

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1983

The effect of discussion groups on a field placement program comparison of two groups of undergraduate students

Kathryn L. Gerstman
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [School Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gerstman, Kathryn L., "The effect of discussion groups on a field placement program comparison of two groups of undergraduate students" (1983). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 500.
<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/500>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

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

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

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

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

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

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

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

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

**THE EFFECT OF DISCUSSION GROUPS ON A FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM:
COMPARISON OF TWO GROUPS OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

by

Kathryn L. Gerstman

A Thesis
Submitted to the Department of Psychology
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts
Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario.

© Kathryn L. Gerstman 1983

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to my two advisors, Dr. Fred Binding and Dr. Robert Morgan, and to my committee members, Dr. Geoff Nelson and Dr. Barbara Hodkin. In addition, I wish to thank the professors who taught the undergraduate psychology courses with field placements. I thank Frank Walsh, Sue Snively, and Elizabeth Poplar, who led the discussion groups. Finally, I thank the discussion group members, without whose voluntary participation this study would not have been possible.

Abstract

The purpose of the present research was to study changes that students with field placements experience with the addition of discussion groups to the regular supervision. The participants were 29 undergraduate students enrolled in psychology courses requiring field placements. These students volunteered to be in discussion groups concerning placements. Thirteen students were in the experimental condition of discussion groups and 16 were in the control group with no additional resource support or supervision. The discussion groups met weekly for approximately 50 minutes during the winter term and were led by advanced psychology honours students. At the beginning and end of the program, all students were given Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965); Fey's Acceptance of Others (1955); semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958) on their field placement site, target population, psychology undergraduate students, and advanced psychology undergraduate students, and they were asked whether they had made a career decision. In addition, a questionnaire on student learning and satisfaction with the placement program was given. No differences were found between the two groups. Limitations of the study were the small sample size and short duration of the program (one term).

Table of Contents

	page
Acknowledgements	i
Abstract	ii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Method	20
Participants	20
Measures	21
Procedure	23
Results	30
Discussion	48
Lack of Results	49
The Present Study in Perspective	53
References	57
Appendix A	60
Appendix B	61
Appendix C	62
Appendix D	64
Appendix E	67
Appendix F	68
Appendix G	69
Appendix H	73
Appendix I	74

List of Tables

	page
Table 1 : Differences in Change of Career Decision Between the Two Groups of Undergraduate Students	32
Table 2 : Differences in Influence of Field Placement on Career Decision	33
Table 3 : Mean Scores on Acceptance and Attitude Variables for Undergraduate Students	34
Table 4 : Analysis of Covariance for Acceptance and Attitude Variables (Pretest Scores Used as the Covariate)	35
Table 5 : Comparison of Two Groups of Undergraduate Students on Overall Satisfaction, Experiential Learning, and Role Definition	38
Table 6 : Pearson Correlations Between Discussion Group Meetings and Goal Attainment for Following Field Placement Visit	40
Table 7 : Comparison of Two Groups of Undergraduate Students on Average Satisfaction and Goal Attainment for Field Placement Visits	41

Introduction

Beginning in the 1950's students began to be recruited for volunteer work due to a severe lack of human resources in social services (Greenblatt & Kantor, 1962; Klein & Zax, 1965; Gruver, 1971; Theodore, 1973). In addition, students sometimes became volunteers as part of a specific course (Klein & Zax, 1965; Rooney, Cummins, Sebastian, & Wood, 1967; Cowen, Chinsky, & Rappaport, 1970; Shulman & James, 1973; Saxon & Holt, 1974). However, volunteer work as a course requirement is not volunteer work in a pure sense. Although the student has freely chosen the course or at least the major area of study, the practical element of working with members of an appropriate population was not chosen voluntarily. Therefore, "field placement" or "practicum" are better terms. Unfortunately, researchers have not always followed a consistent use of terminology (Gruver, 1971; Saxon & Holt, 1974).

The focus of this thesis is upon the changes students with field placements experience as a result of different

supervisory and resource structures. First, I will review the literature on the effects of volunteer work on the volunteers. Then I will briefly review the literature on training and supervision of paraprofessionals and volunteers. Included will be literature on supervision from the field of social work. Finally, I will describe the evaluation research on the Wilfrid Laurier University undergraduate psychology field placement program which led to the present study.

Effects of Volunteer Helping Experiences on Volunteer Helpers

Gruver (1971) reviewed numerous programs in which college students have participated in helping relationships. Gruver stated that college students serving as therapeutic agents experience positive personality changes themselves, similar to the changes brought about by traditional psychotherapies (Gruver, 1971, pp. 123-124). However, the supporting evidence for this position is based mainly upon clinical observation and impressions.

In a study by Greenblatt and Kantor (1962) more than 70 percent of the students in a psychiatric patient companion program who were previously undecided in regard to a career choice made a decision in the direction of a mental health profession (social work, occupational

therapy, clinical psychology, psychiatry, and related research) after the program. Referring to this study, Gruver (1971) elaborated on the high educational value of such programs in providing greater understanding towards and involvement with the patient population.

Shulman and James (1973) compared three types of psychology internships offered as part of a course in community mental health centers: community organizers, companion therapists, and research assistants. A control group with no internship was also included in this study. The internships were ordered from greatest to least in role ambiguity, with the community organizers having the most ambiguous roles. The hypothesis was that the greater the role ambiguity the more frustrated the student would feel. This in turn would cause the student to question his/her career decision. Vocational goal was measured at the beginning and at the end of the program by asking the student to clearly state his/her career aspirations. The students in the community organizer group changed their previous career goals more than the other internship groups. These changes were in a direction away from community mental health or work in the inner city (the location of the community internship). Students who reported becoming frustrated with role definition tended to make changes in career, although this relationship was

4

not statistically significant. In conclusion, Shulman and James stated that most of the students profited from the internships, although the result was not necessarily attracting students to the field particularly in the case of a significant number of those in the community organization internship.

A developmental psychology class at the University of Alabama changed its requirements to include the option of volunteer work at developmental facilities instead of one-quarter of the readings and class meetings. A direct comparison of student performance on the same final examination was made between the previous year's class who did not have field placements and the class with placements. In this way it could be seen if the volunteer work coupled with less class time would have a negative effect on the students' overall familiarity with developmental psychology. The class with field placements scored significantly higher on the examination, thus suggesting that academic standards were not sacrificed. The authors concluded that the needs of the students and of the community were satisfied as measured by self-report questionnaires (Saxon & Holt, 1974).

In a study by Holzberg, Gewirtz, and Ebner (1964), changes in the personalities of volunteers working with mental patients were investigated systematically. In part

5

of the study, a self-acceptance questionnaire was used. The volunteer group was compared to a control group who was not involved in the companion program. The scores of the two groups on self-acceptance did not differ on the pretest nor on the posttest. However, when examining changes the experimental group had increased significantly on self-acceptance when compared to their own pretest. The control group showed a trend toward less self-acceptance on their posttest when compared to their pretest scores.

Aronson and Page (1980) found that undergraduate students with field placements became more positive in their attitudes toward their target group (psychiatric patients), psychology graduate students, psychology undergraduate students, and toward themselves, than did a non-equivalent control group.

Goldstein and Simpkins (1973) reported attitude change in college students who worked with boys or girls at training schools for four weeks. The students became more positive in their attitudes toward "juvenile delinquent" as measured by a six-item semantic differential scale.

In a study by Scheibe (1965) students were paid to work with chronic mental patients full-time for eight weeks mainly in mental hospitals. They were given the

Gough Adjective Check List, along with other tests, when they first entered the program and at the end of their involvement. The students gained significantly in Self-Confidence, Achievement, Dominance, and Nurturance. Also, students described the average mental patient more positively at the end of the program than at the beginning as measured by Gough's Adjective Check List. Follow-up was carried out in the form of a questionnaire six months after the program ended. Fifty-five percent of the students were considering careers in a mental health setting at that time. Unfortunately a pretest of vocational goals was not given.

In a study by Holzberg and Gerwitz (1963), a group of student volunteers in a companion program with psychiatric patients was compared to a control group of students who had volunteered for other human service activities including organizing social events. Each group was given a questionnaire at the beginning and at the end of the school year. The questionnaire consisted of factual questions and questions pertaining to attitudes about mental illness. It was shown that the students who were companions to psychiatric patients became more aware of the problems associated with mental illness and had better informed attitudes toward it. The control group was not tested on the areas in which they did volunteer work.

Cowen, Zax, and Laird (1966) examined the effects of a college student volunteer program at an elementary school on the volunteers. Children with emotional problems were referred to an afterschool program by their teachers or another member of the school staff. The volunteer group was compared to a control group on a modification of a semantic differential measuring attitudes toward various aspects of schools and mental health. There were differences between the volunteers involved in the afterschool program and the control group on the pretest. There were a large number of significant attitude changes in the volunteer group over time. Before they worked at the school the volunteers had idealized conceptions about schools. After contact with the school, the volunteers viewed elementary schools as places which were less agreeable, friendly, relaxed, and interesting as measured on semantic differential scales, than they had on the pretest. The students went from extremely positive attitudes towards schools to moderately positive, more realistic ones.

The volunteers' perceptions of children with emotional problems changed from a neutral to a positive attitude by the end of the experience. Some of the volunteers in the study were majoring in elementary education. The authors felt that these changes in

attitudes of volunteers could aid future school children if these volunteers were to become teachers. With a more positive attitude toward school children, perhaps emotional problems could be avoided. In this way such a program could be argued as being directed toward primary prevention (Cowen et al., 1966).

Fretz (1979) compared college students either in a volunteer program for children or for adults with matched control groups. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1966) was given to each volunteer group and control group before and after the timespan of the programs. The students in the adults' program showed greater increases in self-acceptance and spontaneity than did their control group. The students in the children's program did not increase significantly on the POI when compared to their control group.

It may be concluded that, in general, volunteer work has a positive effect on the volunteers who offer their services. Personality growth has been cited in several studies (Scheibe, 1965; Gruver, 1971; Fretz, 1979); change in volunteers' attitudes towards their target groups in a positive direction has been documented (Scheibe, 1965; Cowen et al., 1966; Aronson & Page, 1980); and career decisions are sometimes aided through volunteer work (Greenblatt & Kantor, 1962; Shulman & James, 1973).

Some studies did not include control groups (Greenblatt & Kantor, 1962; Scheibe, 1965). In other studies, control groups were employed without random assignment to conditions (Aronson & Page, 1980; Holzberg et al., 1964; Saxon & Holt, 1974; Schulman & James, 1973). Holzberg and Gewirtz (1963) used a control group of students who had volunteered for other activities, while Cowen et al. (1966) included a control group comparable to the experimental group except that they did not volunteer for the program. In addition they were given only the pretest. In both cases participants were not randomly assigned. Fretz (1979) matched his control group on sex and age with the experimental group, but did not use random assignment. Holzberg et al. (1964) formed their control group from college students who were not involved in the companion program without any matching or random assignment.

Regression, selection, and maturation effects can be made equivalent between groups through random assignment (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The authors support random assignment by stating, "the case for random assignment has to be made on the grounds that it is better than the available alternatives for inferring cause and not on the grounds that it is perfect for inferring cause" (p. 342). Also, the authors note that random assignment is the

optimum condition for use with popular statistical models. The statistical tests have more power and less bias with randomly assigned groups, than those used to test differences between nonequivalent groups.

Differences between students who volunteer to be in research and those who decline were found by Kohn, Hunt, Davies, and Cowles (1981) in scores on kinds of experience seeking. Experience seeking was defined as scores on various scales which purport to measure arousal-seeking tendency, the tendency to increase or decrease levels of stimuli, boredom and need for change, liking for physical thrills and unusual internal states, practical and abstract curiosity, general sensation seeking, and liking for outgoing activities such as parties. The students were asked to fill out several experience seeking scales and whether they were willing to participate in further research in principle. Two months later those who indicated they were willing to participate were contacted. Most of the students (84%) who said they would volunteer in principle did indeed participate in the research. Those who volunteered in principle scored higher on Arousal-Seeking Tendency, Internal Sensation Seeking, Experience Seeking, Thrill- and-Adventure Seeking, and General Sensation Seeking, than those who did not volunteer.

In the present study, the experimental and control groups consisted of students all of whom volunteered to either lead discussion groups or participate in them. The purpose of restricting the study to those students who volunteered to be in the present research was to eliminate initial differences between the control and experimental groups.

Effects of Training/Supervision on Paraprofessionals and Volunteers

The use of paraprofessionals in service delivery helps to lessen the manpower shortage in the area of mental health (Hart & King, 1979). By definition, paraprofessionals lack formal professional training in the mental health field. In order to increase the possibility that paraprofessionals and volunteers are effective in their work, they are usually given training and/or supervision. However, the efficacy of such training and supervision has rarely been studied.

The present research centered upon changes in students with field placements, comparing a group with extra supervision. (the discussion groups) with a control group. In this way the issue of the effectiveness of supervision and/or training relates to this thesis.

Training was shown to have a positive effect on paraprofessional hotline workers as measured by the Telephone Counseling Effectiveness Scale (Hart & King, 1979). Groups with training sessions were compared to groups without training working at a telephone counseling service. Berenson, Carkhuff, and Myrus (1966) also investigated the effects of training on college student volunteers. The experimental group received research scales and training including group therapy experiences, while the training control group received the same training but without the research scales or group therapy. A second control group was given no training. All three groups received a pretest and posttest to determine possible personality change during the timespan of the training sessions. The experimental group showed more improvement on empathic and facilitative measures than the other groups. The training control group generally showed greater improvement than the control group with no training.

A greater amount of supervision was shown to result in greater satisfaction with volunteer experiences. In a study by Conter, Seidman, Rappaport, Kniskern, and Desaulniers (1979), volunteers from two programs similar in basic goals and settings but different in degrees of supervision and volunteer commitment were compared. The

volunteers served as companion/advocates to teenagers in legal jeopardy. They were asked to assess the program in which they participated. The group with relatively more supervision and clearer obligations rated their experience as more positive than the group with less supervision.

The Relationship Between Social Work Supervision and Supervision in the Discussion Groups

Supervision is part of social work education and practice. Experienced caseworkers oversee new caseworkers and social work students. The traditional model is tutorial, a one-to-one teacher-student relationship. However, in more recent years, group supervision has been utilized for professionals (Fizdale, 1958; Judd, Kohn, & Schulman, 1962; Getzel, Goldberg, & Salmon, 1971) and for social work students (Cowan, Dastyk, & Wickham, 1972). This is not necessarily unlike the traditional model except that one supervisor meets with several supervisees at a time. However, in the case of peer-group supervision, there is equal status among all members of the group and no one is designated as the supervisor (Watson, 1973). One person chairs the meetings and acts as moderator.

Supervision in social work focuses upon casework. In this way it is different from the supervision of the present study. Psychology students with field placements work with clients in various settings, but not as therapists. The major goals of the present group supervisory meetings were for all participants (including the leader) to share their knowledge and experience with each other, to discuss their field placements and solve problems as a group, for students to evaluate experiences for themselves, and to increase integration of class material to the placement. While social work supervision and the group meetings of the present study share some common elements (e.g. encouraging students to try out new methods at their placements), there are also major differences. The present model for group meetings and the model of peer-group supervision share the idea of equal status among members and leader, but the focus in this model is not on casework as in social work. The major component of the present model is processing through group discussion of field placement experience in order to enrich that experience. Thus, the social work literature is tangentially related but not directly applicable to the subject of this thesis.

Evaluation of the Wilfrid Laurier University Undergraduate
Psychology Field Placement Program

Field placements are typically required in undergraduate courses such as developmental, educational, and industrial psychology. At WLU students spend a few hours each week at field placement sites which include pre-schools, public schools, Canadian Mental Health Association programs, homes for women in distress, and consumer organizations.

At schools students perform duties such as assisting the classroom teacher and tutoring individual students or small groups. In the Friends program students serve as companions to former psychiatric patients. At the Better Business Bureau students learn how to deal with consumer complaints. These placements are representative of those offered by the WLU Field Placement Program.

In an evaluation of the WLU Undergraduate Psychology Field Placement Program (Petelka & Gerstman, 1981), perceived quality of supervision was positively correlated with perceived student satisfaction with the placement. Amount and quality of supervision were also positively correlated with student experiential learning.

The educational pyramid (Seidman & Rappaport, 1974) is a way of efficiently utilizing human resources. A pyramid structure is set up whereby professionals and

nonprofessionals work together in order to expand service delivery. In the academic setting, professor(s) are at the top of the structure. Each professor supervises and teaches a number of graduate students, who in turn supervise and consult with a number of undergraduate students. The undergraduates provide direct care to the client population. The training structure expands service delivery geometrically (Seidman & Rappaport, 1974).

Petelka and Gerstman (1981) compared student satisfaction and experiential learning in psychology classes with field placements. The undergraduate Community Psychology class, which utilized the educational pyramid (Seidman & Rappaport, 1974), was contrasted with the other two-term courses. No differences were found except in greater amount of supervision, and in more integration by the instructor of material from class into practice at the field setting for the Community Psychology class. Course instructors and content varied across classes so that the groups were not equivalent.

Weaknesses in the study by Petelka and Gerstman (1981) exist since nonequivalent groups were being compared. In the present study, experimental and control groups were randomly selected from students who volunteered for the discussion groups in classes with field placements. Thus, this study has a much stronger design than the earlier research.

The Current Study and Hypotheses

The purpose of this research was to study changes that students with field placements experience under the condition of pyramid structured supervision as compared to students with the regular kind and amount of supervision. The experimental condition was extra supervision given by advanced undergraduate group facilitators. The key issue in the research was whether supervision of the educational pyramid form, in addition to that provided to both groups by the agency, field staff, and course instructor, would produce greater changes in the experimental group than in the control group (no extra supervision).

Experimental Hypotheses:

1. Students participating in the discussion groups will show greater change in positive or negative decisions to enter a career in a similar setting than students not in the discussion groups, as measured by self-report (group leaders and members).
2. The experimental groups (group leaders and members) will show greater increases in self-acceptance than the control groups as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965).
3. The experimental groups (group leaders and members) will show greater increases in acceptance of others than the control groups as measured by Fey's Acceptance of Others scale (1955).
4. Attitudes will become more positive for the experimental groups than for the control groups (group leaders and members) with regard to the type of field placement setting (public schools, high schools, programs/homes for adolescents, etc.), the recipients of services from those field settings, advanced undergraduate psychology students, and undergraduate psychology students.

5. The experimental group will show greater overall satisfaction with the field placement than the control group, as measured by self-report (group members only).
6. The experimental group (group members only) will show greater experiential learning than the control group as measured by students' reports of acquiring new or improved skills, increase in self-knowledge and knowledge of the target population, and amount of integration from classroom theory into practice (Petelka & Gerstman, 1981).
7. For the experimental group of students participating in discussion groups, satisfaction with individual sessions will correlate positively with degree of goal attainment for the following field placement visit.
8. The experimental group of students participating in discussion groups will achieve higher goal attainment than the control group.
9. The experimental group of students participating in discussion groups will be more satisfied with their field placement visits on the average than the control group.



Method

Participants

Students in Developmental Psychology I, Developmental Psychology II, Educational Psychology, and Industrial Psychology were asked to participate in weekly discussion groups for the purpose of enriching their field placement experience. Thirty-two volunteered; half were randomly assigned to the control group and half to the experimental condition of discussion groups. Of the 16 students in the experimental group, three dropped out of the study due to personal time constraints.

Advanced undergraduate psychology honours students were asked to serve as group facilitators. Seven students volunteered and three of them were randomly selected to be group facilitators and the remaining four volunteers served as a control group.

A full-time faculty member acted as the head of the educational pyramid. The faculty member supervised the researcher, who in turn supervised the advanced undergraduate students who served as leaders of discussion groups for undergraduate students. At the bottom of the pyramid were the receivers of services (i.e., school children, adolescents in homes).

Measures

Career decision of the group leaders and members, and their respective control groups was measured through self-report (see Appendix A).

Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (1965) was used to measure self-acceptance for both experimental groups, undergraduates and advanced undergraduate facilitators, and their respective control groups (see Appendix A). This scale was chosen for its thoroughness, brevity, and unidimensionality. Test-retest reliability has been reported at .85 (Silber & Tippett, 1965), and Guttman scale reproducibility coefficient at .92 (Rosenberg, 1965). Convergent validity, determined from correlations with similar measures and clinical evaluations, ranged from .56 to .83. Rosenberg (1965) supported the construct validity of this scale by relating high self-esteem to several social outcomes (e.g., more assertiveness, more extra-curricular activities, and less depression and shyness).

Fey's Acceptance of Others (1955) was also administered to both experimental groups and their respective control groups (see Appendix B). Fey reported that split-half reliability was .90. In the present study, scores from Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale were positively correlated with scores from Fey's Acceptance of

Others. The Pearson correlation was .31 for both the pretest and posttest scores.

Participants were given twenty-item semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958) to measure attitudes toward several variables, including the site of the field placement, target population, undergraduates in psychology, and advanced undergraduates in psychology (see Appendix C). These four scales were identical, consisting of the same twenty word pairs. Pairs of words with high loadings on the Evaluative Factor were chosen, as recommended for attitude measurement by Osgood et al. (1958). Test-retest reliability of the differential as a measure of attitude has been reported as .85 and .91. Product-moment correlations between semantic differential scale ratings on three concepts (The Negro, The Church, and Capital Punishment), and Thurstone scales constructed to measure attitudes toward the same three concepts, ranged from .74 to .82 (Osgood et al., 1958). The rank order correlation was .78 between a Guttman-type scale measuring attitude toward the concept Crop Rotation and evaluative scales of the semantic differential on the same concept (Osgood et al., 1958).

A revised version of the Evaluation of the Wilfrid Laurier University Undergraduate Psychology Field

Placement Program questionnaire (Petelka & Gerstman, 1981) was used to measure student experiential learning and general satisfaction with the placement (see Appendix D).

Questionnaires were used to evaluate the weekly discussion group meetings of undergraduate students and the field placement visits (see Appendices E-F). The End-of-Session Reaction Form (Stenzel & Feeney, 1968) was modified for use as an evaluation questionnaire for the group meetings each week. The Weekly Evaluation of Time Spent at Field Placement questionnaire was constructed by the researcher to measure goal attainment and satisfaction for each weekly visit.

Procedure

When the undergraduate psychology classes with field placements met in January, the researcher described the experimental condition of discussion groups to the classes and asked for the names of those willing to participate. The set of questionnaires measuring the variables of career decision, self-acceptance, acceptance of others; attitudes toward field placement site, target group, undergraduates in psychology, and advanced undergraduates in psychology was given at this time. The students were matched on field placement site as much as possible within each class. The experimental group was randomly selected

from pairs of students with the same or similar placements; the remaining students were asked to serve in the control group. It was explained that not all volunteers could participate. Consent forms were distributed to members of both groups (see Appendix G).

Each class had as close as possible to an equal number of students in the experimental and control conditions. (Numbers became unequal as three students who had volunteered to be in the discussion groups later dropped out of the study.)

The honours student control group rated their attitudes toward every field placement site and client group on semantic differential scales identical to those given to the undergraduate students. The honours student group leaders were given semantic differential scales on their attitudes toward the field placement sites and clients of those facilities to match the field placements of their group members. The prediction was that the group leaders would change their attitudes toward field placement sites and client groups to which they were indirectly exposed through the experiences of their group members. Also, all of the honours students were pretested on Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale, Fey's Acceptance of Others, and career decision.

All questionnaires, including the field placement program evaluation (see Appendix D), were given to both groups of undergraduate students during the last week of classes. The honours student groups were given the same questionnaire set as in their pretest.

Researcher's meetings with head of educational pyramid.

The researcher met with her advisor four times during the winter term 1982. The meetings were set up for the purpose of ensuring that the pyramid-structured supervision was running well. There were no problems with the researcher's meetings with the group leaders, so the majority of the time was spent talking about how the discussion groups were progressing. Occasionally questions pertaining to data collection were discussed. At the last meeting, the faculty member suggested a debriefing session for the group leaders, which was subsequently held.

Researcher's meetings with the group leaders. The researcher met with the group leaders on a weekly basis, ten times during the course of the study. The meetings were for the purpose of assisting the leaders with their roles, describing the goals of the discussion groups, and discussing any problems the leaders might be having. At

the first meeting, an outline of the meetings with group leaders was distributed to each honours student group leader (See Appendix H). In addition, various chapters on group process (Bradford, 1978) were distributed and discussed at following meetings. At one meeting, a staff member from Wilfrid Laurier University Counselling Services talked about goalsetting and evaluation of goals.

The researcher was able to learn of problems quickly through these weekly meetings. An example was the need for more information on goals, which was remedied by having a resource person attend a meeting and also by the researcher distributing readings by Mager (1975) to the group leaders for discussion. The researcher was able to hand out forms, check on attendance at the discussion groups, give messages to group leaders from their members, and keep in touch with weekly developments in the discussion groups at these meetings. Any problems reported by students on the Weekly Evaluation of Group Meetings form could be fed back to the leaders at these meetings. However, no problems involving the group leaders were reported.

Discussion group meetings. The extra supervision received by students in the experimental group consisted of approximately 50 minutes each week spent discussing the

students' field placements. The honours student served as a leader/facilitator of the group. They had the responsibility of facilitating the discussions, but were not to act as the chief problem solvers (Klein & Zax, 1965; Cowen et al., 1970). The leaders received initial and on-going training weekly in this role by the researcher. The members of the groups were encouraged to solve their own problems with the added benefit of sounding out their ideas in front of their peers and a student facilitator, a kind of open forum. The groups consisted of four or five students and one facilitator. Students were assigned to specific discussion groups that best accommodated their schedules.

Meetings were designed to be informal. The researcher guided the honours students in their role as leader/facilitator. They tried not to make value judgments and each group member's viewpoint was accepted as valid.

The first discussion group meeting began with sharing past field placement and volunteer experiences. Each person, including the group leader, participated on an equal basis as much as possible. However, when the discussion became monopolized by one person or drifted away from the subject of field placements, it was the group leader's responsibility to guide the group back to

the topic. The major goal of the first few meetings was to build rapport among the group leaders and the members, so that everyone felt comfortable contributing to the discussions.

As the groups progressed, other issues surfaced. One student felt the format was too loose. The researcher suggested that the group leaders ask their members how they felt about the way the group was run. Most of the students were happy with the open-ended format. The group in which the student desired more structure had a session on the goals of the discussion groups, in order to satisfy the need which was voiced.

Above all, the groups met for the benefit of the members. The undergraduate students understood that it was their time to be utilized according to their needs, around the subject of field placements. Sometimes this meant discussing problems encountered at the setting, discussing field placement experiences which were satisfying, or focussing on a term paper topic from the placement. During a week when no problems were encountered, the discussion time was spent on processing what had occurred at the placements.

The group leaders were instructed by the researcher to aid the students' integration of course theory, into practice. However, the discussion group leaders told the

researcher that there were few opportunities to accomplish this.

Confidentiality and Feedback

The participants were asked to use a six-digit identifying number made up of the month, day, and year of their birthday. This was necessary in order to match pretest, posttest, and data collected weekly. These data were accessible only to the researcher and members of the thesis committee.

The participants were mailed a written summary of the research on August 16, 1982.

Results

Overall, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the posttest measures.

Number of Meetings and Attendance

Two of the discussion groups met seven times during the winter term and one group met eight times. On a few occasions group meetings were cancelled because only one student came. On one occasion a group leader did not come so the group was cancelled. The groups did not meet during Reading Week. The average number of meetings attended by undergraduate students was 4.92.

Sampling Error Variability

There were seven honours students in the study, three as group leaders and four in the control group. Due to the small size of the groups, statistical analyses were not considered appropriate. Therefore only descriptive data on the honours students is reported.

Hypothesis #1 (Group Leaders and Members)

Students participating in the discussion groups will show greater change in positive or negative decisions to enter a career in a similar setting than students not in the discussion groups, as measured by self-report.

Fisher's exact test was used to compare the experimental and control groups on the measures involving career decision (see Tables 1-2). This test was used in place of chi-square because expected frequencies were less than five. The two groups of undergraduate students did not differ from each other on career decision change (undecided to decided or decided to undecided) or influence from the field placement. Therefore Hypothesis #1 was not supported.

Hypothesis #2 (Group Leaders and Members)

The experimental groups will show greater increases in self-acceptance than the control groups as measured by the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). (See Tables 3-4 and discussion under Hypothesis 4.)

Hypothesis #3 (Group Leaders and Members)

The experimental groups will show greater increases in acceptance of others than the control groups as measured by Fey's Acceptance of Others scale (1955). (See Tables 3-4 and discussion under Hypothesis 4.)

Table 1

Differences in Change of Career Decision Between the
Two Groups of Undergraduate Students

	Control Group	Experimental Group
No Change in Career Decision	12	9
Change in Career Decision	4	4

Fisher's Exact Test = .303

Table 2

Differences in Influence of Field Placement on Career Decision

	Control Group	Experimental Group
No Influence on Decision	7	7
Influenced Decision	7	5

Fisher's Exact Test = .281

Table 3
 Mean Scores on Acceptance and Attitude Variables
 for Undergraduate Students

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>				
	<u>EXPERIMENTAL</u>		<u>CONTROL</u>		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
SELF-ACCEPTANCE (Total possible score of 6)	Pre	4.69	.85	4.81	1.38
	Post	4.85	.80	4.75	1.06
ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS (5-point scale)	Pre	3.19	.42	3.23	.29
	Post	3.22 (12)	.51	3.24 (14)	.39
ATTITUDE TOWARD FIELD PLACEMENT SITE (7-point scale)	Pre	3.97	.46	3.88	.92
	Post	4.22	.73	4.01	.90
ATTITUDE TOWARD TARGET POPULATION (7-point scale)	Pre	3.70	.95	4.28	.90
	Post	4.03	.98	3.80 (15)	.60
ATTITUDE TOWARD ADVANCED UNDERGRADUATES IN PSYCHOLOGY (7-point scale)	Pre	3.93	.49	4.22	.82
	Post	3.99	.68	3.94 (15)	.67
ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATES IN PSYCHOLOGY (7-point scale)	Pre	3.88	.48	4.25	.85
	Post	3.93	.74	3.90	.78

Note. The number of cases is 13 for the experimental group and 16 for the control group. Exceptions appear in parentheses below individual mean scores. A high score indicates greater acceptance or a more positive attitude.

Table 4

Analysis of Covariance for Acceptance and Attitude Variables
(Pretest Scores Used as the Covariate)

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>ADJUSTED MEANS</u>		<u>ANCOVA</u>	
	<u>EXPERIMENTAL</u>	<u>CONTROL</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>
SELF-ACCEPTANCE (Total possible score of 6)	4.88	4.72	.33	1,26
ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS (5-point scale)	3.28 (12)	3.25 (14)	.11	1,23
ATTITUDE TOWARD FIELD PLACEMENT SITE (7-point scale)	4.18	4.04	.34	1,26
ATTITUDE TOWARD TARGET POPULATION (7-point scale)	4.16	3.70 (15)	2.91**	1,25
ATTITUDE TOWARD ADVANCED UNDERGRADUATES IN PSYCHOLOGY (7-point scale)	4.14	3.81 (15)	2.93***	1,25
ATTITUDE TOWARD UNDERGRADUATES IN PSYCHOLOGY (7-point scale)	4.08	3.77	2.09*	1,26

Note. The number of cases is 13 for the experimental group and 16 for the control group. Exceptions appear in parentheses below individual mean scores. A high score indicates greater acceptance or a more positive attitude. None of the F values were significant.

*p = .161

**p = .101

***p = .099

Hypothesis #4 (Group Leaders and Members)

Attitudes will become more positive for the experimental groups than for the control groups with regard to the type of field placement setting (public schools, high schools, etc.), the recipients of services from those field settings, advanced undergraduate psychology students, and undergraduate psychology students.

An analysis of covariance was performed on the acceptance and attitude variables from the undergraduate experimental and control groups (see Table 4). The posttest means from the two groups were compared after the influence of the pretest scores was removed from each group's posttest scores. The hypotheses on changes in self-acceptance; acceptance of others; attitude toward field placement site, target population, advanced undergraduates and undergraduates in psychology were not supported. However, there were trends in the direction of the experimental group having more positive attitudes toward advanced undergraduates in psychology ($p=.099$), toward target population ($p=.101$), and toward undergraduates in psychology ($p=.161$).

Hypothesis #5 (Group Members Only)

The experimental group will show greater overall satisfaction with the field placement than the control group, as measured by self-report (see Table 5 and discussion under Hypothesis 6).

Hypothesis #6 (Group Members Only)

The experimental group will show greater experiential learning than the control group as measured by students' reports of acquiring new or improved skills, increase in self-knowledge and knowledge of the target population, and amount of integration from classroom theory into practice (Petelka & Gerstman, 1981).

The two groups of undergraduate students did not differ on overall satisfaction with their field placement or on the measures of experiential learning (see Table 5). However, all experimental group means were higher than those of the control group. All students in both groups reported acquiring new skills or improving skills through their field placement. Hypotheses 5 and 6 were not supported.

Table 5

Comparison of Two Groups of Undergraduate Students on Overall Satisfaction, Experiential Learning, and Role Definition

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>				<u>t(independent)</u>
	<u>EXPERIMENTAL</u>		<u>CONTROL</u>		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH FIELD PLACEMENT	4.46	.78	4.25	.86	.69
NUMBER OF NEW OR IMPROVED SKILLS ACQUIRED AT SETTING	1.62	.77	1.60 (15)	1.06	.06
INCREASE IN SELF-KNOWLEDGE	3.92	.76	3.63	.72	1.08
INCREASE IN KNOWLEDGE OF CLIENT POPULATION	4.08	.86	3.88	.89	.62
INTEGRATION OF THEORY INTO PRACTICE	2.92	1.12	2.81	.83	.31
CLARITY OF ROLE DEFINITION AT SETTING	3.85	.99	3.75	1.00	.26

Note. N is equal to 13 for the experimental group and 16 for the control group unless otherwise stated below the individual mean. All scales had 5 points except Number of New or Improved Skills which was unlimited. None of the t values were significant.

Hypothesis #7 (Group Members Only)

For the experimental group of students participating in discussion groups, satisfaction with individual sessions will correlate positively with degree of goal attainment for the following field placement visit.

Pearson correlations were calculated between each of the three discussion group meeting measures (individual interest, group interest, and new learning occurring at the meeting) and goal attainment for the following field placement visit (see Table 6). Correlations could not be calculated for six of the meetings because the n was too small. Of nine correlations, two were significant, both in a positive direction. Because of small n 's, Hypothesis #7 was not adequately tested. However, there is a tendency in the predicted direction because two of the nine correlations were significant.

Hypothesis #8 (Group Members Only)

The experimental group of students participating in discussion groups will achieve higher goal attainment than the control group (see Table 7 and discussion under Hypothesis 9).

Table 6

Pearson Correlations Between Discussion Group Meetings
and Goal Attainment for Following Field Placement Visit

Goal Attainment of Field Placement Visit	Individual Interest in Meeting	Group Interest in Meeting	New Learning at Meeting
Visit #2 With Meeting #1	.76* (8)	.28 (8)	.03 (8)
Visit #4 With Meeting #3	.15 (7)	.39 (7)	.84* (7)
Visit #5 With Meeting #4	.11 (11)	.34 (11)	.34 (11)

Note. The number of cases appears below each correlation. Correlations were not calculated for meetings 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9 because the n 's were too small.

* $p < .05$

Table 7

Comparison of Two Groups of Undergraduate Students on Average Satisfaction and Goal Attainment for Field Placement Visits

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>				<u>t(independent)</u>
	<u>EXPERIMENTAL</u>		<u>CONTROL</u>		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
AVERAGE GOAL ATTAINMENT (5-point scale)	3.40	.33	3.56	.56	- .90
AVERAGE SATISFACTION (5-point scale)	3.80	.48	4.03	.61	- 1.09

Note. N was 13 for the experimental group and 16 for the control group. A high score indicates greater goal attainment or satisfaction. Average goal attainment was calculated by averaging goal attainment across visits. Average satisfaction was calculated by averaging satisfaction across visits. The t values were not significant.

Hypotheses #9 (Group Members Only)

The experimental group of students participating in discussion groups will be more satisfied with their field placement visits on the average than the control group.

Overall, goal attainment and satisfaction with field placement visits did not differ between the two groups (see Table 7). In both cases the control group scored nonsignificantly higher than the experimental group. Hypotheses #8 and #9 were not supported.

At the end of the term all students in the control group were asked how students in the discussion groups or other students felt about this project. All 16 students replied that they did not know how others felt about the discussion groups. The control group was also asked how much they talked with other students about their field placements. The mean response was 3.31 ($SD=1.01$, $n=16$) on a five-point scale, where "1" indicated "very little" and "5" was "very much."

Descriptive Comments

Students. Undergraduate students participating in discussion groups responded to Weekly Evaluation of Group Meetings questionnaires. When asked what they enjoyed most about the particular meeting, typical replies included:

Friendliness and interest shown

Concern and friendliness for each other

Getting to know the others

Listening to others

I didn't feel pressured to say something

Helped me to focus on short-range and long-range goals

Meeting the people in the group and learning about their experiences in their field placements

Discussing problems that I was having and receiving advice from other members in the group

Everyone was so open about what they had learned over the course of the placement- the placement was very worthwhile for all of us

Responses to the question, what could be done to improve meetings, included:

More people (they weren't all there)

If there were more problems to discuss

More people maybe- but it's interesting with just three

Have them at a better time

Make meetings once a month for a couple of hours

When asked what could be done to improve the Field Placement Program, one student in the experimental group replied that the discussion groups should be compulsory and that students earn one-half credit for their participation.

The researcher attended the final discussion group meeting of each of the three groups. At the end of the meeting the students talked about what they thought of the idea of having the discussion groups. Responses varied from person to person and group to group. One student said that the meetings were really good for the first three or four weeks; there weren't many problems after that. A student from another group said that the group got better as it went along. One person said that it was good having a mix of placements (students in the group from different placements), while another student said that it was good having another person from the same placement in the group. One student said that she would have liked guidelines for the discussions, while several students said they liked the informality of the group. All groups reported that it was interesting to meet the other students and hear about their placements.

In one group the students spoke about goalsetting, part of the Weekly Evaluation of Time Spent at Field Placement questionnaire. It should be noted that the control group also filled out this questionnaire each week. One student said that she accomplished more by writing out goals for each visit; it crystallized the goals for her. One student carried through goalsetting to a new job. Several students mentioned that the group helped them with deciding on a paper topic, and one student said that she appreciated the time once a week to get her goals organized regarding her paper.

The students were asked whether they noticed any changes in themselves as a result of the discussion groups. Most of the students said that they were not aware of any personal changes. However, one student said that she became more critical of her field placement setting and more sympathetic with the patients.

Overall, the students reported that having the groups was a good idea and that the experience was very worthwhile.

Group leaders. The researcher met with the group leaders after all other data were collected. They were debriefed as to the hypotheses involved in the study. When asked what they thought happened as a result of the

discussion groups, one leader said that the groups contributed to more realistic attitudes toward placement sites. Another leader said that the discussion groups helped to focus career decisions for the undergraduate students. The remaining student leader did not think that the discussion groups caused any changes in self-acceptance or the other dependent variables; the placement itself was foremost in producing change.

The group leaders were then asked how they found the experience of being a discussion group leader. One leader said that it helped his confidence and that it was fun relating to younger students. Another student leader said that she learned that people are really different and that undergraduates tend to be unfocussed. The remaining honours student leader said that it was hard being a leader at first, but that she gained a lot of confidence. She found that a couple of people were really "off-base" and she tried not to impose her values on them. All three leaders admitted that they felt discouraged when attendance was low.

The researcher. Generally the discussion group program was a positive experience for the researcher. However, initial interest in participating in the groups was not as great as expected. Thus, there were fewer

students in the experimental group than was originally planned.

At times attendance was low in the groups. Sometimes they met with only two or three members. The groups were set up with five persons per group in anticipation of high regular attendance. When it became apparent that attendance was a problem, the researcher contacted the group members by telephone to remind them about meeting times. However, 100 percent attendance for each meeting could not be ensured. From time to time the researcher and the group leaders felt discouraged about the lack of high attendance.

The researcher found the weekly meetings with the group leaders very useful. She was able to help them with problems, clarify the purpose of the discussion groups, and keep in touch with how the discussion groups were progressing. The experimenter stressed group process to the leaders so that they would be more sensitive and competent leaders.

A need for discussion groups was voiced by students in previous years. The researcher felt positive about fulfilling this need and studying the impact of the groups. In addition, the honours students involved were given an opportunity to develop leadership skills and to learn more about themselves. They seemed to enjoy the experience, as did the group members.

Discussion

To reiterate, the results indicate that the two groups of undergraduate students did not differ from each other on any of the posttest measures. The experimental and control groups did not differ from each other on career decision change, self-acceptance, and acceptance of others; attitude toward field setting, the clients of that setting, advanced undergraduates in psychology, and undergraduate psychology students; satisfaction with field placement, experiential learning, or goal attainment. They did not differ on three measures of attitude toward others: attitudes toward advanced undergraduates in psychology, toward target population, or toward undergraduates in psychology; however, the probabilities were .099, .101, and .161, respectively. Perhaps with a larger sample significant differences might be obtained. Due to the small number of honours students ($n=7$), statistical analyses were not considered appropriate. Consequently, only the undergraduate student results will be discussed.

Students with field placements as part of psychology courses at Wilfrid Laurier University have several options when they have a problem. They can talk with their supervisor at the agency, the course instructor, the

graduate student serving as liaison between that agency and the student, the field supervisor, and other students and/or friends. Those students who volunteered for the discussion groups expressed a need for additional support. The groups provided a specific time each week to discuss placements. The control group had no such structured time. When asked by the researcher at final group meetings, the students said they appreciated the added time for this use and felt the groups were worthwhile. However, the data do not confirm the experimental hypotheses. There are possible explanations for the lack of significant differences.

Lack of Results.

Statistical power. The total number of honours students involved in the study was too small to interpret statistical analyses meaningfully. Because of this, the educational pyramid was not adequately tested on the honours student level. The total number of undergraduate students was 29, smaller than originally planned.

The power of the present research was calculated to be .38 with a medium effect size of .50, according to the estimation method recommended by Welkowitz, Ewen, and Cohen (1971) and Cohen (1977). A sample size of 100 would be needed to attain a power of .80 (see Appendix I).

Assuming the same means and standard deviations as found in the present research, a sample size of 80 would produce significant t values on attitude toward undergraduates in psychology and increase in self-knowledge.

Control group. It is the researcher's view that the use of a control group, made up of students who volunteered to be in the discussion groups, is a major strength of the study. In addition, the control group also wrote out their goals and how closely they were reached, for each field placement visit. The researcher saw each member of the control group weekly in order to accomplish this. Attention was given to the control group in this way, and perhaps contributed to the lack of results. The attention given the control group in collecting the weekly data may have obscured differences between the experimental and control groups, a Hawthorne Effect.

Extraneous variables. As with any field research, confounding variables may be present. In the present study, the amount of supervision and support that a student receives at the field placement site varies. As much as possible this was considered when students were matched on field placement. (Within each class, as close as possible to an equal number of students from each placement were randomly assigned to experimental or

control groups.) However, the students may still have had different supervisors at the same placement site. This occurs particularly at a public school placement, where students work with different teachers at the same school. It was not feasible to control for supervisor. However, this is an area which could influence the results. Similarly, which clients (school children, etc.) a student encounters could also serve to confound the results.

Some placements have periodic meetings for the purpose of supervising students. Some placements may even have had discussion group meetings similar to those set up by the researcher. While these differences should have been equally distributed over both groups, there may have been some inequality due to unequal numbers of different placements within each class and the dropping out of three students from the discussion groups.

The control group was asked on their final questionnaire how much they talked with others about their placements. Due to an oversight the experimental group was not asked this question (e.g., How much did you discuss your placement with other students and/or friends outside of the discussion group?) It may be that the control group compensated by talking with other students, while the experimental group did not.

Test materials. Differences may have occurred between the two groups which were not reflected on the testing materials. All measures were self-report, therefore responses may have been shaped by social approval. However, frankness of response or lack of it should be evenly distributed over both groups through random assignment. However, true differences between groups due to the treatment could be obscured by students' not being completely honest. For example, everyone may report being satisfied with their placement when not all were.

There is also the possibility that the testing materials were weak. They may not have been sensitive to the changes students experienced.

Ceiling effect. The scores on overall satisfaction with the field placement were close to ceiling. Self-acceptance scores also tended toward the upper end of the scale. Because there was a ceiling effect, these variables were not adequately tested.

Length of program. The discussion groups ran for two and one-half months to accommodate one-term placements. This may have been too short a time with too few discussion group meetings, to have made a difference for those involved in the groups.

The Present Study in Perspective

A limitation of the present study was the small sample sizes. When viewed in relation to prior research, the n of the present study was at the lower end of the range of sample sizes. Other investigation employed 34 to 125 participants (Greenblatt & Kantor, 1962; Holzberg et al., 1964; Scheibe, 1965; Cowen et al., 1966; Conter et al., 1979; Fretz, 1979; Aronson & Page, 1980). Goldstein and Simpkins (1973) and Shulman and James (1973) studied 15 and 21 students, respectively. However, in the case of the former study, students spent three to four days per week for four weeks at the field setting, a more intensive program than was offered by the present research.

Compared to other research, the present program was also at the lower end of the range in respect to duration. Scheibe (1965) investigated changes in students involved in a program which lasted eight weeks, but the program was full-time. The study by Cowen et al. (1966) is most like the present research in duration and sample size. The program lasted two and one-half months; n was equal to 34. From three to eight months was a more common duration for programs (Holzberg et al., 1964; Shulman & James, 1973; Conter et al., 1979; Fretz, 1979; Aronson & Page, 1980).

Students in the aforementioned studies all experienced changes over the course of their field

experiences. However, changes were not as dramatic as predicted (Aronson & Page, 1980). In the research by Holzberg et al. (1964), the experimental and control groups did not differ from each other on the posttest, although the experimental group increased on self-acceptance when compared to their own pretest.

The following are recommendations for improvements and suggestions for further research:

1. The study needs to be executed with larger samples. The educational pyramid could then be tested on two levels, the undergraduate group members and the honours student group leaders.
2. The program should be set up for two terms.
3. Discussion groups should be made up of six or seven students, rather than four or five.
4. An attempt should be made to develop measures other than self-report. Perhaps a behavioral measure of student performance or a rating by the supervisor at the field placement could be employed.
5. Interviews should be employed to find out how much support/supervision/consultation similar in kind to that provided by the discussion groups, each student in the control and experimental groups received. An analysis

of covariance could then be employed to control for this confounding factor.

In conclusion, this program was endorsed by those who participated in it. Students reported enjoying meeting other students and discussing field placement experiences. However, the research hypotheses that participation in this discussion group would lead to greater learning, goal attainment, satisfaction, acceptance, and more positive attitudes toward others, were not supported. Research incorporating the experimenter's recommendations could clarify some of the benefits of utilizing discussion groups as an adjunct to the Wilfrid Laurier University Undergraduate Psychology Field Placement Program.

References

- Aronson, D. W., & Page, H. A. Attitude change toward the self and others as a function of helper training and experience. Journal of Community Psychology, 1980, 8, 75-79.
- Berenson, B. G., Carkhuff, R. R., & Myrus, P. M. The interpersonal functioning and training of college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13(4), 441-446.
- Bradford, L. P. (Ed.). Group development (2nd ed.). La Jolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1978.
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1977.
- Conter, K., Seidman, E., Rappaport, J., Kniskern, D., & Desaulniers, G. A. A comparative evaluation of two college student volunteer programs by the volunteers themselves: The importance of commitment and supervision. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1979.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1979.
- Cowan, B., Dastyk, R., & Wickham, E. R. Group supervision as a teaching/learning modality in social work. The Social Worker, December 1972, 256-261.
- Cowen, E. L., Chinsky, J. M., & Rappaport, J. An undergraduate practicum in community mental health. Community Mental Health Journal, 1970, 6(2), 91-100.
- Cowen, E. L., Zax, M., & Laird, J. D. A college student volunteer program in the elementary school setting. Community Mental Health Journal, 1966, 2(4), 319-328.
- Fey, W. F. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: A reevaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50(2), 274-276.
- Fizdale, R. Peer-group supervision. Social Casework, 1958, 39, 443-450.
- Fretz, B. R. College students as paraprofessionals with children and the aged. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1979, 7(3), 357-360.

- Goldstein, M. W., & Simpkins, R. E. Attitude change toward juvenile delinquents as a function of interpersonal contact. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 1220.
- Greenblatt, M., & Kantor, D. Student volunteer movement and the manpower shortage. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1962, 118, 809-814.
- Gruver, G. G. College students as therapeutic agents. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76(2), 111-127.
- Hart, L. E., & King, G. D. Selection versus training in the development of paraprofessionals. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1979, 26(3), 235-241.
- Holzberg, J. D., & Gewirtz, H. A. A method of altering attitudes toward mental illness. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 1963, 37, 56-61.
- Holzberg, J. D., Gewirtz, H. A., & Ebner, E. Changes in moral judgment and self-acceptance in college students as a function of companionship with hospitalized mental patients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28(4), 299-303.
- Judd, J., Kohn, R. E., & Schulman, G. L. Group supervision: A vehicle for social development. Social Work, 1962, 7, 96-102.
- Klein, W., & Zax, M. The use of a hospital volunteer program in the teaching of abnormal psychology. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 155-165.
- Kohn, P. M., Hunt, R. W., Davis, C. A., & Cowles, M. P. Volunteering in principle, volunteering in fact, and experience seeking. York University Department of Psychology Reports, April 1981(108).
- Mager, R. Preparing instructional objectives (2nd ed.). Belmont, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1975.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Petelka, B., & Gerstman, K. L. Evaluation of the Wilfrid Laurier University undergraduate psychology field placement program: 1980-1981. Unpublished manuscript, Wilfrid Laurier University, 1981.

- Rooney, H., Cummins, H., Sebastian, M., & Wood, R. The field work student as a volunteer: An added dimension in social work education. Social Work Education Reporter, 1967, 15, pp. 51;55.
- Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Saxon, S. A., & Holt, M. M. Field placements as an adjunct experience for developmental psychology students. Teaching Psychology, 1974, 1(2), 82-83.
- Scheibe, K. E. College students spend eight weeks in mental hospital: A case report. Psychotherapy: Therapy, Research and Practice, 1965, 2, 117-120.
- Seidman, E., & Rappaport, J. The educational pyramid: A paradigm for training, research, and manpower utilization in community psychology. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1974, 2(2), 119-130.
- Shostrum, E. Personal orientation inventory manual. San Diego: Educational & Industrial Testing Service, 1966.
- Shulman, A. D., & James, S. A. Undergraduate community psychology work-study programs: Effects on self-actualization and vocational plans. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1973, 1(2), 173-181.
- Silber, E., & Tippett, J. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1017-1071.
- Stenzel, A. K., & Feeney, H. M. Volunteer training and development. New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.
- Theodore, A. The voluntary participation of college students as a catalyst for change. In D. H. Smith (Ed.), Voluntary action research: 1973. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.
- Watson, K. W. Differential supervision. Journal of Social Work, 1973, 18, 80-88.
- Welkowitz, J., Ewen, R.B., & Cohen, J. Introductory statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1977.

Appendix A

Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)
and Pretest of Career Choice

Discussion Group:

Yes No

Id. No. _____

SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

(Numbers in parentheses refer to high self-esteem responses)

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others. (1,2)
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. (1,2)
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (3,4)
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people. (1,2)
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (3,4)
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself. (1,2)
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. (1,2)
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. (3,4)
9. I certainly feel useless at times. (3,4)
10. At times I think I am no good at all. (3,4)

For Guttman scaling two or three correct out of the first three items are scored as one item; two correct of 4 and 5 as one item, and two correct of 9 and 10 as one item.

Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965). Rights reserved by Princeton University Press. Reprinted here with permission.

Pretest only:

Have you decided on a career? Yes No

If so, what?

Appendix B

Acceptance of Others (Fey, 1955)

Acceptance of Others

1. People are too easily led.
Almost always 1 2 3 4 5 Very rarely
- *2. I like people I get to know.
3. People these days have pretty low moral standards.
4. Most people are pretty smug about themselves, never really facing their bad points.
- *5. I can be comfortable with nearly all kinds of people.
6. All people can talk about these days, it seems, is movies, TV, and foolishness like that.
7. People get ahead by using "pull," and not because of what they know.
8. If you once start doing favors for people, they'll just walk all over you.
9. People are too self-centered.
10. People are always dissatisfied and hunting for something new.
11. With many people you don't know how you stand.
12. You've probably got to hurt someone if you're going to make something out of yourself.
13. People really need a strong, smart leader.
14. I enjoy myself most when I am alone, away from people.
15. I wish people would be more honest with you.
- *16. I enjoy going with a crowd.
17. In my experience, people are pretty stubborn and unreasonable.
- *18. I can enjoy being with people whose values are very different from mine.
- *19. Everybody tries to be nice.
20. The average person is not very well satisfied with himself.

(* Reversed item)

Reprinted with permission of Fey, W. F. Acceptance of Others in Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: A revaluation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 274-276. Copyright 1955 by the American Psychological Association.

Appendix C

Semantic Differential
(Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958)

(There will be four copies of the 20-item form given to the participants, one for each of the concepts.)

Id. No. _____
Discussion Group
Yes _____ No _____

Semantic Differential
(Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1958)

Note. For the data analysis the 7-point scale was reversed so that "1" became the negative end and "7" became the positive end.

Instructions: The purpose of this part of the study is to find out what certain concepts mean to you by measuring them on various scales. The concepts are found at the top of each page. If you feel that the concept is very closely associated with one of the words in the pair, place an X in this way:

good X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ bad
or

good _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ bad

If you feel that the concept is closely associated with one of the words in the pair, place an X in this way:

good _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ bad
or

good _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ bad

If you feel that the concept is slightly related to one side of the scale, place an X in this way:

good _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ bad
or

good _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ bad

If you feel that the concept is equally related to both ends of the scale (neutral) or that the scale does not apply, place an X in the middle:

good _____ : _____ : _____ : X : _____ : _____ : _____ bad

The concepts to be tested are attitudes toward field placement site (i.e., public schools), client group (i.e., public school children), advanced undergraduates in psychology, and undergraduates in psychology.

(concept)

1. good _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ bad

2. beautiful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ ugly

3. sour _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ sweet

Appendix D

**Evaluation of the Wilfrid Laurier University Undergraduate Psychology
Field Placement Program Questionnaire**

AGENCIES:

8. How much feedback were you provided by the agency personnel (the supervisor, teacher, coordinator)?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

9. How many hours each month were spent in supervision/support/consultation with you at your agency?

1/2 hour or less	1 to 2 hours
1/2 to 1 hour	over 2 hours

10. Do you feel that the time spent in supervision/support/consultation with you at your placement was:

1	2	3	4	5
Far Too Little	Less Than Enough	Just Right	More Than Enough	Far Too Much

11. Do you feel that the quality of the supervision/support/consultation at your placement was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent

FIELD STAFF: (Dr. Hodkin and graduate student field coordinators)

12. How many hours each month were spent in supervision/support/consultation with you by the field staff?

1/2 hour or less	1 to 2 hours
1/2 to 1 hour	over 2 hours

13. Do you feel that the time spent in supervision/support/consultation with you by the field staff was:

1	2	3	4	5
Far Too Little	Less Than Enough	Just Right	More Than Enough	Far Too Much

14. Do you feel that the quality of the supervision/support/consultation by the field staff was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent

COURSE INSTRUCTOR:

15. How many hours each month were spent in supervision/support/consultation in your class?

1/2 hour or less	1 to 2 hours
1/2 to 1 hour	over 2 hours

16. Do you feel that the time spent in supervision/support/consultation in your class was:

1	2	3	4	5
Far Too Little	Less Than Enough	Just Right	More Than Enough	Far Too Much

17. Do you feel that the quality of the supervision/support/consultation in your class was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent

18. Do you feel that the supervision/support/consultation you received from your course instructor helped you to integrate course theory into practice at your placement?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at All	Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

19. How clearly was your role defined in your field placement?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unclear	Unclear	Adequate	Clear	Very Clear

20. a) How much responsibility were you given by the agency?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

- b) How do you feel about this amount of responsibility?

1	2	3	4	5
Too Little	Less Than Enough	Just Right	More Than Enough	Too Much

21. Were you satisfied with the placement?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Adequately Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

22. How clear were the goals of the WLU field placement program to you?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unclear	Unclear	Neither Clear nor Unclear	Clear	Very Clear

23. Will you continue your placement on your own? Yes ___ Maybe ___ No ___

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM AND OTHER COMMENTS:

Appendix E

Weekly Evaluation of Group Meetings
(Stenzel & Feeney, 1968)

Id. No. _____
 Week No. _____

Weekly Evaluation of Group Meetings
 (Stenzel & Feeney, 1968)

Instructions: Circle the number on the scale which best reflects your feelings about this meeting.

1. How interested were you in this particular meeting?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Much	Much	Neutral	Little	Very Little

2. How interested was most of the group during the meeting?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Much	Much	Neutral	Little	Very Little

3. Did you learn anything new at the session?

1	2	3	4
Yes, Definitely	Probably	Perhaps	No, Definitely

4. Did you feel that you had enough opportunity to participate?

1	2	3	4
Too Much	Enough	Needed More	Needed More

5. What did you enjoy most about the meeting?

6. What could be done to improve meetings in the future?

Appendix F

Weekly Evaluation of Time Spent at Field Placement

Id. No. _____

Date: _____

Weekly Evaluation of Time Spent at Field Placement

1. Goals for the visit: (List as many that apply.)

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

(d) _____

2. How closely was each goal reached?
(Circle the number which best applies.)

<u>Goal (a)</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not Very Much	A Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

<u>Goal (b)</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not Very Much	A Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

<u>Goal (c)</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not Very Much	A Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

<u>Goal (d)</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
	Not Very Much	A Little	Moderate	Much	Very Much

3. How satisfied were you with the visit?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Adequately Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

Other Comments:

Appendix G
Consent Forms

Consent Form: Advanced Undergraduate Group Leaders

I understand that I will be responsible for leading a student group meeting once a week for approximately 50 minutes during the winter term 1982. There will also be weekly meetings with the researcher, Kathy Gerstman, during this time. I will be asked to fill out a set of questionnaires at the beginning and at the end of the term. Confidentiality will be insured and results of the study will be made available by September, 1, 1982.

I have read the above and agree to participate in the research being conducted by Kathy Gerstman.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Consent Form: Advanced Undergraduate Control Group

I agree to fill out a set of questionnaires at the beginning and end of the winter term 1982. Data will be kept confidential and the results of the study will be made available by September 1, 1982.

I have read the above and agree to participate in the research being conducted by Kathy Gerstman.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Consent Form: Psychology Students Participating in Discussion Groups

I agree to attend a 50-minute discussion group once a week during the winter term 1982. I will be asked to fill out a set of questionnaires at the beginning and at the end of the term. There will also be brief evaluation forms to be completed at the end of each group meeting. Data will be kept confidential and the results of the study will be made available by September 1, 1982.

I have read the above and agree to participate in the research being conducted by Kathy Gerstman.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Consent Form: Psychology Student Control Group.

I agree to fill out a set of questionnaires at the beginning and at the end of the winter term 1982. There will also be brief evaluation forms to be completed weekly. Data will be kept confidential and the results of the study will be made available by September 1, 1982.

I have read the above and agree to participate in the research being conducted by Kathy Gerstman.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B

Outline of Meetings with Honours Student Group Leaders

Outline of Meetings with Honours Student Group Leaders

I. Meeting One

- A. Explain the goals of the discussion groups
 - 1. For the participants, including the leader, to share their knowledge and experience with each other
 - 2. To discuss field placement experiences
 - a. For students to evaluate their own experiences
 - b. For students to solve their own problems encountered at the field setting with the help of the group
 - c. For the leader, in particular, to be open to instances where integration of theory into practice can occur
 - 3. Ultimately, to improve the students' practice and learning at the field setting
- B. Discuss the role of group leader/supervisor/facilitator
- C. Distribute copies of "Group Formation and Development" (Bradford, 1978) and discuss group process

II. Future Weekly Meetings

- A. Discuss content and feelings regarding group meetings
- B. Discuss any problems and attempt to solve them as a group
- C. Distribute one reading each session on group process or supervision, and discuss reading assigned from the previous session

Appendix I

Calculation of Power and Sample Size

Calculation of Power and Sample Size

$$\delta = \gamma \sqrt{\frac{N}{2}}$$

where γ = population "effect" size and N = size of each sample.

The effect size was set at .50 with a harmonic mean of 14.34.

$$\delta = 1.33$$

Power = .379.

Sample size determination for a power of .80, an effect size of .50, and α of .05 (one-tailed), was calculated by the formula:

$$N = 2 \left(\frac{\delta}{\gamma} \right)^2$$

$N = 50$ for each group.