with student perceptions of effective supervision, it appears that the students, as a group, are remarkably consistent in their positive attitudes toward supervision. Although the association of placement sequence and supervision ranking is statistically significant, its true significance is subject to question due to the disproportionately high number of students in the sample on the third fieldwork placement. This variable was not well controlled in the sample selection; perhaps more careful sampling would have yielded a different result.

Not discounting the significance of this result completely, this finding is consistent with a developmental model of fieldwork supervision as described by Schwartz (1983). Using Loevinger's Ego Stage Levels, Schwartz stated that students progress through stages which are characterized by first passive acceptance of rules, then challenging of rules, to acceptance of justified rules. It is possible that if students do indeed operate on these levels, those students in the third fieldwork placement have progressed to challenging and seeking justification of rules. This process may be cause for dissatisfaction with supervision.

The last research question addressed the exploration of supervisory techniques and models. From the results

presented, several trends were noted. The association between the type of supervision ratio used and the preferred ratio was very strong for both supervisors and students. Subjects who participated in single supervision definitely preferred this ratio.

Supervisors who provided multiple rotation or multiple concurrent supervision preferred the ratio that was used in their setting. This strong association leads one to believe that supervisors perceive they are free from external pressure to use one particular ratio, thus using the ratio they like the best. The preference of these alternative ratios points to the conclusion that some fieldwork educators are following the current guidelines for supervision ratios recommended by AOTA and some educators are interpreting supervision ratio according to the AOTA Essentials (AMA and AOTA, 1983; AOTA, Commission on Education, 1985).

Students who received multiple supervision were divided between their preference for single supervision and multiple supervision. Since results of analysis by descriptive variables were non-significant, it appears that placement sequence, supervisor experience, or type of fieldwork are not of much impact. A possible cause could be student comparison of the present ratio with his/her past

experiences with supervision; in future studies this variable might be addressed.

Trends in supervision also emerged in the use of observation as a supervisory technique. A majority of both students and supervisors perceived that the student frequently used observation of the supervisors to gain knowledge. This supports Christie, Joyce, and Moeller's (Part I, 1985) assertion that the supervisor role model is a primary influence on the student during fieldwork education.

Regarding the therapists' use of observation of the student, a greater percentage of supervisors reported this technique was used frequently than was reported by the students. A possible interpretation of this result is that the fieldwork educator may observe without the student being aware of the supervisor's presence. Also, related personnel may be observing the student and reporting to the fieldwork supervisor; this may have been a consideration when supervisors made their responses.

Another significant pattern is the use of a specific teaching model during fieldwork. A large majority of both supervisors and students indicated that teaching centered around whatever experiences emerged from the patient treatment demands. This pattern indicates that instruction not only varies from clinical setting to clinical setting,

but also from one fieldwork placement to the next. Therefore, it does appear that each fieldwork placement is an unique experience in instruction.

The last trends discovered were related to the supervisory conference. Students perceived that conferences were held less frequently than the supervisors perceived conference frequency. Considering the definition of a supervisory conference given to the subjects on the questionnaire, it is possible that supervisors considered informal, brief meetings as conferences. Comments from students indicated they did not consider informal meetings as such.

Regarding supervisory conference content, both students and supervisors ranked the seven topics very similarly in terms of mean percentage of time. A very small percentage of time was noted to be devoted to discussing student personal problems. This finding seems to indicate two possible conclusions. Either there were no students of this type in the sample, or there is a reluctance on the part of the supervisor or student to discuss personal problems affecting performance. If the latter is the case, perhaps the lack of communication between student and supervisor could compound the performance problems that exist.

Implications for Occupational Therapy Education

The results of the study have several implications for the occupational therapy educational system, especially fieldwork educators, academic fieldwork coordinators, and occupational therapy educational administrators.

The study indicates no significant differences between the use of single or multiple supervision. This suggests that the current guidelines for fieldwork regarding ratio are unsupported and alternative ratios may be used to meet the Essential of "quality experience and maximal learning" during fieldwork (AMA and AOTA, 1983; Commission on Education, AOTA, 1985).

Fieldwork educators may view these results as support for the use of alternative ratios in their facilities. In the future these educators may consider accepting fieldwork students by using a multiple supervision arrangement.

Academic fieldwork coordinators need to make selection decisions in scheduling students for fieldwork education. In light of the results of this study, supervisor-student ratio need not be a consideration when selecting options for a fieldwork education experience for students.

The use of alternative ratios also impacts on the expansion of occupational therapy curricula. As stated earlier, there is a question of the ability of the fieldwork system at present to accommodate future expansion of

occupational therapy educational programs. If alternative ratios are used, the number of fieldwork centers could be increased to facilitate educational expansion (Commission on Occupational Therapy Manpower, 1985, Crist, 1986).

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, it seems that further questions need to be addressed regarding the supervision process in Level II fieldwork education. The following are suggested for possible research in this area:

1. Replication of the present study with a larger, more representative sample. Consideration should be given to even distribution of placement sequence, use of several curriculum formats, and expansion of geographical areas for sampling.
2. Replication of the present study with revision of data collection procedures to increase response rate.
3. Qualitative studies of supervision focusing on similarities and differences in types of clinical settings.
4. Expanded descriptive studies of instructional techniques and models used in Level II supervision.
5. Investigation of the role of the supervisory conference in the Level II supervision process.
6. A detailed study of instruments used to measure supervisory effectiveness in fieldwork education, including the one used in this study.

7. Investigation of combinations of descriptive variables which impact the effectiveness of supervision in Level II fieldwork.

8. Studies investigating supervision based on matched pairs of subjects in order to compare more thoroughly supervisor and student perceptions.

REFERENCES

- American Medical Association (1935). The essentials of an acceptable school of occupational therapy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, 104, 1632-1633.
- American Medical Association (1938). Essentials of an acceptable school of occupational therapy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, 111, 980-981.
- American Medical Association (1944). Essentials of an acceptable school of occupational therapy. The Journal of the American Medical Association, 122, 541-542.
- American Medical Association and American Occupational Therapy Association (1950). Essentials of an acceptable school of occupational therapy. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 4, 125-128.
- American Medical Association & American Occupational Therapy Association (1975). Essentials of an accredited educational program for the occupational therapist. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 29, 485-496.
- American Medical Association & American Occupational Therapy Association (1983). Essentials and guidelines of an approved educational program for the occupational therapist. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 37, 817-824.
- American Occupational Therapy Association (1965). Guidebook for an accredited curriculum in occupational therapy [Appendix]. In Reference manual for occupational therapy educators. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Commission on Education (1977). Fieldwork education manual for academic fieldwork coordinators, fieldwork supervisors, and students. Rockville, MD: Author.

- American Occupational Therapy Association, Commission on Education (1984). Guide to fieldwork education. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Commission on Education (1985). Guidelines for an occupational therapy fieldwork experience - Level II. Proceedings of the 65th Annual Convention of the American Occupational Therapy Association. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Commission on Occupational Therapy Manpower (1985). Occupational therapy manpower: A plan for progress. Rockville, MD: Author.
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Committee on Basic Professional Education (1971). Standards and guidelines for an occupational therapy affiliation program. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 25, 314-316.
- Bell, J. K. (1985). Impact of external constraints on fieldwork education. OT Education Bulletin, Spring, 4-5.
- Burkhardt, B. F. (1985). A time study of staff and student activities in a level II fieldwork program. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39, 35-40.
- Burnside, I. M. (1971). Peer supervision: A method of teaching. Journal of Nursing Education, 10, 15-22.
- Carozza, V., Congdon, J., & Watson, J. (1978). An experimental educationally sponsored pilot internship program. Journal of Nursing Education, 17, 14-20.
- Christiansen, E. (1987). Something's happening in occupational therapy education: Non-traditional options are changing the face of the profession. Occupational Therapy News, 41, 10-11.

- Christie, B. A., Joyce, P. C., & Moeller, P. L. (1985). Fieldwork experience, part I: Impact on practice preference. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39, 671-674.
- Christie, B. A., Joyce, P. C. & Moeller, P. L. (1985). Fieldwork experience, part II: The supervisor's dilemma. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 39, 675-681.
- Coles, J., Dobbyn, M., & Print, C. (1981). Nursing students perception of teaching in the clinical area. The Australian Nurses Journal, 11, 47-49.
- Cosper, B. (1976), Coping with an increased student-faculty ratio. American Journal of Nursing, 76, 1642-1644.
- Cotsanas, N. J. & Kaiser, H. F. (1963). Student evaluation of clinical teaching. Journal of Medical Education, 38, 742-745.
- Crichton, L. J. & Oratio, A. R. (1984). Speech-language pathologists' clinical fellowship training. ASHA, 26, 39-43.
- Crist, P. H. (1986). Contemporary issues in clinical education. In Current Practice Series in Occupational Therapy. Thorofare, N.J.: Slack, Inc.
- Davis, K. L. & Arvey, H. A. (1978). Dual supervision: A model for counseling and education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 17, 293-299.
- Emery, M. J. (1984). Effectiveness of the clinical instructor: Students' perspective. Physical Therapy, 64, 1079-1083.
- Gaipman, B. (1986). Application of cognitive style research to fieldwork education. Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy, 53, 75-78.
- Gallagher, E. & Watwood, V. (1941). The therapists of tomorrow. Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation, 20, 237-240.

- Hale, M. P. (1969). Innovations in field learning and teaching. In B.L. Jones, (Ed.), Current patterns in field instruction in graduate social work education. New York: Council on Social Work Education.
- Hallahan, M. T. (1984). A standardized rotation solved our teaching problems. Medical Laboratory Observer, 16, 93-104..
- Halloway, E. & Hosfford, R. E. (1981). Toward developing a prescriptive theory of counselor supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 11, 73-77.
- Handley, P. G. (1982). Relationship between supervisors' and trainees' cognitive styles and the supervision process. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 508-515.
- Hart, G. M. (1982). The process of clinical supervision. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Hedderson, J. (1987). SPSSx made simple. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Heppner, P. P. & Handley, P. G. (1981). A study of the interpersonal influence process in supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 437-444.
- Irby, D. M. (1978). Clinical teacher effectiveness in medicine. Journal of Medical Education, 53, 808-815.
- Jendrek, M. P. (1985). Through the maze: Statistics with computer applications. Belmont, CA; Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Kadushin, A. (1976). Supervision in social work. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kautzman, L. N. (1986). An assessment of the impact of the prospective payment system on level II fieldwork. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 40, 470-473.

- Lanning, W. L. (1971). A study of the relation between group and individual counseling supervision and three relationship measures. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 401-406.
- Minimum standards for course of training in occupational therapy (1924). Archives of Occupational Therapy, 3, 295-298.
- Moore M. L. & Perry, J. E. (1976). Clinical education in physical therapy: Present status, future needs. Washington, DC: American Physical Therapy Association.
- Morgan, J. & Knox, J. (1983). Student perception of clinical teaching. Nursing Papers, 15, 4-12.
- Munson, C. E. (1979). Evaluation of male and female supervisors. Social Work, 24, 104-110.
- Newton, R. M. (1977). Supervisor expectations and behavior: effects of supervisory pairing on supervisees' satisfaction with supervision, perceptions of supervisory relationships, and the related counselor competence. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 911-B.
- O'Shea H. & Parsons, M. K. (1979). Clinical instruction: Effective and ineffective teacher behaviors. Nursing Outlook, 27, 411-416.
- Ottenbacher, K. E. (1984). Nomethic and idiographic reseach strategies for clinical research: In apposition or opposition? Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 4, 198-212.
- Presseller, S. (1983). Fieldwork education: The proving ground for the profession [Nationally Speaking]. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 37, 163-165.
- Robinovitch, A. & Nash, K. B. (1983). Issues for hospitals in educating social work students for social work practice in health care settings. Social Work in Health Care, 9, 97-105.

- Rose, S. P., Lowenstein, J. & Fellini P. (1969). Measuring student perception of field instruction. In B.L. Jones, (Ed.), Current patterns of field instruction in graduate social work education. New York: Council on Social Work Education.
- Saxon, J. (1975). Multiple assignments--try them. American Journal of Nursing, 75, 2183-2184.
- Schwartz, K. B. (1984). An approach to supervision of students on fieldwork. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 38, 393-397.
- Scott, S. J. (1984). The medicare prospective payment system. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 38, 330-334.
- Shalik, L. D. (1987, April). Cost-benefit analysis of level II fieldwork at occupational therapy sites. Paper presented at the meeting of the Commission on Education, American Occupational Therapy Association, Indianapolis, IN.
- Smith, K. J. & Anderson, J. L. (1982). Relationship of perceived effectiveness to verbal interaction content variables in supervisory conferences in speech-language pathology. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 25, 252-261.
- Stritter, F.T., Hain, J. D. & Grimes, D. A. (1975). Clinical teaching reexamined. Journal of Medical Education, 50, 876-882.
- Strohmman, R. H. (1977). Improving student clinical experiences. Nursing Outlook, 25, 460-462.
- Study shows clinical education to be high priority among occupational therapy educators. (1986, July). Occupational Therapy Newspaper, 40, p. 7.
- Teske, Y. R. & Spelbring, L. M. (1983). Future impact on occupational therapy from changes in higher education. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 37, 667-672.

- Tiberius, R. & Gaipman, B. (1985). The supervisor-student ratio: 1:1 versus 1:2. Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy, 52, 175-183.
- Willard, H. S. & Gleave, M. (1949). A letter to clinical training directors. American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 3, 104-105.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors in training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 64-73.
- Zimmerman, L. & Waltman, N. (1986). Effective clinical behaviors of faculty: A review of the literature. Nurse Educator, 11, 31-34.

APPENDIX A

Supervision Questionnaire

Carleton E. Munson, DSW

SUPERVISION QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE FILL IN OR CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANK FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. Sex of Therapist: (1) Male_____ (2) Female_____
2. Sex of Supervisor: (1) Male_____ (2) Female_____
3. Age of Therapist: _____
4. Age of Supervisor: _____

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

1

2

3-4

5-6

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE CATEGORY BELOW EACH QUESTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION. THE CODES FOR THE RESPONSES ARE:

SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
MD = MILDLY DISAGREE
MA = MILDLY AGREE
A = Agree
SA = STRONGLY AGREE

5. My supervisor lets me do the work the way I think best.

SD D MD MA A SA

7

6. I feel my supervisor has contributed to my professional growth.

SD D MD MA A SA

8

7. My supervisor respects me as a professional and treats me as such.

SD D MD MA A SA

9

8. I think my supervisor is fair.

SD D MD MA A SA

10

9. Overall, I am satisfied with my supervisory experience.

SD D MD MA A SA

11

10. I usually come out of my supervisory conferences or groups feeling pretty good.

SD D MD MA A SA

12

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

11. I do not look forward to my supervisory sessions and dread them beforehand.

SD D MD MA A SA

13

12. My supervisor's written and oral evaluations of my performance are similar to my self-evaluations of my level of performance.

SD D MD MA A SA

14

13. My supervisor knows how to set priorities.

SD D MD MA A SA

15

14. My supervisor is good at organizing work.

SD D MD MA A SA

16

15. My supervisor knows how to teach techniques.

SD D MD MA A SA

17

16. My supervisor emphasizes the quantity of work while I am more interested in the quality of my work.

SD D MD MA A SA

18

17. My supervisor rules with an iron hand.

SD D MD MA A SA

19

18. My supervisor is slow to accept new ideas.

SD D MD MA A SA

20

19. My supervisor insists that everything be done his or her way.

SD D MD MA A SA

21

20. My supervisor likes to give directions.

SD D MD MA A SA

22

21. My supervisor has a "just pay attention and listen" attitude.

SD D MD MA A SA

23

22. My supervisor seems to know what he or she is talking about when it comes to dealing with case material.

SD D MD MA A SA

24

CODE: SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE; D = DISAGREE; MD = MILDLY DISAGREE;
MA = MILDLY AGREE; A = AGREE; SA = STRONGLY AGREE.

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

23. My supervisor has adequate knowledge to function as a good supervisor as far as his or her teaching role is concerned.

SD D MD MA A SA

25

24. My supervisor tends to talk mostly about theory and does not bother to deal with applying theory to the practice component of my cases.

SD D MD MA A SA

26

25. My supervisor tends to assume that I know a lot more than I really do and often talks "over my head."

SD D MD MA A SA

27

26. My supervisor tends to assume that I know a lot less than I feel within myself I know.

SD D MD MA A SA

28

27. My supervisor has helped me develop more self-awareness.

SD D MD MA A SA

29

28. My supervisor seems more interested in analyzing me than my cases.

SD D MD MA A SA

30

29. When one of my cases drops out of treatment, my supervisor is more interested in how I contributed to this than in what motivated the patient.

SD D MD MA A SA

31

30. My supervisor has helped to improve my efficiency as a therapist.

SD D MD MA A SA

32

31. My supervisor has improved my effectiveness as a therapist.

SD D MD MA A SA

33

32. When I go home at the end of a day and I have had supervision. I can feel pretty good about my day's efforts.

SD D MD MA A SA

34

CODE: SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE; D = DISAGREE; MD = MILDLY DISAGREE;
MA = MILDLY AGREE; A = AGREE; SA = STRONGLY AGREE.

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

33. In absolute terms my caseload is too small, and I wish I had more cases.

SD D MD MA A SA

35

34. In absolute terms, my caseload is too large.

SD D MD MA A SA

36

35. My supervisor is friendly and can be easily approached.

SD D MD MA A SA

37

36. My supervisor encourages me to talk openly and freely with him or her.

SD D MD MA A SA

38

37. My supervisor makes me feel at ease when talking with him or her.

SD D MD MA A SA

39

38. My supervisor expresses appreciation when I do a good job.

SD D MD MA A SA

40

39. My supervisor does not always make himself or herself clear.

SD D MD MA A SA

41

40. My values about what constitutes good treatment are much different from those of my supervisor.

SD D MD MA A SA

42

41. I often seek the advice of my co-workers rather than take the matter up with my supervisor.

SD D MD MA A SA

43

42. If I can get around it, I avoid conferences with my supervisor.

SD D MD MA A SA

44

43. It does not pay to confront my supervisor with an issue.

SD D MD MA A SA

45

CODE: SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE; D = DISAGREE; MD = MILDLY DISAGREE;
MA = MILDLY AGREE; A = AGREE; SA = STRONGLY AGREE,

44. My supervisor is usually looking for some issue to discuss in our conferences, and the best policy is to reveal as little as possible.

SD D MD MA A SA

46

45. My supervisor seems more concerned that I deal with my cases according to the rules and regulations rather than being concerned that I do the utmost to aid my patients.

SD D MD MA A SA

47

46. My supervisory experience has been of limited value because of the agency confines.

SD D MD MA A SA

48

47. It is no use to try to do something creative or innovative in this agency because there is always someone ready to put you down.

SD D MD MA A SA

49

48. Usually I am way behind on my dictation and should take some time to get caught up.

SD D MD MA A SA

50

49. The administrators in this agency are only concerned with output and really show little concern for the welfare of the therapists.

SD D MD MA A SA

51

50. This agency seems to be constantly in a state of crisis, and we simply seem to just go from one crisis to another.

SD D MD MA A SA

52

51. There are so many problems in this agency that I avoid them and devote my time to doing a good job with my patients.

SD D MD MA A SA

53

52. All in all this agency is a pretty good place to work.

SD D MD MA A SA

54

CODE: SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE; D = DISAGREE; MD = MILDLY DISAGREE;
MA = MILDLY AGREE; A = AGREE; SA = STRONGLY AGREE.

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE CATEGORY BELOW EACH QUESTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION.

53. How often do you become annoyed with your supervisor?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

55

54. How often do you become angry with your supervisor?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

56

55. How often do you confront your supervisor?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

57

56. My supervisor allows me to observe directly his or her own methods of working with cases through allowing me to sit in on some of his or her interviews.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

58

57. My supervisor sits in on some of my own interviews as a means of gathering data to help me develop my own professional skill.

59

58. My supervisor uses audio tape recordings of interviews in our supervisory conferences or groups.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

60

59. My supervisor uses videotaped interviews as supervisory material in our conferences or groups.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

61-64

1

60. My supervisor requires me to process record case material for use in supervisory conferences or groups.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

2

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

IN PERCENT, ON THE AVERAGE THE PROPORTIONING OF TIME IN MY
SUPERVISORY SESSIONS IS:

61. _____% discussing supervisor's personal problems.
 62. _____% discussing supervisor's cases.
 63. _____% discussing my personal problems.
 64. _____% discussing administrative matters.
 65. _____% discussing case material.
 66. _____% discussing my growth and development of self-awareness
 as a therapist.
 67. _____% discussing everyday small talk that is unrelated to my
 work.
 TOTAL = 100 %

68. How often do you have conferences with your supervisor?
 (0) _____Never (1) _____Monthly or Less (2) _____Biweekly
 (3) _____Weekly (4) _____Daily
 69. Supervisory conferences are usually held:
 (1) _____at my request. (2) _____at request of my field instructor.
 70. If I had my choice, I would prefer:
 (1) _____individual one-to-one supervision.
 (2) _____group supervision.
 (3) _____combination individual and group supervision
 (4) _____no supervision.

71. On the average I conduct _____interviews each day.
 72. On the average each interview lasts _____.

IN PERCENT, ON THE AVERAGE MY WORK LOAD IS PROPORTIONED:

73. _____% doing therapy.
 74. _____% dictation.
 75. _____% staff meetings.
 76. _____% community work.
 77. _____% Other _____

TOTAL = 100 %

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

3-4

5-6

7-8

9-10

11-12

13-14

15-16

17

18

19

20-21

22-23

24-25

26-27

28-29

30-31

32-33

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

78. IN THE SPACE PROVIDED, CHECK THE MODEL OF SUPERVISION THAT MOST CLOSELY PARALLELS THE ONE USED IN YOUR SUPERVISION:

- ☐ 1. Emphasis in supervision is placed on the three-part process of help, teaching and administration. Therapists are expected to develop self-awareness. Regularly scheduled individual conferences are used to manage the flow and content of work of supervisees.
- ☐ 2. Supervision is viewed as strictly an administrative and teaching process. The supervisor avoids psychologizing the worker. The structure of supervision is regularly scheduled conferences with a specific agenda.
- ☐ 3. Emphasis in supervision is placed on teaching, and administration latitude is provided for a variety of supervisory styles adapted to individual therapist needs. Therapists are allowed to choose among available experts for advice. Individual conferences are used sparingly. There is some use of group seminars.
- ☐ 4. Role of individual supervisor is played down. The specific work group, which is set up on specialized skills and/or services, is the main supervisory unit and has virtually replaced the individual conference for supervisory decision making and problem solving.
- ☐ 5. The individual supervisor supervises several therapists in a group arrangement. The group works together to establish the direction and content of supervision. Learning experiences are provided mainly through members of the group sharing ideas, information and observations with one another.
- ☐ 6. Therapists function completely independently and only answer to their own consciences. No direct control is exercised over the therapist who is treated as a mature, experienced professional without need of supervision.

79. All supervisors are required to exercise authority and control in supervision from time to time. This question deals with how you view the source of authority and control in dealing with students used by your supervisor. CHECK THE BLANK THAT MOST CLOSELY PARALLELS THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY USED BY YOUR SUPERVISOR.

- ☐ 1. Administratively assigned and agency sanctioned authority over therapists.
- ☐ 2. Authority rests in ability to require or expect therapists to reveal much about themselves in the supervisory relationship.

(NOTE: THERE ARE MORE SOURCES OF AUTHORITY LISTED ON NEXT PAGE.)

DO NOT WRITE
IN THIS COLUMN

- ____ 3. In part, authority depends on the ability to have influence beyond the job situation through, for example, evaluations.
- ____ 4. Authority derives from the role as mediator of the relationship between therapists and the agency.
- ____ 5. Authority derives from the fact that the supervisor knows more about some things than the therapist does.
- ____ 6. Authority grows out of the personality of the supervisor and his or her ability to achieve cooperation from therapists through diplomacy and skill in handling supervisees.

35

80. Along with their other duties, supervisors are required to perform teaching functions. This question deals with the teaching models used in your supervision. IN THE BLANK PROVIDED, CHECK THE MODEL THAT MOST CLOSELY PARALLELS THE ONE USED BY YOUR SUPERVISOR.

- ____ 1. Basically the Socratic method is used. That is, supervisees are skillfully asked leading questions until they identify and recognize the material sought. The supervisor talks very little. The therapist does most of the talking.
- ____ 2. The major thrust of teaching is to provide information that will help therapists avoid making errors and emphasis is placed on what not to do so as to avoid grave situations. This method is used to foster as much as possible the growth and self-expression of the therapist. The main function of teaching is viewed as provision for self-expression and development of self-awareness of the therapist.
- ____ 3. Teaching in supervision centers around whatever experiences that emerge from the patient treatment demands and the development of the essential skills necessary to provide treatment. Emphasis is placed on the relationship between knowing, feeling and doing in practice.

36

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES:

81. The things I like the most about my supervisor are:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____
- 5. _____

37

	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS COLUMN
82. The things I dislike about my supervisor are:	
1. _____	
2. _____	
3. _____	
4. _____	
5. _____	
83. Rank your supervisor from 1 to 10 (1 = low. 10 = high) according to how good a supervisor you think he or she is. _____	38
84. Rank yourself from 1 to 10 (1 = low, 10 = high) in terms of how good a therapist you think you are. _____	39
85. Do you think supervision has helped you improve your effectiveness and efficiency as a therapist? (1) Yes _____ (2) No _____	40
86. What do you see as the chief value of supervision? _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	41
87. COMMENTS:	42
	43
Reference: Munson, C. E., D.S.W. (1983). <u>An introduction to clinical social work supervision.</u>	77-80

APPENDIX B

Correspondence

January 26, 1987

417 Withers, #17
Denton, TX 76201

Carleton F. Munson, DSW
Professional Supervision Institute
1202 Bering Drive, #60
Houston, TX 77057

Dear Dr. Munson:

I am a graduate student at Texas Woman's University and have read with great interest your book, An Introduction to Clinical Social Work Supervision. As part of my thesis I would like to study supervision as it applies to occupational therapy clinical teaching and would like to request more information.

On page 320 of the above publication there is a statement regarding the use of your "Supervision Questionnaire" and a corresponding SPSS software package for tabulation of results of the questionnaire. My thesis will be addressing satisfaction with supervision as a function of student-supervisor ratio in occupational therapy clinical internships. I am very interested in using your questionnaire as a research instrument and would like to make slight grammatical changes to reflect reference to two or more supervisors when completing the questionnaire.

I would like to request additional standardization information for the questionnaire, information regarding the SPSS package, and a list of compatible computer hardware for the program. I am also interested in any cost that would be necessary for the use of the questionnaire and/or the software package.

I thank you for your cooperation in this effort; I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,


Sandra J. Jarrad, OTR/L

The Clinical Supervisor

78

... the journal of supervision in psychotherapy & mental health

EDITOR:

Carlton Munson, DSW
Graduate School of Social Work
University of Houston
Central Campus
Houston, Texas 77004
(713) 749-3814

January 29, 1987

Sandra J. Jarrad, OTR/L
417 Withers, #17
Denton, TX 76201

Dear Sandra:

Attached is the supervision material you requested in your letter of January 26.

There would be no cost associated with the use of my questionnaire. I would request that you simply cite me as the source of the questionnaire in any published material.

Good luck with your study, and if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Carlton E. Munson, DSW
Professor
Graduate School of Social Work
University of Houston

jem

Attach.

APPENDIX C

Questionnaires

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANK FOR EACH QUESTION.

- ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION. CODES FOR RESPONSES ARE:

SA - strongly agree

4. I/we allow the student to do the work the way he/she thinks best.
- | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|----|---|----|
| SD | D | MD | MA | A | SA |
|----|---|----|----|---|----|
5. I/we feel supervision has contributed to the student's professional growth.
- | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|----|---|----|
| SD | D | MD | MA | A | SA |
|----|---|----|----|---|----|

6. I/we respect the student as a professional and treat him/her as such.
SD D MD MA A SA
7. I/we think the supervision provided is fair.
SD D MD MA A SA
8. Overall, I/we am/are satisfied with the supervision of this student.
SD D MD MA A SA
9. I/we usually come out of a supervisory conference with this student feeling pretty good.
SD D MD MA A SA
10. I/we do not look forward to supervisory sessions with this student.
SD D MD MA A SA
11. My/our written and oral evaluations of the student's performance are similar to his/her self-evaluations of performance.
SD D MD MA A SA
12. As supervisor(s), I/we know how to set priorities.
SD D MD MA A SA
13. As supervisor(s), I/we am/are good at organizing work.
SD D MD MA A SA
14. As supervisor(s), I/we know how to teach techniques.
SD D MD MA A SA
15. The student and supervisor(s) differ on how much importance should be placed on the quantity of work the student performs.
SD D MD MA A SA
16. The supervision provided to this student tended to be rigid.
SD D MD MA A SA
17. Supervision was focused on doing things according to facility standards.
SD D MD MA A SA
18. As supervisor(s) I/we enjoy giving directions to the student.
SD D MD MA A SA

19. I/we prefer that the student "just pay attention and listen" to the supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA
20. I/we feel that I/we know what I/we am/are talking about when it comes to dealing with treatment of patients.
SD D MD MA A SA
21. I/we have adequate knowledge to function as supervisor(s) as far as the teaching role is concerned.
SD D MD MA A SA
22. I/we emphasize theory rather than application during the supervision of this student.
SD D MD MA A SA
23. At times I/we assumed that the student knew more than he/she really did.
SD D MD MA A SA
24. At times I/we assumed that the student knew less than he/she really did.
SD D MD MA A SA
25. Supervision has helped the student develop more self awareness.
SD D MD MA A SA
26. Supervision has helped to increase this student's efficiency as a therapist.
SD D MD MA A SA
27. Supervision has helped this student's effectiveness as a therapist.
SD D MD MA A SA
28. When I/we go home at the end of the day after supervising this student, I/we can feel pretty good about the day's efforts.
SD D MD MA A SA
29. At times I/we did not make myself/ourselves clear to the student.
SD D MD MA A SA
30. I/we feel that the student can approach me/us easily as supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA

31. The student is encouraged to speak openly and freely with me/us.
SD D MD MA A SA
32. I/we feel at ease when talking with this student.
SD D MD MA A SA
33. I/we express appreciation when the student does a good job.
SD D MD MA A SA
34. This student's values about what constitutes good treatment are very different than those of the supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA
35. In absolute terms, the student's caseload was too large.
SD D MD MA A SA
36. I/we avoid conferences with this student whenever possible.
SD D MD MA A SA
37. It does not pay to confront the student with an issue.
SD D MD MA A SA
38. This student did not speak openly about issues during supervisory conferences.
SD D MD MA A SA
39. I/we are more concerned that the student deal with patients according to the rules and regulations rather than being concerned that he/she do the utmost to aid the patients.
SD D MD MA A SA
40. This supervisory experience has been of limited value to the student because of the agency confines.
SD D MD MA A SA

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE BELOW EACH QUESTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION.

41. How often do you become annoyed with the student?
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently
42. How often do you become angry with the student?
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently
43. How often do you confront the student?
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently
44. I/we allow the student to observe my/our methods of working with patients by allowing him/her to sit in on some of my/our treatment sessions.
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently
45. I/we sit in on some of the student's treatment sessions as a means of gathering data to help the student develop professional skills.
Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

IN PERCENT, ON THE AVERAGE THE PROPORTION OF TIME SPENT IN SUPERVISORY SESSIONS IS:

46. _____ % discussing supervisor's personal problems.
47. _____ % discussing supervisor's patients.
48. _____ % discussing student's personal problems.
49. _____ % discussing administrative matters.
50. _____ % discussing matters directly related to student's patients.
51. _____ % discussing student's growth and development as a therapist.
52. _____ % discussing small talk unrelated to the student's work.

TOTAL = 100%

53. How often do you have conferences with the student?
(a conference is defined as a two-way verbal exchange of information regarding the student's performance)
(1) _____ Never (3) _____ Biweekly (5) _____ Daily
(2) _____ Monthly or less (4) _____ Weekly

54. Supervisory conferences are usually held:
(1) _____ at student's request.
(2) _____ at my/our request.
(3) _____ at request of fieldwork coordinator.
55. If I/we had a choice, I/we would prefer:
(1) _____ single individual supervision. (see Question)
(2) _____ multiple rotation supervision. (#3 for)
(3) _____ multiple concurrent supervision (definitions)
56. Rank the supervision provided to this student from
1 to 10 (1 = low, 10 = high): _____
57. Rank yourself/selves from 1 to 10 (1 = low, 10 = high)
in terms of how good a supervisor you think you are:
(use average of multiple supervisors) _____
58. CHECK THE MODEL OF SUPERVISION BELOW THAT MOST CLOSELY
PARALLELS THE ONE USED FOR SUPERVISION OF THIS STUDENT:
- (1) _____ Emphasis in supervision is placed on the three-
part process of help, teaching and administration.
Students are expected to develop self-awareness.
Regularly scheduled and individual conferences
are used to manage the flow and content of
student work.
- (2) _____ Supervision is viewed as strictly an
administrative and teaching process. The
supervisor avoids psychologizing the student.
The structure of supervision is regularly
scheduled conferences with a specific agenda.
- (3) _____ Emphasis in supervision is placed on teaching,
and administrative latitude is provided for a
variety of supervisory styles adapted to student
needs. Students are allowed to choose among
available experts for advice. Individual
conferences are used sparingly; there is some
use of group seminars.
- (4) _____ Role of individual supervisor is played down.
The specific work group which is set up on
specialized skills/services is the main
supervisory unit and has replaced the individual
conference for supervisory decision-making and
problem solving.

- (5) _____ The individual supervisor supervises several students in a group arrangement. The group works together to establish the direction and content of supervision. Learning experiences are provided mainly through members of the group sharing ideas, information, and observations with one another.
- (6) _____ Students function completely independently and only answer to their own consciences. No direct control is exercised over the students who are treated as mature, experienced professionals without need of supervision.

59. PLEASE CHECK THE TEACHING MODEL BELOW THAT MOST CLOSELY PARALLELS THE ONE USED IN SUPERVISING THIS STUDENT.

- (1) _____ Basically the Socratic method is used. That is, students are asked leading questions until they identify and recognize the material being sought. The supervisor talks very little; the student does most of the talking.
- (2) _____ The major thrust of teaching is to provide information that will help students avoid making errors; emphasis is placed on what not to do so as to avoid grave situations. The main focus of teaching is viewed as provision for self-expression and development of self-awareness of the student.
- (3) _____ Teaching centers around whatever experiences emerge from the patient treatment demands and the development of the essential skills necessary to provide treatment. Emphasis is placed on the relationship between knowing, feeling, and doing in practice.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Student Form, p. 1

Supervision Questionnaire

PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANK FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. Type of fieldwork: (1) ☐ Physical Dysfunction
(2) ☐ Psychosocial Dysfunction
(3) ☐ Pediatric
2. Present fieldwork placement is:
(1) ☐ first Level II experience
(2) ☐ second
(3) ☐ third
3. Supervision structure used with me this placement:
(1) ☐ Single Individual: assigned to one supervisor entire placement.
(2) ☐ Multiple Rotation: assigned to rotate through program, resulting in two or more supervisors.
(3) ☐ Multiple Concurrent: assigned to two or more supervisors at the same time during entire placement.
(4) ☐ Other (describe): _____

4. Number of Level II student your supervisor(s) have previously supervised (use average number if more than one supervisor):
(1) ☐ no students before.
(2) ☐ 1-3 students.
(3) ☐ 4 or more students.

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION. IF YOU HAD MORE THAN ONE SUPERVISOR, PLEASE CONSIDER ALL AS ONE GROUP WHEN MAKING YOUR RESPONSES. CODES FOR RESPONSES ARE:

SD - strongly disagree
D - disagree
MD - mildly disagree
MA - mildly agree
A - agree
SA - strongly agree

5. My supervisor(s) let(s) me do the work the way I think best.
SD D MD MA A SA

Student Form, p. 2

6. I feel my supervision has contributed to my professional growth.
SD D MD MA A SA
7. My supervisor(s) respect(s) me as a professional and treat(s) me as such.
SD D MD MA A SA
8. I think my supervision is fair.
SD D MD MA A SA
9. Overall, I am satisfied with my supervisory experience.
SD D MD MA A SA
10. I usually come out of my supervisory conferences feeling pretty good.
SD D MD MA A SA
11. I do not look forward to my supervisory sessions and dread them beforehand.
SD D MD MA A SA
12. My supervisor's written and oral evaluations of my performance are similar to my self-evaluation of my performance.
SD D MD MA A SA
13. My supervisor(s) know(s) how to set priorities.
SD D MD MA A SA
14. My supervisor(s) is/are good at organizing work.
SD D MD MA A SA
15. My supervisor(s) is/are good at teaching techniques.
SD D MD MA A SA
16. My supervisor(s) and I differ on how much importance should be put on the quantity of work I perform.
SD D MD MA A SA
17. My supervisor(s) rule(s) with an iron hand.
SD D MD MA A SA
18. My supervisor(s) is/are slow to accept new ideas.
SD D MD MA A SA

Student Form, p. 3

19. My supervisor(s) insist(s) that everything be done his/her way.
SD D MD MA A SA
20. My supervisor(s) like(s) to give directions.
SD D MD MA A SA
21. My supervisor(s) has/have a "just pay attention and listen" attitude.
SD D MD MA A SA
22. My supervisor(s) seem(s) to know what he/she is talking about when it comes to dealing with treatment of patients.
SD D MD MA A SA
23. My supervisor(s) has/have adequate knowledge to function as a good supervisor as far as the teaching role is concerned.
SD D MD MA A SA
24. My supervisor(s) tend(s) to talk mostly about theory and does not bother to deal with applying theory to treatment of my patients.
SD D MD MA A SA
25. My supervisor(s) tend(s) to assume that I know a lot more than I really do and often "talks over my head".
SD D MD MA A SA
26. My supervisor(s) tend(s) to assume that I know a lot less than I feel within myself I know.
SD D MD MA A SA
27. My supervision has helped me to develop more self-awareness.
SD D MD MA A SA
28. My supervision has improved my efficiency as a therapist.
SD D MD MA A SA
29. My supervision has improved my effectiveness as a therapist.
SD D MD MA A SA
30. When I go home at the end of a day and I have had supervision, I can feel pretty good about the day's efforts.
SD D MD MA A SA

Student Form, p. 4

31. In absolute terms, my caseload is too large.
SD D MD MA A SA
32. My supervisor(s) is/are friendly and can be easily approached.
SD D MD MA A SA
33. My supervisor(s) encourage(s) me to talk openly and freely with him or her.
SD D MD MA A SA
34. My supervisor(s) make(s) me feel at ease when talking with him/her.
SD D MD MA A SA
35. My supervisor(s) express(es) appreciation when I do a good job.
SD D MD MA A SA
36. My supervisor(s) do(es) not always make him/herself clear.
SD D MD MA A SA
37. My values about what constitutes good treatment are much different than those of my supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA
38. I often seek the advice of other students rather than take the matter up with my supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA
39. If I can get around it, I avoid conferences with my supervisor(s).
SD D MD MA A SA
40. It does not pay to confront my supervisor(s) with an issue.
SD D MD MA A SA
41. My supervisor(s) is/are usually looking for some issue to discuss in our conferences, and the best policy is to reveal as little as possible.
SD D MD MA A SA
42. My supervisor(s) seem(s) more concerned that I deal with my patients according to the rules and regulations rather than being concerned that I do the utmost to aid my patients.
SD D MD MA A SA

Student Form, p. 5

43. My supervisory experience has been of limited value because of the agency confines.

SD D MD MA A SA

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE BELOW EACH QUESTION THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE QUESTION.

44. How often do you become annoyed with your supervisor(s)?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

45. How often do you become angry with your supervisor(s)?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

46. How often do you confront your supervisor(s)?

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

47. My supervisor(s) allow(s) me to observe directly his/her methods of working with patients by allowing me to sit in on some of his/her treatment sessions.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

48. My supervisor(s) sit(s) in on some of my treatment sessions as a means of gathering data to help me develop my own professional skills.

Never Infrequently Sometimes Frequently

IN PERCENT, ON THE AVERAGE THE PROPORTIONING OF MY TIME IN MY SUPERVISORY SESSIONS IS:

49. _____ % discussing supervisors' personal problems.
 50. _____ % discussing supervisors' patients.
 51. _____ % discussing my personal problems.
 52. _____ % discussing administrative matters.
 53. _____ % discussing matters directly related to my patients.
 54. _____ % discussing my growth and development as a therapist.
 55. _____ % discussing small talk that is unrelated to my work.

TOTAL = 100%

Student Form, p. 6

56. How often do you have conferences with your supervisor(s)?
(a conference is defined as a two-way verbal exchange of
information regarding the student's performance)

- (1) ☐ Never (3) ☐ Biweekly (5) ☐ Daily
(2) ☐ Monthly or less (4) ☐ Weekly

57. Supervisory conferences are usually held:

- (1) ☐ at my request.
(2) ☐ at the request of my supervisor.
(3) ☐ at the request of the fieldwork coordinator.

58. If I had my choice I would prefer:

- (1) ☐ single individual supervision.
(2) ☐ multiple rotation supervision.*
(3) ☐ multiple concurrent supervision.*
 (* see Question #3 for definitions)

59. CHECK THE MODEL OF SUPERVISION BELOW THAT MOST CLOSELY
PARALLELS THE ONE USED IN YOUR SUPERVISION.

- (1) ☐ Emphasis in supervision is placed on the three-part process of help, teaching, and administration. Students are expected to develop self-awareness. Regularly scheduled individual conferences are used to manage the flow and content of student work.
- (2) ☐ Supervision is viewed as strictly an administrative and teaching process. The supervisor avoids psychologizing the student. The structure of supervision is regularly scheduled conferences with a specific agenda.
- (3) ☐ Emphasis in supervision is placed on teaching, and administrative latitude is provided for a variety of supervisory styles adapted to student needs. Students are allowed to choose among available experts for advice. Individual conferences are used sparingly; there is some use of group seminars.
- (4) ☐ Role of individual supervisor is played down. The specific work group which is set up on specialized skills/services is the main supervisory unit and has replaced the individual conference for supervisory decision making and problem solving.

Student Form, p. 7

- (5) ____ The individual supervisor supervises several students in a group arrangement. The group works together to establish the direction and content of supervision. Learning experiences are provided mainly through members of the group sharing ideas, information, and observations with one another.
- (6) ____ Students function completely independently and only answer to their own consciences. No direct control is exercised over students, who are treated as mature, experienced professionals without need of supervision.
60. Along with other duties, supervisors are required to perform teaching functions. This question deals with the teaching models used in your supervision. PLEASE CHECK THE MODEL BELOW THAT MOST CLOSELY PARALLELS THE ONE USED IN YOUR SUPERVISION.
- (a) ____ Basically the Socratic method is used. That is, students are asked leading questions until they recognize the material sought. The supervisor talks very little; the student does most of the talking.
- (b) ____ The major thrust of teaching is to provide information that will help students avoid making errors; emphasis is placed on what not to do so as to avoid grave situations. The main function of teaching is viewed as provision for self-expression and development of self-awareness of the therapist.
- (c) ____ Teaching centers around whatever experiences that emerge from the patient treatment demands and the development of the essential skills necessary to provide treatment. Emphasis is placed on the relationship between knowing, feeling, and doing in practice.
61. Rank your supervision from 1 to 10 (1 = low, 10 = high):
- _____

Student Form, p. 8

62. Rank yourself from 1 to 10 (1 = low, 10 = high) in terms of how good a therapist you think you are: _____

63. Do you think supervision has helped you improve your efficiency and effectiveness as a therapist?

(1) _____ Yes

(2) _____ No

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire Cover Letters and Instructions

March 1, 1987

(Student Name)
(Street Address)
(City Zip)

Dear Student:

As you complete your final stages of occupational therapy education I'm sure you agree that fieldwork is a unique experience. Enclosed is a questionnaire concerning supervision in fieldwork which will be used in a study I am conducting as part of my graduate work in occupational therapy. Will you please take a few moments to complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope? (Your response will remain completely anonymous.) A copy of the completed results of the study will be sent upon request.

Thank you for your cooperation; best of luck and good wishes for your remaining training.

Sincerely,

Sandi Jarrad, OTR/L

I UNDERSTAND THAT MY RETURN OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTITUTES MY INFORMED CONSENT TO ACT AS A SUBJECT IN THIS RESEARCH. NO MEDICAL SERVICE OR COMPENSATION IS PROVIDED TO SUBJECTS BY THE UNIVERSITY AS A RESULT OF INJURY FROM PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH.

March 1, 1987

(Fieldwork Educator Name)
 (Department or Division Name)
 (Facility Name)
 (Street Address)
 (City, Zip)

Dear Fieldwork Instructors:

As occupational therapists in a teaching center for occupational therapy students, I'm sure you are aware of the importance of supervision during clinical fieldwork. Enclosed is a short questionnaire concerning supervision in fieldwork education which will be used in a study I am conducting as part of my graduate work in occupational therapy. Will you please take a few moments to complete the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope? A copy of the completed results of the study will be sent upon request.

Thank you for your cooperation; best wishes in your continued role as occupational therapy educators.

Sincerely,

Sandra Jarrad, OTR/L
 Master of Arts Candidate
 Texas Woman's University

I UNDERSTAND THAT MY RETURN OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTITUTES MY INFORMED CONSENT TO ACT AS A SUBJECT IN THIS RESEARCH. NO MEDICAL SERVICE OR COMPENSATION IS PROVIDED TO SUBJECTS BY THE UNIVERSITY AS A RESULT OF INJURY FROM PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH.

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

Supervisor Form

Single Supervisor: If only one supervisor provided at least 80% of the total supervision for the student named below, that therapist should complete the questionnaire.

Multiple Supervisors: Any supervisor who provided at least 25% of the total supervision of the student named below should have input into completion of the questionnaire. This questionnaire may be filled out at the same time all supervisors meet to complete the student's FWE (or FWPR).

PLEASE NOTE!

DO NOT RETURN THIS SHEET WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO AVOID IDENTIFICATION.

Level II Student: _____

APPENDIX E

Text of Reminder Cards

Text of Reminder Cards

Dear Student:

When tallying returned "Supervision Questionnaires" for my study, I note the one sent to you was not received. If you have misplaced your copy and need another, please call (817) 898-2802 and a new questionnaire will be sent. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sandi Jarrad, OTR/L

Dear Clinical Supervisor:

When tallying returned "Supervision Questionnaires" for my study, I noted that the one sent to your facility was not received. If you have misplaced it and need another, please call (817) 898-2802 and a new questionnaire will be sent. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sandra J. Jarrad, OTR/L

APPENDIX F

SPSSX Commands

```

TITLE 'SUPERVISOR COMMANDS'
FILE HANDLE DATAIN/NAME='SUP.DTA'
DATA LIST FILE=DATAIN/
  VAR01 TO VAR45 3-47
  VAR46 TO VAR54 48-65
  VAR55          66
  VAR56 TO VAR57 67-74
  VAR58          75
  VAR59          76
VARIABLE LABELS
  VAR01 'TYPE FIELDWORK'//
  VAR02 'EXPERIENCE'//
  VAR03 'RATIO'//
  VAR04 'LET DO WORK'//
  VAR05 'HELP PROF GROWTH'//
  VAR06 'RESPECT PROFESSIONALISM'//
  VAR07 'SUPERVISION FAIR'//
  VAR08 'OVERALL SATISFACTION'//
  VAR09 'FEEL GOOD SUPERVISING'//
  VAR10 'DREAD SUPERVISING'//
  VAR11 'EVALUATION AGREE'//
  VAR12 'SET PRIORITIES'//
  VAR13 'ORGANIZE WORK'//
  VAR14 'TEACH TECHNIQUES'//
  VAR15 'QUANTITY OF WORK'//
  VAR16 'RIGID SUPERVISION'//
  VAR17 'FACILITY STANDARD'//
  VAR18 'GIVES DIRECTIONS'//
  VAR19 'PAY ATTENTION'//
  VAR20 'GOOD CLINICIAN'//
  VAR21 'GOOD TEACHER'//
  VAR22 'THEORY'//
  VAR23 'ASSUMED KNEW MORE'//
  VAR24 'ASSUMED KNEW LESS'//
  VAR25 'HELP SELF-AWARENESS'//
  VAR26 'HELP EFFICIENCY'//
  VAR27 'HELP EFFECTIVENESS'//
  VAR28 'FEEL GOOD DAY END'//
  VAR29 'SUPERVISOR UNCLEAR'//
  VAR30 'SUPERVISOR FRIENDLY'//
  VAR31 'SUPERVISOR OPEN'//
  VAR32 'FEEL AT EASE'//
  VAR33 'EXPRESS APPRECIATION'//
  VAR34 'TX VALUES DIFFER'//
  VAR35 'CASELOAD LARGE'//
  VAR36 'AVOID CONFERENCES'//
  VAR37 'CONFRONTATION USELESS'//

```

VAR38 'STUDENT REVEAL LITTLE'/
 VAR39 'RULE ORIENTED'/
 VAR40 'AGENCY CONFINES'/
 VAR41 'ANNOYED AT STUDENT'/
 VAR42 'ANGRY AT STUDENT'/
 VAR43 'CONFRONT STUDENT'/
 VAR44 'OBSERVE THERAPIST'/
 VAR45 'OBSERVE STUDENT'/
 VAR46 'DIS SUP PROBLEMS'/
 VAR47 'DIS SUP PATIENTS'/
 VAR48 'DIS STU PROBLEMS'/
 VAR49 'DIS ADMIN MATTERS'/
 VAR50 'DIS STU PATIENTS'/
 VAR51 'DIS STU GROWTH'/
 VAR52 'DIS SMALL TALK'/
 VAR53 'CONFERENCE FREQUENCY'/
 VAR54 'CONFERENCE INITIATION'/
 VAR55 'SUPERVISION PREFERENCE'/
 VAR56 'SUPERVISION RANK'/
 VAR57 'SELF RANK'/
 VAR58 'SUPERVISION MODEL'/
 VAR59 'TEACHING MODEL'/

VALUE LABELS

VAR01 (1) 'PHYSICAL DYSFUNCTION' (2) 'PSYCH DYSFUNCTION'
 (3) 'PEDIATRICS'/
 VAR02 (1) 'NO STUDENTS' (2) 'ONE-THREE STUDENTS'
 (3) '4+ STUDENTS'/
 VAR03 (1) 'SINGLE INDIVIDUAL' (2) 'MULTIPLE ROTATION'
 (3) 'MULTIPLE CONCURRENT'/
 VAR04 TO VAR09 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
 (3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE'
 (5) 'AGREE' (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/
 VAR10 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY AGREE'
 (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
 (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
 VAR11 TO VAR14 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
 (3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
 (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/
 VAR15 TO VAR17 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE'
 (3) 'MILDLY AGREE' (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE'
 (5) 'DISAGREE' (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
 VAR18 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
 (3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
 (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/
 VAR19 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY AGREE'
 (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
 (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/

```

VAR20 TO VAR21 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
(3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
(6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'//
VAR22 TO VAR24 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE'
(3) 'MILDLY AGREE' (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE'
(5) 'DISAGREE' (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'//
VAR25 TO VAR28 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
(3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
(6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'//
VAR29 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY AGREE'
(4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
(6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'//
VAR30 TO VAR33 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
(3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
(6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'//
VAR34 TO VAR40 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY'+
'AGREE' (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
(6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'//
VAR41 TO VAR45 (1) 'NEVER' (2) 'INFREQUENTLY'
(3) 'SOMETIMES' (4) 'FREQUENTLY'//
VAR53 (1) 'NEVER' (2) 'MONTHLY' (3) 'BIWEEKLY' (4) 'WEEKLY'
(5) 'DAILY'//
VAR54 (1) 'STUDENT REQUEST' (2) 'SUPERVISOR REQUEST'
(3) 'COORDINATOR REQUEST'//
VAR55 (1) 'SINGLE INDIVIDUAL' (2) 'MULTIPLE ROTATION'
(3) 'MULTIPLE CONCURRENT'//
VAR58 (1) 'TRAD INDIV' (2) 'MODIF ADMIN' (3) 'INDIV GROUP'
(4) 'WORK GROUP' (5) 'GROUP SUPRVSN'//
VAR59 (1) 'SOCRATIC' (2) 'GROWTH' (3) 'EXPERIENCE'//
RECODE VAR02 (1=2)
RECODE VAR56 (750=700) (850=800)
COMPUTE SCORE=SUM(VAR04 TO VAR40)
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=VAR01 TO VAR59/
STATISTICS=ALL

```

```

TITLE 'STUDENT COMMANDS'
FILE HANDLE DATAIN/NAME='STU.DTA'
DATA LIST FILE=DATAIN/
    VAR01 TO VAR48    3-50
    VAR49 TO VAR57    51-68
    VAR58 TO VAR60    69-71
    VAR61 TO VAR62    72-77
    VAR63              78
VARIABLE LABELS
    VAR01 'TYPE FIELDWORK'//
    VAR02 'PLACEMENT SEQUENCE'//
    VAR03 'RATIO'//
    VAR04 'EXPERIENCE'//
    VAR05 'LET DO WORK'//
    VAR06 'HELP PROF GROWTH'//
    VAR07 'RESPECT PROFESSIONALISM'//
    VAR08 'SUPERVISION FAIR'//
    VAR09 'OVERALL SATISFACTION'//
    VAR10 'FEEL GOOD CONFERENCES'//
    VAR11 'DREAD CONFERENCES'//
    VAR12 'EVALUATION AGREE'//
    VAR13 'SET PRIORITIES'//
    VAR14 'ORGANIZE WORK'//
    VAR15 'TEACH TECHNIQUES'//
    VAR16 'QUANTITY OF WORK'//
    VAR17 'IRON HAND'//
    VAR18 'SLOW ACCEPT IDEAS'//
    VAR19 'OWN WAY'//
    VAR20 'GIVES DIRECTIONS'//
    VAR21 'PAY ATTENTION'//
    VAR22 'GOOD CLINICIAN'//
    VAR23 'GOOD TEACHER'//
    VAR24 'THEORY'//
    VAR25 'ASSUMED KNEW MORE'//
    VAR26 'ASSUMED KNEW LESS'//
    VAR27 'HELP SELF-AWARENESS'//
    VAR28 'HELP EFFICENCY'//
    VAR29 'HELP EFFECTIVENESS'//
    VAR30 'FEEL GOOD DAYS END'//
    VAR31 'CASELOAD LARGE'//
    VAR32 'SUPERVISOR FRIENDLY'//
    VAR33 'SUPERVISOR OPEN'//
    VAR34 'FEEL AT EASE'//
    VAR35 'EXPRESS APPRECIATION'//
    VAR36 'SUPERVISOR UNCLEAR'//
    VAR37 'TX VALUES DIFFER'//
    VAR38 'SEEK OTHER STUDENTS'//

```

```

VAR39 'AVOID CONFERENCES'/
VAR40 'CONFRONTATION USELESS'/
VAR41 'REVEAL LITTLE'/
VAR42 'RULE ORIENTED'/
VAR43 'AGENCY CONFINES'/
VAR44 'ANNOYED AT SUPERVISOR'/
VAR45 'ANGRY AT SUPERVISOR'/
VAR46 'CONFRONT SUPERVISOR'/
VAR47 'OBSERVE THERAPIST'/
VAR48 'OBSERVE STUDENT'/
VAR49 'DIS SUPERVISOR PROBLEMS'/
VAR50 'DIS SUPERVISOR PATIENTS'/
VAR51 'DIS STUDENT PROBLEMS'/
VAR52 'DIS ADMIN MATTERS'/
VAR53 'DIS STUDENT PATIENTS'/
VAR54 'DIS GROWTH'/
VAR55 'DIS SMALL TALK'/
VAR56 'CONFERENCE FREQUENCY'/
VAR57 'CONFERENCE INITIATION'/
VAR58 'SUPERVISION PREFERENCE'/
VAR59 'SUPERVISION MODEL'/
VAR60 'TEACHING MODEL'/
VAR61 'SUPERVISION RANK'/
VAR62 'SELF RANK'/
VAR63 'HELP EFFICIENCY & EFFECTIVENESS'/
VALUE LABELS
VAR01 (1) 'PHYSICAL DYSFUNCTION' (2) 'PSYCH DYSFUNCTION'
      (3) 'PEDIATRICS'/
VAR02 (1) 'FIRST' (2) 'SECOND' (3) 'THIRD'/
VAR03 (1) 'SINGLE INDIVIDUAL' (2) 'MULTIPLE ROTATION'
      (3) 'MULTIPLE CONCURRENT'/
VAR04 (1) 'NO STUDENTS' (2) '1-3 STUDENTS'
      (3) '4+ STUDENTS'/
VAR05 TO VAR10 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
      (3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
      (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/
VAR11 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY AGREE'
      (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
      (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
VAR12 TO VAR15 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE'
      (3) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
      (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/
VAR16 TO VAR19 (1) 'STRONGLY AGREE' (2) 'AGREE' (3) 'MILDLY'+
      'AGREE' (4) 'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5) 'DISAGREE'
      (6) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
VAR20 (1) 'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2) 'DISAGREE' (3) 'MILDLY'+
      'DISAGREE' (4) 'MILDLY AGREE' (5) 'AGREE'
      (6) 'STRONGLY AGREE'/

```

```

VAR21 (1)'STRONGLY AGREE' (2)'AGREE' (3)'MILDLY AGREE'
      (4)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5)'DISAGREE' (6)'STRONGLY'+
      'DISAGREE'/
VAR22 TO VAR23 (1)'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2)'DISAGREE'
      (3)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4)'MILDLY AGREE' (5)'AGREE'
      (6)'STRONGLY AGREE'/
VAR24 TO VAR26 (1)'STRONGLY AGREE' (2)'AGREE' (3)'MILDLY'+
      'AGREE' (4)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5)'DISAGREE'
      (6)'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
VAR27 TO VAR30 (1)'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2)'DISAGREE'
      (3)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4)'MILDLY AGREE' (5)'AGREE'
      (6)'STRONGLY AGREE'/
VAR31 (1)'STRONGLY AGREE' (2)'AGREE' (3)'MILDLY AGREE'
      (4)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5)'DISAGREE' (6)'STRONGLY'+
      'DISAGREE'/
VAR32 TO VAR35 (1)'STRONGLY DISAGREE' (2)'DISAGREE'
      (3)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (4)'MILDLY AGREE' (5)'AGREE'
      (6)'STRONGLY AGREE'/
VAR36 TO VAR43 (1)'STRONGLY AGREE' (2)'AGREE' (3)'MILDLY'+
      'AGREE' (4)'MILDLY DISAGREE' (5)'DISAGREE'
      (6)'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/
VAR44 TO VAR48 (1)'NEVER' (2)'INFREQUENTLY'
      (3)'SOMETIMES' (4)'FREQUENTLY'/
VAR56 (1)'NEVER' (2)'MONTHLY OR LESS' (3)'BIWEEKLY'
      (4)'WEEKLY' (5)'DAILY'/
VAR57 (1)'STUDENT REQUEST' (2)'SUPERVISOR REQUEST'
      (3)'COORDINATOR REQUEST'/
VAR58 (1)'SINGLE INDIVIDUAL' (2)'MULTIPLE ROTATION'
      (3)'MULTIPLE CONCURRENT'/
VAR59 (1)'TRAD INDIV' (2)'MODIF ADMIN' (3)'INDIV GROUP'
      (4)'WORK GROUP' (5)'GROUP SUPRVSN' (6)'NO SUPRVSN'/
VAR60 (1)'SOCRATIC' (2)'GROWTH' (3)'EXPERIENCE'/
VAR63 (1)'YES' (2)'NO'/
RECODE VAR04 (1=2)
RECODE VAR03 (3=2)
RECODE VAR61 (075=070) (085=080) (095=090)
RECODE VAR62 (075=070) (085=080) (095=090)
COMPUTE SCORE=SUM (VAR05 TO VAR43)
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=VAR01 TO VAR63/
STATISTICS=ALL

```

APPENDIX G

Variables and Questionnaire Item Numbers

Variables and Questionnaire Item Numbers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Questionnaire Item Number</u>	
	<u>Student Form</u>	<u>Supervisor Form</u>
Helps professional growth of student	6	5
Student respected as a professional	7	6
Fairness of supervision	8	7
Associated with good feelings	30	28
Facilitates student self-awareness	27	25
Developed student efficiency	28	26
Facilitates student effectiveness	29	27
Rigidity of supervision	17	16
Agency limited supervision	43	40
Satisfaction with supervision	9	8
Supervisor friendliness	32	30
Supervisor openness	33	31
Student openness	41	38
Giving directions	20	18
Ease of communication	34	32
Expression of appreciation	35	33
Value of confrontation	40	37
Feelings toward conferences	10	9

Variable	<u>Questionnaire Item Number</u>	
	<u>Student Form</u>	<u>Supervisor Form</u>
Clarity of communication	36	29
Supervisor receptiveness	18	--
Agreement on quantity of work	16	5
Emphasis of theory vs. application	24	22
Agreement of treatment values	37	34
Size of student caseload	31	35
Supervision focused on facility standards	19	16
Amount of freedom for student	5	4
Supervision rule oriented	42	39
Organization of work	14	13
Priority setting	13	12
Clinical competence	22	20
General teaching competence	23	21
Technical teaching competence	15	14
Performance Evaluation	12	11
Overestimating student knowledge	25	23
Underestimating student knowledge	26	24