

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

---

1994

## Perceived differences in the experiences of full-time and part-time master of social work students

Michelle Marie Pianalto

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Pianalto, Michelle Marie, "Perceived differences in the experiences of full-time and part-time master of social work students" (1994). *Theses Digitization Project*. 4293.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/4293>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPERIENCES OF FULL-TIME  
AND PART-TIME MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS

---

A Project  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Social Work

---

by  
Michelle Marie Pianalto

June 1994

PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES IN THE EXPERIENCES OF FULL-TIME  
AND PART-TIME MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS

---

A Project  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino


---

by  
Michelle Marie Pianalto  
June 1994

Approved by:

  
Dr. Rosemary McCaslin, Project Advisor

  
Dr. Rosemary McCaslin, Department Representative

  
Dr. Teresa Morris, Chair of Research Sequence

6/10/94  
Date

## ABSTRACT

Using a survey research design, this project explored, discovered, and described specific areas where perceived differences existed in the experiences of full-time and part-time students in the Master's of Social Work (MSW) program at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) during the years 1991, 1992, and 1993. In general, the results of this research project did not support the hypotheses that part-time students would be less satisfied than full-time students with field placements, Department support, the ability to participate in extra Department activities such as the Student Association, and their overall experience in the MSW program. While some significant differences were found in the experiences of full-time and part-time students, they did not exist for all three study years. In fact, only two questionnaire items were significant in more than one year. Frequency distributions and the Chi-Square test of significance were used to answer the research question and test the hypotheses.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . .	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
LITERATURE REVIEW . . . . .	6
Demographic Differences in Full-time and Part-time Students . . . . .	6
Stress Levels and Extracurricular Roles . . . . .	6
Department and Faculty Support . . . . .	9
Field Placement Satisfaction . . . . .	12
Overall MSW Educational Experience Satisfaction . . . . .	12
Literature Review Summary . . . . .	13
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS . . . . .	15
RESULTS . . . . .	22
Sample . . . . .	22
Hypotheses Questions . . . . .	24
Other Findings . . . . .	26
Curriculum . . . . .	27
Departmental Administrators . . . . .	31
Facilities and Resources . . . . .	33
Student Services . . . . .	34
Educational Milieu . . . . .	36
The Department as a Reference Group . . . . .	38
Overall Perceptions . . . . .	40

Educational Equity . . . . .	41
Departmental Faculty . . . . .	45
DISCUSSION . . . . .	46
Results . . . . .	46
Hypotheses . . . . .	46
Other Significant Findings . . . . .	51
Curriculum . . . . .	51
Departmental Administrators . . . . .	53
Facilities and Resources . . . . .	54
Student Services . . . . .	55
Educational Milieu . . . . .	56
The Department as a Reference Group . . . . .	57
Overall Perceptions . . . . .	58
Educational Equity . . . . .	59
Other Areas of Concern . . . . .	60
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	64
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	65
Implications for Evaluation of Social Work Practice . . . . .	66
Conclusion . . . . .	67
APPENDICES . . . . .	69
APPENDIX A: Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1991 Questionnaire . . . . .	69
APPENDIX B: Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1992 Questionnaire . . . . .	87

APPENDIX C: Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1993 Questionnaire . . . . .	105
APPENDIX D: Frequencies Related to Significant Items . . . . .	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	126

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Frequencies Related to Demographic Information . . . . .	23
2.	Percentages for Items Related to Curriculum . . . . .	28
3.	Percentages for Items Related to Department Administration . . . . .	32
4.	Percentages for Items Related to Facilities and Resources . . . . .	33
5.	Percentages for Items Related to Student Services . . . . .	35
6.	Percentages for Items Related to Overall Educational Milieu . . . . .	37
7.	Percentages for Items Related to the Department as a Reference Group . . . . .	39
8.	Percentages for Items Related to Overall Perceptions . . . . .	40
9.	Percentages for Items Related to Educational Equity . . . . .	42
10.	Percentages for Items Related to Department Faculty . . . . .	45



## INTRODUCTION

"My field placement is not very challenging." "The only professor I ever see is the one teaching my class." "I never hear about activities like the Christmas party." "I enjoy being on campus during the day when faculty are there." "It must be easier to be a full-time student since they do not work while they are in school." "We are more stressed-out than part-time students because we carry a heavier class-load than they do."

As a student in the part-time Master's of Social Work (MSW) program at California State University at San Bernardino (CSUSB), this author heard these and similar comments from both full-time and part-time students regarding their experiences in the MSW program. The content of these discussions often seemed to suggest that each group perceived their experiences in this program to be significantly different from those of the other group.

The irony of these comments and perceptions was that many aspects of the MSW program were set up similarly for both full-time and part-time students. Some areas which were designed and implemented identically for both groups included grading procedures, specialization choices, required classes, course requirements, and required field placement hours.

There were four planned differences in the program

structure for full-time versus part-time students. Full-time students attended class primarily during the day, could graduate in two years without attending summer school, and began field placements during their first year of the program. Part-time students, however, attended class primarily in the evening, could graduate in three years if they attended summer school, and did not begin field placements until their second year in the program.

Some aspects of the program which should have been the same for both full-time and part-time students might have been perceived differently by the two groups due to extenuating factors. For example, although all elective courses were available to any student in the program, the majority were offered during the afternoon when most part-time students were working. While all field placement options were also available to all students, some students often had to limit their choices to those placements which offered evening and/or weekend hours or provided a stipend. Finally, while Department and faculty support was available to all students, many professors left campus prior to part-time students arriving for evening classes.

Since full-time and part-time students appeared to perceive their experiences differently, it seemed important to explore and discover those specific areas in which perceived differences exist. This seemed especially true

since most of the experiences should have been similar for both groups.

If significant differences were found in the perceptions of these two groups, the Department faculty and administration could choose to take these differences into account, making changes to the MSW program. While it would be virtually impossible to develop a program which appealed fully to all students, it would be important for the Department faculty and administration to acknowledge and address those areas where perceptions varied significantly.

Having a better understanding of the perceived differences between the experiences of full-time and part-time MSW students would, therefore, benefit the Department of Social Work in that it would be provided with additional insight on how to best serve the potentially diverse needs of the two groups of students. With economic resources becoming increasingly scarce, the Department must utilize existing resources in ways which maximize benefits to the largest number of students.

The research question for this study was, "What are the perceived differences in the experiences of full-time students as compared to part-time students in regard to those areas which should be similarly viewed by both groups of students"?

The hypotheses were that part-time students in the MSW

program would be less satisfied than full-time students with their field placements, their feeling connected to the Department faculty, and their opportunities to participate in extra Department activities such as the Student Association. Additionally, it was believed that part-time students would be less satisfied with their overall experience in the MSW program when compared to full-time students.

Due to the nature of the research question asked, this project was done from the positivist research paradigm and was descriptive and exploratory. While it appeared that there were perceived differences in the experiences of full-time and part-time MSW students, it was unknown in which specific areas those differences existed. Therefore, this research project attempted to find the correlation between student status (full-time or part-time) and field placement satisfaction, Departmental support satisfaction, ability to participate in extra Department activities, and overall satisfaction with the MSW program. Once differences and similarities in perceptions are identified, the Department faculty and administration could evaluate the information to determine what, if anything, could and should be done to alleviate the cause(s) of these perceived differences.

The primary social work role addressed was one of administration and policy planning since future program

development and implementation could be enacted if the research results indicated a need for change. If the students believed their needs and concerns were being addressed by the Department, they would feel validated regarding their issues. If this translated into changes being made which students ultimately perceived as benefiting them, they would then be more likely to have a positive attitude about their experiences in the program.

The other social work role addressed was that of educator. For example, if the MSW program was structured in a way that students did not feel as overwhelmed by the demands of their numerous roles, they would be more likely to come to class better prepared. If students were better prepared for class, this would lead to a more successful experience for everyone involved. Students would perceive they were learning more and professors would feel better about the jobs they do as educators and mentors. It is believed that the more positively students perceived single experiences in the MSW program, such as their field placements or the support received by the Department, the more positively they would perceive their overall experiences.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

A literature review did not reveal much information on students' perceptions of their experiences in MSW programs or on full-time and part-time graduate student perceptions in general. A significant amount of literature found on MSW programs, however, focused on stress levels and the extracurricular roles associated with being either a full-time or part-time student.

### Demographic Differences in Full-time and Part-time Students

In a study by Yamatani, Page, Koeske, Diaz, and Maguire (1986), it was reported that full-time and part-time students differed demographically. Part-time students were likely to be older, have at least five years of social work experience, be employed full-time while in school, and have spouses and children. Full-time students were more likely to be younger, have less than five years of social work experience (if they had any at all), be unemployed or employed part-time, be divorced or single, and have no children. Similar findings were reported by Fortune (1987), Kramer, Mathews, and Endias (1987), and Potts (1992).

### Stress Levels and Extracurricular Roles

Mayer and Rosenblatt (1974) reported that most MSW students experienced some level of stress during their program. They found that students often had unrealistically high standards for developing relationships with clients and

achieving goals with limited resources. When unable to attain the set goals, students would often blame themselves. Munson (1984) argued, however, that only 50 percent of MSW students experienced some level of stress, with most of it being low levels. Higher levels of stress were primarily associated with classroom activity, not field placement settings. When stress was experienced in field placement settings, it often related to supervision issues. Neither Mayer and Rosenblatt nor Munson addressed the differences in stress levels between full-time and part-time students.

In a study on comparative stress levels, Kramer, Mathews, and Endias (1987) found significantly higher stress levels among part-time students. The author's partially attributed this to 75.6 percent of part-time students working full-time, whereas 85 percent of full-time students were unemployed or only working part-time. Patchner (1983) also reported some level of stress in the majority of MSW students, with part-time students reporting higher stress levels than full-time students.

In contrast, Koeske and Koeske (1989), argued that full-time students with part-time jobs showed more evidence of stress than part-time students with full-time jobs. They believed this was due to full-time students with part-time jobs having more demands and fewer resources to cope with them. This group of students was also more likely to be

paying for their own education. Part-time students with full-time jobs often relied heavily on employers to provide them with financial assistance, and full-time students without jobs tended to rely on family members for financial support. Therefore, these authors concluded that the number of roles a student fulfilled in life was more important than status as a part-time or full-time student when explaining the stress experienced by MSW students.

In her article on the effects of part-time enrollment and extracurricular roles, Potts (1992) reported that part-time students were more likely to be employed, be married, and have children when compared to their full-time counterparts. While she agreed with Koeske and Koeske (1989) in that the number of roles a student played was more important than their status as a full-time or part-time student, Potts argued that because of the issue of multiple roles, it was reasonable to suggest that part-time enrollment was more likely to cause role stress. It is important to note that the research by Potts was conducted using the same questionnaire as the one used for this research project.

Fortune (1987) also agreed the stress of multiple roles impacted MSW students, and she argued that multiple roles equated with less stress. In her study, she found that first-year, full-time students experienced more stress than



part-time students. She attributed this difference in stress levels to the number of roles being enacted. First-year students were typically younger, childless, unemployed, and had less social work experience when compared to part-time students. She also found that being employed while in school was associated with less stress among second year students. She stated that multiple roles correlated with stress levels in that "benefits in self-esteem, emotional support, and distraction accrue to those with multiple roles, thus offsetting any difficulties associated with a 'scarcity' of time/energy resources."

Ackerman, Gelber, and Wayne (1987) found that part-time students were more likely than full-time students to report that the demands of school, both time-wise and emotionally, were greater than they had anticipated. Additionally, part-time students were less likely than full-time students to report that their families were supportive of their academic efforts.

#### Department and Faculty Support

With regard to a hypothesis that part-time students felt less connected to the Department, Kramer, Mathews, and Endias (1987) reported that part-time students in their study felt less appreciated as part of the social work program when compared to full-time students. Part-time students also identified relationships with social work

school personnel as more problematic than full-time students. One student in their study wrote, "... no one seems to realize or care about the extreme demands placed on a person who chooses full-time employment while pursuing the MSW."

Koeske and Koeske (1989) also reported that concerns about problematic relationships with school personnel and feelings of being unappreciated may have been associated with stress for students. They wrote, "These difficulties may reflect a sense of social marginality and perceived disadvantage based on social comparison, suggesting the need for enhancing students' sense of importance and belonging."

However, they also wrote of the importance of recognizing that, "... negative feelings are, in part, perceptual phenomena, dependent on socially defined experiences of expenditure, reward, and relative deprivation/enhancement." They went on to say that it could not be assumed that reference groups and social comparison operated the same way across all groups of students, or even across all groups of full-time or part-time students.

In the previously mentioned studies, student evaluations of faculty were often used to assess students' feelings. Some researchers cautioned, however, that these evaluations might have potential problems. Petchers and Chow (1988) reported that student evaluations of faculty were

influenced by many factors, including "extraneous or contextual factors over which faculty members had no control." Overall, they found that students gave more favorable ratings to faculty who taught elective courses, not required courses. Ratings did not vary based on the faculty member's rank, gender, class size, or content area. Weinbach (1988) suggested that student evaluations of faculty's teaching effectiveness were highly influenced by the personal qualities of faculty members which students perceived to be signs of effective teaching. He concluded that student ratings of effective teaching were often based more on faculty behaviors toward students, than true teaching effectiveness.

Faculty qualities or behaviors which were mentioned by students discussing teaching effectiveness included "warmth (Baird, 1973; Elmore and LaPointe, 1975); agreement between student and faculty attitudes (Hofman and Kremer, 1980); friendliness, helpfulness, and openness to others' opinions (Feldman, 1976); sensitivity to student problems (Tomasco, 1980); and shared perceptions toward higher education (Hofman and Kremer, 1980)" (Weinbach, 1988). Because of their potential variations, Weinbach (1988) suggested that student evaluations of faculty should only be one component of faculty evaluations.

### Field Placement Satisfaction

With regard to the hypothesis that part-time students tended to be less satisfied with their field placements than full-time students, Fortune, Feathers, Rook, Scrimenti, Smollen, Stemerman, and Tucker (1985) found that most student characteristics such as gender, age, marital status, and student status did not relate to field placement satisfaction. Instead, relevant learning, as well as student involvement in designing the field placement experience, seemed to have a greater impact on levels of field placement satisfaction. Additionally, Heppner and Roehlke (1984) stated that students with prior social work experience generally had the same expectations and evaluations of field placement supervision as did students with less social work experience. Therefore, less experienced full-time students would not necessarily be more satisfied with their field placements than more experienced part-time students.

### Overall MSW Educational Experience Satisfaction

Rosenthal, Wedel, and Wilson (1989) disagreed with this researcher's hypothesis regarding part-time students being less satisfied overall with their educational experience when compared to full-time students. Their research indicated that part-time students tended to view their educational experience as better than, or equal to, that of

full-time students. Brennan and Black (1984) reported similar findings.

#### Literature Review Summary

In summarizing the literature, most of the research indicated full-time and part-time MSW students differed demographically. Part-time students were more likely to be older, have at least five years of social work experience, be employed full-time, and have families. Full-time students were more likely to be younger, have little social work experience, be unemployed or employed part-time, be divorced or single, and have no children.

There seemed to be, however, little consensus on how full-time or part-time student status impacted stress levels. Some studies concluded that full-time students experienced more stress during their MSW programs. Others found that part-time students showed more symptoms of stress.

Two researchers found that part-time students were more likely to report feeling less appreciated as part of the social work program and to identify relationships with Department personnel as more problematic than full-time students. Other researchers cautioned, however, that student evaluations of faculty were often influenced by factors outside the faculty's control, and that results from these evaluations needed to be used carefully.

The literature suggested that student field placement satisfaction was based on students' perceptions that relevant learning had taken place and that they had participated in designing their field placement experiences. Students with prior social work experience tended to have similar expectations and evaluations of field placement experiences as those students with little or no previous social work experience. There was no indication that full-time or part-time student status impacted student satisfaction with field placements.

Finally, two studies indicated that part-time students were at least as likely, if not more likely, than full-time students to view their educational experiences positively.

## RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The purpose of this study was to use data from a survey research design (questionnaires) to explore, discover, and describe the specific areas where perceived differences existed between the experiences of full-time students and part-time students in the California State University at San Bernardino (CSUSB) Master's of Social Work (MSW) program.

This project used the positivist research paradigm and was a comparison of overlapping cohorts. The research question for this study was, "What are the perceived differences in the experiences of full-time students as compared to part-time students in regard to those areas which should be similarly viewed by both groups of students"?

The four study hypotheses were as follows:

H<sup>1</sup>: Part-time students in the MSW program will report being less satisfied with their field placements when compared to full-time students in the MSW program.

H<sup>2</sup>: Part-time students in the MSW program will report feeling less connected to the Department faculty when compared to full-time students in the MSW program.

H<sup>3</sup>: Part-time students in the MSW program will report being less satisfied with their opportunities to participate in extra Department activities, such as the Student Association, when compared to full-time students in the MSW program.

H<sup>4</sup>: Part-time students will assess their overall experiences in the MSW program less positively when compared to full-time students in the MSW program.

Data were gathered utilizing a questionnaire called "Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience" (Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C). Originally developed at San Diego State University (SDSU) for their Department of Social Work, this questionnaire was also used by the Department of Social Work at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB). In 1990, the questionnaire was piloted in the Department of Social Work at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). It was revised in 1992, and has been given out at the end of each school year.

The questionnaire focused on different facets of students' experiences in the MSW program such as curriculum, Department faculty, Department administration, facilities and resources, student services, educational milieu, the Department as a reference group, educational equity, and overall perceptions of the program. The 1991 questionnaire consisted of 88 questions. However, after 1992, the revised questionnaire consisted of 89 questions.

The questionnaire was primarily a Likert Scale format which asked students to reflect the degree to which they strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed



with each statement. Students could also respond with don't know/not applicable. On the 1991 questionnaire, students could also respond with neutral. This category was removed during the 1992 revision in order to force students to make a choice between disagreement and agreement. Therefore, the Likert Scale was reduced from six points to five points. There were also open-ended comment sections at the end of each main topic and several questions regarding demographic information.

The main concept measured in this research project was whether or not student status effected perceptions and feelings about the MSW program. Therefore, student status was the independent variable. Dependent variables included perceptions of, and feelings about, field placements, Departmental support, extra activities engaged in, and overall experiences in the MSW program.

The questionnaire item, "My field placement provided me with learning opportunities related to developing skills that are essential to my career plan," was used to evaluate students' feelings about field placements. "The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness" was the questionnaire item used to explore students' feelings of connectedness to Department faculty. The questionnaire item, "There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that

influence my education (i.e., Student Association)," was used to measure students' feelings about being involved in Department activities. Overall feelings about students' experiences in the MSW program were measured with the questionnaire item, "In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive."

Because this questionnaire was set up only to collect data on students' experiences in the MSW program, the validity, reliability, and cultural sensitivity of the instrument were not tested.

Quantitative procedures were used to test the hypotheses and answer the research question. Because the majority of the questionnaire was in a Likert Scale format, most of the variables were measured at an ordinal level. The demographic data, however, were measured at a nominal level.

The first procedure used was to run frequency distributions and measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) on all data. These distributions provided a description of the number of times each answer was given by students.

The second procedure was to collapse the data from the Likert Scales into larger categories. In order to do this, the strongly disagree and disagree categories were collapsed into a disagree category. The strongly agree and agree

categories were collapsed into an agree category. The neutral category in 1991 was also collapsed into the disagree category.

The third procedure was to carry out bivariate analyses using cross-tabulations so that patterns of relationships could be observed between student status and the other key variables of field placement satisfaction, Departmental support satisfaction, ability to participate in extra Department activities, and overall satisfaction with the MSW program.

The final procedure was to run significance tests in order to determine the importance of the patterns observed in the bivariate analyses. Because the previously identified variables were measured at nominal and ordinal levels, and since it could not be assumed that there was a normal distribution around the mean, the non-parametric test, Chi-Square, was used. The significance level of .05 was used to determine if the null hypotheses should be accepted or rejected.

There were several strengths and weaknesses to using questionnaires for this research project. The strengths of using questionnaires included being able to describe the characteristics of a large group of students, being able to quickly and inexpensively survey a large group of students, and being able to be more flexible with the type of analyses

used to evaluate the data. An additional strength was that all students were asked all questions in the exact same manner.

Weaknesses of using questionnaires for this project included being unable to deal with the context of social life (i.e., the impact of working full-time, going to school part-time, doing an internship, and having a family). This approach was also inflexible in that responses could not be clarified by the students or expanded upon by them.

This research project was a comparison of overlapping cohorts as many students answered the questionnaire more than one time. The questionnaires were given out in class by professors at the end of Spring quarter each year, and students were asked to complete them at that time. The questionnaires were then returned to the professors who left them with the Department of Social Work.

Because of the data collection method employed and the fact that Department faculty passed out and collected the questionnaires, it was relatively easy to collect the data. Additionally, it only took students fifteen to twenty minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Because current and recent students were used in this study, it was important to protect their confidentiality and anonymity. This project was set up in a way that this was not difficult. To begin with, the questionnaires did not

ask for students' names. Secondly, the questionnaires were given out and collected by the faculty.

It is also necessary to note that there were several open-ended questions on the questionnaire regarding different facets of the students' experiences. Given the possible candid nature of some of these responses, this researcher was not given an opportunity to see the written responses on the questionnaires. Instead, she was only given quantitative data responses from 1991 and 1992 which had been input in the computer by someone else. For 1993, on questionnaires from which data were entered by this researcher, the written responses were blackened out in order to protect confidentiality. Additionally, this researcher signed a statement of confidentiality which is on file with the Department of Social Work. This clearly allowed for the protection of student responses, as well as any possible Department personnel issues.

## RESULTS

### Sample

In 1991, the sample population consisted of 76 students. Of the students who responded to the demographic questions, 52.6 percent were in the part-time program, 52.6 percent were married, 64.5 percent had children, 78.9 percent were employed at least part-time, and 67.1 percent were at least 33 years old. The gender and ethnicity breakdowns are unknown as these two items were not addressed by the questionnaire in 1991.

The 1992 sample population consisted of 63 students. Of the students who responded to the demographic questions, 50.8 percent were Caucasian, 58.7 percent were female, 66.7 percent were part-time students, 47.6 percent were married, 60.3 percent had children, 73 percent worked at least part-time, and 50.7 percent were 33 years of age or older.

The sample population in 1993 consisted of 44 students. Of the students who responded to the demographic questions, 70.5 percent were Caucasian, 79.5 percent were female, 63.6 percent were full-time students, 52.3 percent were married, 56.8 percent had children, 65.9 percent worked at least part-time, and 54.5 percent were at least 33 years old.

Table 1 shows the frequencies for each of the three years for demographic information such as gender, student status, age, ethnicity, marital status, whether or not the student had children, and whether or not they were employed.

Table 1. Frequencies for Demographic Information  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

	1991		1992		1993	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender <sup>1</sup>						
Female	--	----	37	58.7	35	79.5
Male	--	----	14	22.2	7	15.9
No response	76	100.0	12	19.0	2	4.5
Student Status						
Full-time	33	43.4	16	25.4	28	63.6
Part-time	40	52.6	42	66.7	16	36.4
No response	3	3.9	5	7.9	0	0.0
Age						
20-26	7	9.2	7	11.1	6	13.6
27-32	8	10.5	8	12.7	7	15.9
33-38	19	25.0	7	11.1	7	15.9
39-44	18	23.7	12	19.0	8	18.2
45-50	13	17.1	13	20.6	6	13.6
51 and up	1	1.3	0	0.0	3	6.8
No response	10	13.2	16	25.4	7	15.9
Ethnicity <sup>1</sup>						
African/American	--	----	6	9.5	3	6.8
Latino	--	----	7	11.1	3	6.8
Asian	--	----	0	0.0	0	0.0
Anglo	--	----	32	50.8	31	70.5
Other	--	----	3	4.8	2	4.5
No response	76	100.0	15	23.8	5	11.4
Marital Status						
Single	13	17.1	15	23.8	13	29.5
Married/Couple	40	52.6	30	47.6	23	52.3
Separated	3	3.9	2	3.2	3	6.8
Divorced	6	7.9	5	7.9	2	4.5
Widowed	2	2.6	1	1.6	0	0.0
Other	2	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
No response	10	13.2	10	15.9	3	6.8
Any Children						
No	19	25.0	16	25.4	19	43.2
Yes	49	64.5	38	60.3	25	56.8
No response	8	10.5	9	14.3	0	0.0
Employed						
No	12	15.8	9	14.3	14	31.8
Yes	60	78.9	46	73.0	29	65.9
No response	4	5.3	8	12.7	1	2.3

<sup>1</sup> These questions were not asked on the 1991 questionnaire.

It is important to note that the samples for each year do not consist of all students enrolled in the program. In 1991, there were 102 students in the program. Thus, the 76 students in the study comprised 74.5 percent of the total enrollment. There were 94 students in the program in 1992. Thus, the 63 students in the study comprised 67 percent of the total enrollment. In 1993, there were 116 students in the program. Thus, the 44 students in the study comprised only 37.9 percent of the total student enrollment.

It is unknown if the missing questionnaires are due to students not being given the questionnaires, if students did not complete the questionnaires when they received them, or if the questionnaires were completed but not returned to the Department. This must be taken into consideration when looking at the results of the study since the results might have been different if the samples were truly representative of the MSW student population.

#### Hypotheses Questions

The first hypothesis stated that part-time students would be less satisfied with their field placements when compared to full-time students. The questionnaire item used to measure field placement satisfaction was, "My field placement provided me with learning opportunities related to developing skills that are essential to my career plan." In



1992, there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=4.75$ ,  $p=.029$ ,  $df=1$ ) between full-time and part-time student responses with part-time students being more likely to agree than full-time students. There were no significant differences between the two groups in either 1991 or 1993. Therefore, the null hypothesis was supported only in 1992. Over the three year study period, however, there was an overall increase in student agreement with this questionnaire item.

The second hypothesis stated that part-time students would report feeling less connected to the Department faculty when compared to full-time students. The questionnaire item used to measure connectedness to the Department faculty was, "The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness." There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students during 1991, 1992, or 1993. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not supported for any of the study years. The level of agreement with this questionnaire item was consistent for 1991 and 1992, but increased in 1993. The majority of both full-time and part-time students agreed during all three years.

The third hypothesis was that part-time students would report being less satisfied with their opportunity to participate in extra Department activities when compared to full-time students. The questionnaire item used to measure

this was, "There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that influence my education (i.e., Student Association)." There were significant differences in both 1991 ( $X^2=4.72$ ,  $p=.03$ ,  $df=1$ ) and 1993 ( $X^2=3.89$ ,  $p=.049$ ,  $df=1$ ), with part-time students being more likely than full-time students to disagree both years. Therefore, the null hypothesis was supported in both 1991 and 1993. There were no significant differences between student responses in 1992. Notably, part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree with the questionnaire item during that year.

The fourth hypothesis was that part-time students would assess their overall experience in the MSW program less positively when compared to full-time students. The questionnaire item used to measure this was, "In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive." There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1991, 1992, or 1993. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not supported in 1991, 1992, or 1993. In fact, the rate of agreement with this questionnaire item remained consistent over the three study years for both full-time and part-time students.

#### Other Findings

Upon analyzing the data for all questionnaire items,

other significant findings which were unexpected emerged. They will be discussed using the main subject headings from the questionnaire.

### Curriculum

Table 2 shows the percentages for all items related to curriculum for the years 1991, 1992, and 1993.

There was a significant difference ( $X^2=4.69$ ,  $p=.03$ ,  $df=1$ ) between full-time and part-time student responses in 1992 on the questionnaire item, "The objectives and content of the curriculum have been clear and relevant to my development as a professional social worker." Part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree with this questionnaire item. There were no significant differences in student responses during 1991 or 1993. However, in 1991 part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree with the questionnaire item, whereas, in 1993, full-time students were more likely than part-time students to agree.

On the questionnaire item, "My social work courses were sequenced in a way that facilitated manageable and progressive learning on my part," there was a significant difference ( $X^2=12.10$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $df=1$ ) between the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1992. That year, part-time students were more likely to agree than full-time students. While there were no significant differences in

Table 2. Percentages for Items Related to Curriculum  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Curriculum was relevant to my professional development.	20.0	80.0	14.8	85.2*	22.7	77.3
Courses sequenced to promote progressive learning.	25.3	74.7	28.6	71.4***	30.2	69.8
Courses sequenced to promote course integration.	34.2	65.8	25.8	74.2***	22.7	77.3
There were both experiential and cognitive learning.	33.3	66.7	23.8	76.2	27.3	72.7
My performance was evaluated fairly.	21.1	78.9	14.3	85.7	9.1	90.9
Helpful and adequate feedback.	N/A	N/A <sup>3</sup>	15.9	84.1	18.6	81.4
Curriculum was flexible enough to meet my needs.	40.0	60.0	42.9	57.1*	38.6	61.4
There were adequate opportunities to evaluate courses.	35.5	64.5	25.8	74.2	31.7	68.3
There were adequate opportunities to evaluate the field.	46.4	53.6	41.2	58.8	30.8	69.2
Instruction quality met my expectations.	43.4	56.6*	30.2	69.8	27.3	72.7
Field placement provided opportunities related to my needs.	18.9	81.1	19.6	80.4*	16.2	83.8

Table 2 - Continued.

Field placement provided opportunities for career skills.	22.6	77.4	20.0	80.0*	10.8	89.2
There was a link between class and field.	45.3	54.7	39.1	60.9*	43.2	56.8

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree

<sup>2</sup> Agree

<sup>3</sup> This question was not asked on the 1991 questionnaire.

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

1991 or 1993, the rate of overall agreement with the questionnaire item slowly decreased over the three study years.

In 1992, there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=12.08$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $df=1$ ) between full-time and part-time student responses on the questionnaire item, "My social work courses were sequenced in a way that facilitated integration between courses." Part-time students were more likely to agree with this questionnaire item. There were no significant differences in 1991 or 1993. However, the overall rate of agreement with this questionnaire item increased slightly during each of the three study years.

For the questionnaire item, "The curriculum has been flexible enough to meet my educational needs and interests," there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=5.87$ ,  $p=.015$ ,  $df=1$ ) between the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1992, with full-time students being more likely to disagree than part-time students. There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1993. During all three years, however, both full-time and part-time students were more likely overall to agree with the questionnaire item than to disagree.

In 1991, there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=4.97$ ,  $p=.026$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students on the questionnaire item, "Generally, the quality of classroom instruction has met my expectations," with part-time students being more likely to agree than full-time students. There were no significant differences in either 1992 or 1993. However, overall agreement with the questionnaire item increased during each of the three years, and after 1991, full-time students were more likely to agree than to disagree with the questionnaire item.

For the questionnaire item, "My field placement has provided me with learning opportunities related to my learning needs and expectations," there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=5.01$ ,  $p=.025$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-

time and part-time students in 1992. During this year, part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree. There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1993. During the three study years, overall, students were more likely to agree with the item than to disagree.

In 1992, part-time students were more likely to agree with the questionnaire item, "For me, there has been a link between classroom instruction and my field placement education." This created a significant difference ( $X^2=5.63$ ,  $p=.018$ ,  $df=1$ ) between the responses of full-time and part-time students. There were no significant differences in 1991 or 1993. While part-time students were also more likely to agree with the questionnaire item in 1991, full-time students were more likely to agree in 1993.

#### Departmental Administrators

Table 3 shows the percentages for all items related to Departmental administrators for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

In 1991, there was a significant difference ( $X^2=8.92$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $df=1$ ) in full-time and part-time student responses to the questionnaire item, "The attitudes of departmental administrators toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness." Full-time students were more likely to agree with this questionnaire item than part-time students. While there were no significant differences in the

Table 3. Percentages for Items Related to  
Department Administration  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Administrators were competent.	54.8	45.2*	15.1	84.9	16.7	83.3
Administrators showed me concern.	36.2	63.8**	14.0	86.0	19.4	80.6

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree  
<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .  
\*\*  $p < .01$ .  
\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1992 or 1993, part-time students were increasingly more likely to agree with the questionnaire item. Full-time student agreement with this item remained relatively consistent over the three study years.

In 1991, there was also a significant difference ( $\chi^2=4.76$ ,  $p=.029$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students to the questionnaire item, "I have found Departmental administrators to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them." In this case, however, part-time students were more likely to



disagree with the questionnaire item. There were no significant differences in student responses in either 1992 or 1993. However, during these two years, both full-time and part-time students increasingly agreed with this questionnaire item.

#### Facilities and Resources

Table 4 shows the percentages for all items related to facilities and resources for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

Table 4. Percentages for Items Related to  
Facilities and Resources  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Library resources were adequate and accessible.	59.5	40.5	43.3	56.7***	45.2	54.8
Classrooms were adequate and accessible.	44.0	56.0	31.7	68.3*	45.5	54.5

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree

<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

In 1992, there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=10.95$ ,  $p=.001$ ,  $df=1$ ) between full-time and part-time student responses to the questionnaire item, "Reference materials and services of the library have been adequate and accessible." Full-time students were more likely than part-time students to disagree. There were no significant differences in student responses in either 1991 or 1993. While the overall rate of agreement with this questionnaire item improved during 1991 and 1993, part-time students were still more likely than full-time students to agree.

On the questionnaire item, "The location of the classrooms have been adequate and accessible to me," there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=6.43$ ,  $p=.011$ ,  $df=1$ ) in 1992 with full-time students being more likely to agree than part-time students. There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1991 or 1993. While full-time students were more likely to agree with the questionnaire item in 1991, part-time students were more likely to agree in 1993.

#### Student Services

Table 5 shows the percentages for items related to student services for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

On the questionnaire item, "The Department has assisted me to make use of educational services (i.e., registration, placement, financial aid, etc)," in 1991, there was a

significant difference ( $X^2=8.72$ ,  $p=.003$ ,  $df=1$ ) between student responses with part-time students being more likely than full-time students to disagree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1992 or 1993. However, in 1992, part-time students were more likely to agree with the questionnaire item, while in 1993, full-time students were more likely to agree.

Table 5. Percentages for Items Related to Student Services  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Advising process assisted me.	66.7	33.3	47.4	52.6	36.6	63.4
I had opportunities to participate in policy formulation.	52.0	48.0*	32.7	67.3	57.9	42.1*
My student rights were respected and protected.	32.0	68.0	21.3	78.7	16.7	83.3
The Department assisted me with educational services.	59.5	40.5**	31.0	69.0	37.1	62.9

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

- <sup>1</sup> Disagree  
<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

### Educational Milieu

Table 6 shows the percentages for items related to overall educational milieu for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

For the questionnaire item, "The overall environment of the Department has reflected a humanistic orientation that manifests the mission and concerns of a helping profession," there was a significant difference ( $X^2=4.84$ ,  $p=.028$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1991. During this year, full-time students were more likely than part-time students to agree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1992 or 1993. There was, however, an overall trend toward more students agreeing with the questionnaire item each year.

In 1992, there was a significant difference ( $X^2=4.29$ ,  $p=.038$ ,  $df=1$ ) in full-time and part-time student responses to the questionnaire item, "The Department has provided adequate information on its curriculum, policies, and procedures." During this year, part-time students were more likely to agree than full-time students. While there were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1993, full-time students were slightly more likely than part-time students to agree with the questionnaire item both years.

The responses to the questionnaire item, "The process of decision-making and governance in the Department has

Table 6. Percentages for Items Related to  
Overall Educational Milieu  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Department reflected mission of a helping profession.	26.3	73.7*	16.1	83.9	11.4	88.6
Encouraged to be actively involved in education.	22.4	77.6	11.5	88.5	11.9	88.1
Department climate fostered security.	53.3	46.7	29.0	71.0	36.6	63.4
Department provided adequate program information.	46.1	53.9	34.9	65.1*	23.8	76.2
Department provided adequate community activity information.	57.9	42.1	36.5	63.5	37.2	62.8
Department emphasized equality and cultural differences.	18.7	81.3	13.8	86.2	11.9	88.1
Department decision making reflected professional values.	55.4	44.6	29.2	70.8	32.4	67.6**

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree

<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

reflected the values of the profession, especially the democratic principles," produced a significant difference ( $X^2=7.75$ ,  $p=.005$ ,  $df=1$ ) in 1993, with full-time students being more likely to agree than part-time students. There were no significant differences in student responses to this questionnaire item in either 1991 or 1992. In 1991, full-time students were more likely than part-time students to agree with the questionnaire item, while in 1992, part-time students were more likely to agree than full-time students.

#### The Department as a Reference Group

Table 7 shows the percentages for items related to the Department as a reference group for 1991, 1992, 1993.

On the questionnaire item, "I feel that the local social work community has looked to the Department for leadership in matters related to social work education," there was a significant difference ( $X^2=4.30$ ,  $p=.038$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1991, with part-time students being more likely to disagree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1992 or 1993. In both of these years, overall, both full-time and part-time students were more likely to agree than to disagree with the questionnaire item.

In 1991, responses to the questionnaire item, "The Department has a significant impact upon the community in

Table 7. Percentages for Items Related to  
the Department as a Reference Group  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
I am proud of the Department within the University.	36.2	63.8	8.7	91.3	11.1	88.9
Social work community looked to the Department for leadership.	50.7	49.3*	18.2	81.8	30.8	69.2
Department had an impact on social work community.	44.8	55.2*	16.3	83.7	33.3	66.7

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree

<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

relation to issues of concern to social work," produced a significant difference ( $\chi^2=4.53$ ,  $p=.033$ ,  $df=1$ ) between the responses of full-time and part-time students, with full-time students being more likely to agree than part-time students. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1992 or 1993. In both of these years, part-time students agreed with the questionnaire item more than they had in 1991.

## Overall Perceptions

Table 8 shows the percentages for items related to overall perceptions for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

Table 8. Percentages for Items Related  
to Overall Perceptions  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Social work is an important profession.	2.6	97.4	1.6	98.4	0.0	100.0
I was prepared to develop competence as a social worker.	16.0	84.0	20.0	80.0**	17.5	82.5
I would recommend the CSUSB Department of Social Work.	21.1	78.9	22.6	77.4	20.5	79.5
I derived personal satisfaction from the MSW experience.	19.7	80.3	18.3	81.7	14.3	85.7
My overall experience was positive.	20.0	80.0	21.0	79.0	15.0	85.0

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

<sup>1</sup> Disagree

<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

For the questionnaire item, "I am being adequately



prepared to develop the competence required of a professional social worker," there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=7.69$ ,  $p=.006$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1992, with part-time students being more likely than full-time students to agree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1993. In 1991, full-time students were more likely to agree with the questionnaire item than part-time students. However, in 1993, this pattern reversed itself with part-time students being more likely to agree than full-time students.

#### Educational Equity

Table 9 shows the percentages for items related to educational equity for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

In 1992, there was a significant difference ( $\chi^2=6.26$ ,  $p=.012$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students to the questionnaire item, "My social work courses have included adequate content and bibliographic references on the cultural and ethnic populations of our society." During this year, part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1993. In 1991, part-time students were slightly more likely than full-time students to agree with the questionnaire item, whereas, in 1993,

Table 9. Percentages for Items Related  
to Educational Equity  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Courses included adequate content on ethnic populations.	28.0	72.0	13.1	86.9*	20.9	79.1
Curriculum strength was attention to cultural issues.	44.6	55.4	17.5	82.5	21.4	78.6
Library materials on ethnicity were adequate.	56.3	43.7	37.9	62.1	31.3	68.8
Had opportunity for curriculum input.	58.6	41.4	60.3	39.7	64.1	35.9
Curriculum was flexible enough to respond to diverse student body.	49.3	50.7	48.3	51.7	52.5	47.5
Faculty were sensitive to minority students.	22.9	77.1	12.5	87.5	5.6	94.4
Faculty attended to non-minority and minority students.	27.5	72.5	16.4	83.6	9.1	90.9
Would use faculty as role models.	50.0	50.0	25.0	75.0	10.8	89.2
Department attended to minority and non-minority students in field placements.	30.6	69.4	17.9	82.1	18.5	81.5
Advising process seemed meant for me.	77.5	22.5	56.4	43.6	51.4	48.6
I had personal support when needed.	54.3	45.7	41.1	58.9	21.6	78.4

Table 9 - Continued.

Student-faculty relations were not strained.	61.6	38.4	36.8	63.2	41.5	58.5*
Student-faculty relations were accepting of cultural differences.	30.1	69.9	17.5	82.5	17.9	82.1
Department environment was non-discriminatory.	38.4	61.6	14.3	85.7	12.5	87.5
Social atmosphere was accepting of cultural differences.	20.8	79.2	10.3	89.7	12.5	87.5
My ethnic heritage was valued.	49.3	50.7	23.1	76.9	15.6	84.4
Department manifested educational equity.	31.5	68.5	15.8	84.2	7.7	92.3
Department impacted the University in regard to minority students.	36.8	63.2	20.9	79.1*	40.0	60.0*
Proud of Department commitment to educational equity.	43.7	56.3	19.6	80.4	15.6	84.4
Department promoted equity.	30.9	69.1	21.2	78.8	11.4	88.6
Department's grading policies considered cultural differences.	44.4	55.6	20.9	79.1	16.0	84.0
Faculty were sensitive to cultural issues when evaluating student performance.	42.2	57.8	16.7	83.3	12.5	87.5

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

Table 9 - Continued.

- 1 Disagree
- 2 Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

full-time students were more likely than part-time students to agree.

For the questionnaire item, "I feel that student-faculty relationships in the Department have not been strained," there was a significant difference ( $X^2=6.19$ ,  $p=.013$ ,  $df=1$ ) in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1993. During that year, full-time students were more likely than part-time students to agree with the questionnaire item. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in either 1991 or 1992.

For the questionnaire item, "I feel the Department has had a significant impact on the University in relation to the recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students," the responses in 1992 ( $X^2=5.37$ ,  $p=.02$ ,  $df=1$ ) and 1993 ( $X^2=3.90$ ,  $p=.048$ ,  $df=1$ ) produced significant differences between full-time and part-time students. During both years, part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree. There were no significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in 1991.

In fact, in 1991, full-time students were more likely to agree with the questionnaire item than part-time students.

#### Department Faculty

Table 10 shows the percentages for all items related to the Department faculty for 1991, 1992, and 1993.

There were no significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students during the three study years on any of the items related to the Department faculty.

Table 10. Percentages for Items Related to Department Faculty  
1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item	1991		1992		1993	
	D <sup>1</sup>	A <sup>2</sup>	D	A	D	A
Faculty were competent.	32.9	67.1	19.0	81.0	20.9	79.1
Faculty showed concern and responsiveness.	27.4	72.6	30.2	69.8	9.3	90.7
Faculty exemplified professional social work.	37.0	63.0	21.3	78.7	11.6	88.4

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Percentages were adjusted for missing data.

- <sup>1</sup> Disagree  
<sup>2</sup> Agree

\*  $p < .05$ .  
\*\*  $p < .01$ .  
\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

## DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Hypotheses

In general, the hypotheses of this study were not supported by the findings. There were not any significant differences between full-time and part-time student responses in 1991, 1992, or 1993 on the questionnaire items, "In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive," or "The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness." Additionally, the responses of full-time and part-time students to the questionnaire item, "My field placement provided me with learning opportunities related to developing skills that are essential to my career plan," yielded significant differences only in 1992.

The questionnaire item, "There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that influence my education (i.e., Student Association)," was the only hypothesis item which provided significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in more than one year. However, these differences occurred only in 1991 and in 1993. During 1992, there were no significant differences in the responses.

Therefore, the hypotheses were only partially supported, and only minimally at that. Although one

hypothesis was that part-time students would report being less satisfied with their field placements than full-time students, this did not turn out to be true. This finding agreed with the literature. Fortune, Feathers, Rook, Scrimenti, Smollen, Stemerman, and Tucker (1985) found that relevant learning and student involvement in designing the field placement experience were two of the most important factors regarding field placement satisfaction. Additionally, Heppner and Roehlke (1984) found that prior social work experience did not impact the evaluation of field placement supervision.

It had been believed that part-time students would be less satisfied with their field placement experiences because the majority had many years of previous social work experience. Additionally, it was believed that with working full-time, the added stress of having to do a field placement would make the experience less positive for the part-time students.

The findings of this study would then seem to suggest that both full-time and part-time students, regardless of their previous social work experience, believed the learning experiences in their field placement settings were relevant. It would also seem likely that most students had input in designing their field placement responsibilities and experiences, thereby, increasing their satisfaction.

The results of this study would also seem to suggest that student status did not impact responses to the statement regarding faculty concern and responsiveness. The literature in this area focused primarily on the need to be cautious when utilizing student evaluations of faculty. However, as a whole, the student responses in this study seemed to indicate that students felt the Department faculty showed them concern and responsiveness.

Unless they were teaching an evening class, most faculty tended to be on campus during the day. This was believed to be a negative factor for part-time students who attended class primarily in the evening. However, the results of the study indicated that full-time and part-time students agreed with the faculty concern item on a relatively equal level. Therefore, part-time students perceived as much concern and responsiveness being shown to them by faculty as full-time students.

This could be due to several different factors. First of all, the faculty teaching evening classes may have shown enough concern and responsiveness that part-time students felt supported by them. Additionally, these faculty members may have been willing to be flexible with their office hours to accommodate meeting times with students who were often coming to class directly from work. Finally, if students needed to meet with faculty members who typically left



campus early, those faculty may also have been flexible with their meeting times in order to accommodate students. It would appear, however, that part of the reason for there being no significant differences in the responses between full-time and part-time students would be tied directly to positive things the faculty have done to assist part-time students.

Again, it was believed that since part-time students were on campus primarily in the evening, they would be less satisfied with the opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies that influenced their education. This included being involved in the Student Association. The results of this study would suggest that there was merit to this hypothesis since there were significant differences in the responses of full-time and part-time students in both 1991 and 1993. During both of these years, part-time students were more likely to disagree with the statement.

The findings for 1991 could possibly be explained by the fact that part-time students did not have representation on the Student Association. Due to concerns raised by part-time students early in the program, in 1992, it had been decided to have two sets of officers, full-time and part-time, who would work in conjunction with each other on Student Association issues. When it was time to hold the 1993 elections, there were some problems with electing two

slates. The Department eventually had to intervene to make this happen, and it is believed that the findings for 1993 were tied directly to the problems with this process. Because of how things were initially handled, many part-time students believed they were being excluded from student officer representation.

The situation was rectified, and it would appear that in 1993, the two groups of officers were able to work together effectively. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to suspect that this questionnaire item would produce more positive results in the future. If, however, the responses continue to be negative, it would be important to explore other ways students wanted to be involved in policy formulation, and if possible, to include them.

The final hypothesis was that, overall, part-time students would be less satisfied than full-time students with their experiences in the program. The research of Rosenthal, Wedel, and Wilson (1989) and Brennan and Black (1984) suggested that this hypothesis was not correct, and indeed, the results of this study did not support the hypothesis.

It had been thought by this researcher that part-time students would be less satisfied than full-time students with the MSW program overall because part-time students would be less satisfied with faculty support, their field

placements, and their ability to participate in extra Department activities and policy formulation through the Student Association. Since this hypothesis was a product of the other hypotheses added together, the explanation as to why this hypothesis was not true would be that, as a whole, the other hypotheses were not true, either.

Therefore, the results of the study generally found the hypotheses to not be true. However, there were other areas where significant differences were found between the responses of full-time and part-time students.

#### Other Significant Findings

##### Curriculum

The majority of other significant findings were from the statements regarding curriculum, and all but one of the significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students occurred in 1992.

Full-time students were more likely to disagree with the questionnaire item concerning the flexibility of the curriculum. Part-time students, however, were more likely than full-time students to agree with the questionnaire items regarding: curriculum being clear and relevant; courses being sequenced in a way that facilitated manageable learning; courses being sequenced in a way that facilitated integration between courses; the quality of instruction meeting their expectations; field placements providing

opportunities related to learning needs and expectations; field placements providing learning opportunities related to developing career skills; and a link existing between classroom instruction and field placement education.

Given that this pattern of responses occurred only in 1992, one would have to wonder if the significant differences between full-time and part-time students had more to do with the cohort group than with the curriculum itself.

The only other significant item under curriculum was on the questionnaire item regarding the quality of instruction meeting student expectations. This item was only significant in 1991 when part-time students were more likely to agree. Since that time, the level of student agreement with the questionnaire item has increased consistently. Therefore, it could be suggested that the 1991 responses were at least partially related to the newness of the MSW program.

The one questionnaire item which raised concerns other than those related to the significant difference in full-time and part-time student responses was the item on the link between classroom learning and field placement learning. During all three study years, the level of agreement with this questionnaire item has remained low. The highest rating was in 1992, with 60.9 percent of

students agreeing that there was a link between class and field placement learning. With one of the main goals of field placements being to integrate the knowledge obtained in class with the clients being seen in the field, one would hope to see a higher level of agreement. This may be an area for further review by the Department.

#### Departmental Administrators

Both questionnaire items on Department administrators produced significant differences in 1991, but not in 1992 or 1993. Given that the level of agreement increased for both full-time and part-time students on both of these questionnaire items during the past two years, it could be suggested that the 1991 results were based on the growing pains of a new program.

When the questionnaire was distributed at the end of the 1990-1991 school year, the program was completing its second year, in the process of hiring its third Director, and working hard to obtain initial accreditation from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). With so many major issues being in flux, it is relatively easy to see why students did not feel much concern or responsiveness from Department administrators. Additionally, knowing that a new Director was being hired may have impacted student responses on the statement about Department administrator competence. If students were unclear as to why a new Director was being

sought, they may have suspected this action was being taken due to a lack of competence of the current Director.

#### Facilities and Resources

The two questionnaire items on facilities and resources produced significant differences in 1992, but not in 1991 and 1993. In 1992, the full-time students were more likely to disagree with the questionnaire item about library reference materials, but more likely to agree with the questionnaire item about classroom location. It is difficult to explain why there was a significant difference during only one of the study years since all students have primarily had the same class locations for all three years, and have had access to most of the same reference materials during that same time period.

However, it may be more useful to look at the pattern of disagreement and agreement over the three year time period. When looking at the percentage of students who disagreed versus those who agreed with the questionnaire items on the adequacy and accessibility of both the classrooms and library resources, as a whole, students reflected high levels of disagreement on both items.

The situation with the classrooms may be reflective of students primarily attending class in the temporary trailers on the back part of the campus. They were quite a distance from the parking lots, and were not seen as being as

comfortable as classrooms in the permanent buildings. The situation with the library resources may be reflective of the MSW program being relatively new. Because of this, the journals most applicable to Social Work have only recently been subscribed. Therefore, it is difficult to find reference materials which are older than five years.

As permanent classrooms are made available to the Department of Social Work, and as the library has an opportunity to add to the Social Work journals in their holdings, both of these situations may resolve themselves.

#### Student Services

In 1991, there was a significant difference between the responses of full-time and part-time students on the questionnaire item regarding the Department assisting students with educational services. Part-time students were more likely to disagree with this statement than full-time students.

One possible explanation for this finding might be that with part-time students being on campus in the evenings, they were less likely to hear about registration and financial aid information. As the Department became aware of part-time students not receiving this information either in a timely manner, or at all, they became more conscious about making sure part-time students received the information. In fact, in 1991, the Department changed their

advisement system so that the field placement faculty liaison was also the students' advisor. This questionnaire item was not significant in either of the other two years, and the percentage of agreement with the item increased in 1992 and remained consistent in 1993. Therefore, it appears the problem was resolved in some way.

#### Educational Milieu

There were three questionnaire items in this category which produced significant findings. The first statement concerned the Department reflecting a humanistic orientation and manifesting the mission of a helping profession. During 1991, full-time students were more likely to agree with this statement.

This finding could possibly be explained by the fact that previously discussed findings indicated part-time students felt less supported by Department administrators, felt they were not being helped in making use of available educational services, and did not feel they had the opportunity to participate in policy formulation through the Student Association. Helping professionals are typically viewed as supportive, informative, and fair in their dealings with other people. If part-time students did not feel the Department was being supportive, informative, and/or fair, then it is reasonable to see why they did not feel the Department reflected the orientation and mission of



a helping profession.

The second significant difference was in 1992 when part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree that the Department had provided adequate curriculum, policy, and procedure information. Given that the 1992 full-time students were, as a whole, dissatisfied with the curriculum, it is suggested that this result is a continuation of that particular cohort group's lack of satisfaction with the program.

The third significant difference was with part-time students in 1993 being more likely to agree with the questionnaire item about the Department reflecting democratic principles. This finding may be directly tied to the student officer elections at the end of the 1993 school year. While part-time students were not pleased with original decisions made about the elections, their concerns were heard, and the elections were ultimately conducted in a manner which ensured the inclusion of part-time students.

#### The Department as a Reference Group

In 1991, there were two questionnaire items under this category which produced significant differences. One had to do with the local social work community looking to the Department for leadership, and the other with the Department having an impact on the local social work community. Part-

time students were more likely to disagree with the statement about the social work community looking to the Department for leadership. Additionally, full-time students were more likely to agree with the statement about the Department having an impact on the local social work community.

These responses may be indicative of the MSW program still being relatively new to the community. In 1991, the program was just getting ready to graduate its first class, and had really not had much opportunity to impact or provide leadership within the community. A high percentage of students enrolled in the program during this time were local County employees. It is possible that their ideas on how the program could and should impact the community exceeded the abilities of a young program.

#### Overall Perceptions

Part-time students in 1992 were more likely than full-time students to agree with the questionnaire item about being prepared to develop the competence of a professional social worker. Again, given the full-time students predilection to respond unfavorably to statements regarding curriculum, it is not surprising that they would be less likely to believe they were being prepared to develop competence as a social worker. If they did not believe in

the curriculum, which was half of their learning experience, then they would probably not believe they were being effectively educated and trained as social workers, either.

#### Educational Equity

In 1993, full-time students were more likely to agree that student-faculty relationships were not strained. This finding is probably partially related, again, to the student election process of that year. Although part-time students were able to retain representation in the Student Association, the process of reaching that goal impacted student-faculty relationships with at least one faculty member.

As a whole, however, student ratings of this questionnaire item have been low. The highest level of agreement with this item was in 1992 when 63.2 percent of the students agreed. It is difficult to assess the significance of these ratings, however, because it is unknown exactly what students consider to be strained relationships. It would be important to remember the concerns expressed by Koeske and Koeske (1989), Petchers and Chow (1988), and Weinbach (1988) when determining exactly what these particular ratings may indicate, since they could be tied to factors which faculty cannot and/or should not change.

The other two questionnaire items had to do with

courses including adequate content on cultural and ethnic populations and the Department's impact on the University with regard to the recruitment and retention of minority students. In both cases, the significant differences occurred in 1992, and part-time students were more likely than full-time students to agree. Additionally, for the questionnaire item on the Department impacting the retention and recruitment of minority students, there was also a significant difference in 1993, with part-time students again being more likely to agree with the item.

Given that there were no other concerns regarding adequate ethnic content in the curriculum, this finding may be explained, yet again, by the 1992 cohort group. However, the questionnaire item regarding the Department impacting the University in regard to the retention and recruitment of minority students was significant two years in a row. In both cases, part-time students were more likely to agree with the item. Given that the percentage of minority students was higher in the part-time program during both 1992 and 1993, these findings may suggest they were more aware of issues related to minority students, and satisfied overall with what they observed.

#### Other Areas of Concern

In addition to those areas where there were

significant differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students, the findings of this study also suggested that there were other areas of concern which the Department of Social Work needs to be aware.

When looking at the percentage of students who disagreed versus the percentage of students who agreed with each questionnaire item, it was found that there were eight questionnaire items which produced either more disagreement than agreement, or an approximate fifty-fifty split between agreement and disagreement, usually during all three study years. Five of these items were already discussed since the differences between the responses of full-time and part-time students were significant. However, the other three items also seem to be crucial areas to look at, especially since all three fell under the category of educational equity.

For the questionnaire item, "I feel I have been given adequate opportunity to offer input for planning or changes in the social work curriculum," students disagreed more than agreed during all three years of the study period. The highest rate of agreement with this statement was 41.4 percent in 1991. Since then, the amount of agreement has dropped each year.

The second questionnaire item was, "The social work curriculum has been flexible enough to respond to the needs and interests of its diverse body." Students were more

likely to agree with this statement in both 1991 and 1992, with the highest percentage being 51.7 percent in 1992. However, in 1993, 52.5 percent of the students disagreed with this statement.

The third questionnaire item was, "I feel the Department's advising process and procedures were meant for me; they seem to have been designed for students like me." While students have become more likely to agree with this item over the three year study period, more students still disagree with this statement than agree. In 1993, 48.6 percent of the students agreed with the item, and this was the highest level of agreement during the three years.

From the level of disagreement with these statements, it can be suggested that a large portion of the students did not feel as if they had an opportunity to assist in planning the curriculum. Additionally, they did not feel that the curriculum was flexible enough to respond to the diverse student body or that the advising process seemed meant for them.

It is difficult to interpret these results. On the one hand, the Department administration and faculty should be responsible for curriculum development. However, the students may be saying that they wanted some say in curriculum decisions. Given that students tend to see the curriculum as being inflexible, part of what they might have

been looking for was input on how to make the program more flexible. However, as was stated in the introduction, it would be virtually impossible to develop a program which totally appealed to all students. Therefore, a balance might need to be achieved whereby students feel they have had some input on ways to make the curriculum more flexible. However, it would seem important for ground rules to be set with regard to the final decisions being made by the Department faculty and administration.

The results of the questionnaire item on the advising process were also interesting. The purpose of advising is primarily to help students decide what courses to take in order to reach their goal of graduating. In the MSW program, those choices were few as the majority of the program was already laid out based on the concentration the student had selected. In reality, the student was left to find three elective classes to take. Given that, it is difficult to assess exactly what students felt was missing from the advising process. One speculation would be that students were looking for some other type of emotional support when they went in for "advising", but did not receive what they were looking for, and therefore, felt the advising process was not meant for them. This might be an area to further explore in future studies.

### Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations with this research project. Because data were collected from students only at the California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), Master's of Social Work (MSW) program, one limitation of this study was that the results cannot be generalized to any other MSW program. In order to allow for generalization of results, study results from the CSUSB MSW program would need to be compared to student responses from other programs, such as California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) or California State University, Pomona.

Secondly, the sample size for each individual year was small, making the assessment of significant student responses more difficult. This limitation would be difficult to address due to class-size limitations in the MSW program at CSUSB. However, if the Department was to ensure that all students responded to the questionnaire, and that all questionnaires were returned to the Department, the sample size would increase significantly.

Thirdly, there was also a limitation with regard to comparing the three study years as the sample consisted of a group of overlapping cohorts. This meant that students answered the questionnaire two to three times during their time in the program. However, if the Department chooses to utilize this questionnaire annually, this limitation will



always exist.

Fourthly, it was difficult to compare patterns and trends over only a three year time period. In order to effectively decide which areas of concern should be looked at more closely, the Department must continue to evaluate the questionnaire findings on an annual basis, tracking those areas which students continue to evaluate more negatively than positively, or those areas which continue to indicate significant differences in student responses.

Finally, there was a limitation in that the only independent variable used in this research project was that of student status. It could be important to research the correlation between the other demographic data provided at the end of the questionnaire and student satisfaction with the MSW program.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

One recommendation for further research would be that further studies be done to determine what, if any, other independent variables effect one's perceptions and feelings about the MSW program. Given the amount of information contained in the demographic data on the questionnaires, there are several possible options for further research.

Are women more or less likely than men to be satisfied with the program? Does marital status effect student

responses? Does having children impact student perceptions positively, negatively, or not at all? Does working have an impact on student responses? If so, does it effect only those students working full-time, or does it also effect those working part-time? Does age or amount of previous social work experience make a difference?

A second recommendation for further research would be to look at those areas where student responses over the three year study period either tended to be more negative than positive, or bordered on a fifty-fifty split between agreement and disagreement. It might be useful to approach this through a primarily qualitative study where the researcher explored with students ways in which those areas might be improved. If this approach were to be used, a student researcher might be better able than faculty to obtain information from students.

#### Implications for Evaluation of Social Work Practice

The results of this study could be useful to the Department of Social Work faculty and administration. To begin with, it was found that, as a whole, student status did not really impact how students perceived the program. While there were a few areas where significant differences existed between full-time and part-time students, those areas were not significantly different across the three year

study period. Instead, they tended to be isolated to one year of the study, and in many cases, the results could be traced to specific events which occurred during that year.

The results of this study also suggested, however, that there were areas where student satisfaction, both for full-time and part-time students, was low. In some of these cases, students have disagreed more than agreed with particular questionnaire items for all three study years. In other cases, the level of agreement has decreased during the three study years.

Through having a better understanding of the areas where both full-time and part-time students continually perceive the program to have gaps and problems, the faculty and administration of the Department of Social Work could then have a better idea of where to focus their energy and implement changes. By correcting problematic areas, the satisfaction of students would increase, creating more positive teaching experiences for the faculty and learning experiences for the students.

### Conclusion

The research question for this study was "What are the perceived differences in the experiences of full-time students and part-time students in regard to those areas which should be viewed the same by both groups of students"?

This study has shown that although part-time students may talk as if full-time students had it easier than them, or visa versa, there are really no quantifiable differences in their experiences. Therefore, the expressed differences are really student perceptions, not reality.

While student status did not seem to impact how students viewed the program, there were still some areas of concern. With the MSW program being five years old and through the original accreditation process, it would seem as if now would be a good time to evaluate the results of this research project, and see what changes, if any, could or should be made to enhance the overall quality of the program. The program foundation is already in place, and from the results of the study, it would appear that only some fine tuning is needed.

Through the use of these study results, as well as possible future study results, the Department could choose to make changes to the program which would enhance not only the learning experience for students, but the overall reputation of the program within the University and the local social work community. With the increased need for effectively educated and trained social workers, the community at large would certainly benefit.

## APPENDIX A

### Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1991 Questionnaire

#### Introduction:

The purpose of this inventory is to provide an opportunity for you to evaluate your experience as a student in the Department of Social Work. The information that you and your fellow students provide will assist the faculty and administration in ongoing review and further development of the Department's program. Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous and will in no way affect the evaluation of your performance as a student. We need, want, and very much appreciate your help.

#### Instructions:

Listed in this part are a number of statements representing variables that are believed to have significance for professional education in social work. These statements are grouped in nine general categories: (A) curriculum, (B) Faculty, (C) Administration, (D) facilities and resources, (E) student services, (F) educational milieu, (G) School as a Reference Group, (H) overall perceptions, and (I) Educational Equity. In responding to the statements, please rely on your own experiences. Be sure to respond to all statements.

1) Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with each question by using the following scale:

- 5 = SA (Strongly Agree)
- 4 = A (Agree)
- 3 = N (Neutral - no strong positive or negative feelings)
- 2 = D (Disagree)
- 1 = SD (Strongly Disagree)
- 0 = DT or NA (Don't know or not applicable)

2) Where you are asked for your comments and suggestions, please answer on the survey form.

A. Curriculum:

1. The objectives and content of the curriculum have been clear and relevant to my development as a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

2. My social work courses were sequenced in a way that facilitated manageable and progressive learning on my part.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

3. My social work courses were sequenced in a way that facilitated integration between courses.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

4. For me, there has been adequate opportunity for both cognitive and experiential learning in the program.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

5. In the courses I have taken this year, my performance has been evaluated with fairness, and the feedback has been adequate and helpful.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

6. The curriculum has been flexible enough to meet my educational needs and interests.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

7. Opportunities to evaluate the social work courses I have take have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

8. Opportunities to evaluate the field component of my course have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

9. Generally, the quality of classroom instruction has met my expectations.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

10. My field placement(s) has provided me with learning opportunities related to my learning needs and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

11. My field placement(s) provided me with learning opportunities related to developing skills that are essential to my career plan.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

12. For me, there has been a link between classroom instruction and my field placement education.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

13. I feel that I have been trained to work with the diverse needs of a multicultural client population.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

Questions 14 to 16 should be answered by graduating students only.

14. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to practice at an advanced level in my chosen specialty.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

15. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene with individuals, families, and groups.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

16. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene on behalf of clients at the community and policy levels.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

17. Comments and suggestions regarding the curriculum:  
(Use other side of page, if required).



B. Departmental Faculty:

14. I have found members of the faculty to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

15. The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

16. My impression is that members of the faculty exemplify the attitudes and behaviors expected of professional social workers.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

17. Comments and suggestions regarding the faculty: (Use other side of page, if required).

C. Departmental Administration:

18. I have found departmental administrators to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

19. The attitudes of departmental administrators toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

20. Comments and suggestions regarding departmental administration: (Use other side of page, if required).

D. Facilities and Resources:

21. Reference materials and services of the library have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

22. The locations of the classrooms have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

23. Comments and suggestions regarding facilities and resources: (Use other side of page, if required).

E. Student Services:

24. The Departmental advising process and procedures have assisted me in my professional education.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

25. There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that influence my education (i.e., Student Association).

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

26. I believe my rights as a student have been respected and protected.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

27. The Department has assisted me to make use of educational services (e.g., registration, placement, financial aid, etc.).

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

28. Comments and suggestions regarding student services:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

F. Educational Milieu:

29. The overall environment of the Department has reflected a humanistic orientation that manifests the mission and concern of a helping profession.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

30. I have been encouraged to be actively involved in my education.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

31. Generally, the social climate in the Department has fostered in me a sense of aspiration and security.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

32. The Department has provided adequate information about its curriculum, policies, and procedures.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

33. The Department has provided adequate information about professional activities in the community.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

34. The Department has an orientation that emphasizes the basic equality of all persons, while appreciating and respecting cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

35. The process of decision-making and governance in the Department has reflected the values of the profession, especially the democratic principles.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

36. Comments and suggestions regarding the educational milieu in the Department: (Use other side of page, if required).

G. The Department as a Reference Group:

37. In my contacts with students from other departments in the University, I have had a sense of pride in identifying myself as a student of the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

38. I feel that the local social work community has looked to the Department for leadership in matters related to social work education.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

39. The Department has significant impact upon the community in relation to issues of concern to social work.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

40. Comments and suggestions regarding the Department as a Reference Group: (Use other side of page, if required).

H. Overall Perceptions:

41. I believe that social work is an important profession making significant contributions to human betterment.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

42. I am being adequately prepared to develop the competence required of a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

43. I would feel comfortable recommending the CSUSB Department of Social Work to anyone interested in social work education.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

44. I have derived a sense of personal satisfaction from my involvement in the overall educational experiences in the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

45. In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

46. Comments and suggestions regarding overall perceptions:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

I. Educational Equity:

This section of the inventory invites you to evaluate the Department's cross-cultural educational base and issues of educational equity. (Educational equity refers to a system of education extending comparable opportunities to all students regardless of culture, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual preference, age, class, or ability.) Educational equity is premised on the basic equality of all persons.

The statements in this section are intended to tap your perceptions of the Department's cross-cultural educational emphasis and the ways the Department puts into effect the objectives of educational equity in its curriculum policy and practices.

Your views in these areas will assist us in further review and development of the Department's programs. We have provided space at the end of this section for you to include comments and suggestions not already covered by the statements.

47. My social work courses have included adequate content and bibliographic references on the cultural and ethnic populations of our society.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

48. Generally, the strength of the social work curriculum lies in the attention it has given to the concerns and needs of cultural and ethnic groups.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

49. Library collections and reference materials pertaining to culture and ethnicity have been adequate to support the Department's cross-cultural educational base.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

50. I feel I have been given adequate opportunity to offer input for planning or changes in the social work curriculum.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

51. The social work curriculum has been flexible enough to respond to the needs and interests of its diverse body.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

52. The attitudes and behavior of Department faculty have reflected sensitivity to educational aspirations of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

53. Department and faculty have given enough care and attention to minority and non-minority students in helping them achieve their educational goals.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

54. I would use the sensitivity of my faculty as a role model for myself.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA



55. I would use as a role model a faculty of what ethnicity?

1 \_\_\_\_\_ Anglo      2 \_\_\_\_\_ Asian      3 \_\_\_\_\_ Black  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic    5 \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity not relevant

56. My general impression is that the Department has given comparable attention to the needs and requirements of minority and non-minority students in the use and allocation of field work placements.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

57. I feel the Department's advising process and procedures were meant for me; they seem to have been designed for students like me.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

58. I feel that I had appropriate personal support services made available when I needed them.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

59. I feel that student-faculty relationships in the Department have not been strained.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

60. Student-faculty relationships have reflected neutral recognition and equal acceptance of different cultural backgrounds and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

61. The Department's overall environment has been non-discriminatory and non-prejudicial to its students regardless of their personal characteristics or abilities.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

62. The social atmosphere in the Department has reflected a respect and acceptance of cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

63. I feel my ethnic heritage (minority or non-minority) has been valued by the Department.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

64. The educational milieu of the Department has manifested the objectives of educational equity for all students.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

65. I feel the Department has significant impact on the University in relation to recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

66. I take pride in the Department's commitment to the objectives of educational equity as they have been reflected in its educational mission, policy, and practices.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

67. The Department has taken genuine steps for promoting and sustaining the ideals of educational equity.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

68. The Department's grading policy and practices have given adequate consideration of the linguistic and cultural differences of the students.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

69. In evaluating student performance, Department faculty have been sensitive to the differing abilities, potential, and aspirations of the culturally and ethnically diverse student population.

0	1	2	3	4	5
DT/NA	SD	D	N	A	SA

70. Additional comments regarding the cross-cultural educational base and ways it might be strengthened and improved:

71. Additional comments regarding educational equity as you experienced it and ways it might be enhanced: (Continue comments on back of this page, if needed).

Now we would like to ask you some background questions.

NOTE: IF YOU FEEL ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WILL IDENTIFY YOU, SKIP THE QUESTION.

72. Are you a:

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time student

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student

73. Is your concentration in:

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ Children, Youth, and Families

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Mental Health

74. What was your undergraduate major?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ Social work/welfare

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

75. How many months/years of paid social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

(1) 1 to 12 months    (2) 1 to 2 years    (3) 2 to 4 years

(4) 4 to 6 years    (5) more than 6 years    (6) none

76. How many months/years of unpaid (volunteer) social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

(1) 1 to 12 months    (2) 1 to 2 years    (3) 2 to 4 years

(4) 4 to 6 years    (5) more than 6 years    (6) none

We would also like to have some personal background information.

77. Age:

(1) 20-26    (2) 27-32    (3) 33-38    (4) 39-44

(5) 45-50    (6) 51-62    (7) 57-62    (8) 63 and up

78. Marital Status:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Single
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Married or Couple
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ Separated
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

79. Do you have any children?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

80. Are you presently employed?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, part-time
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, full-time

For graduating students only:

81. Have you accepted a position yet?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, please let the Department know your title, agency and contact numbers. If no, as soon as you do accept a position, please let the department know your title, agency, and contact numbers.

82. Are you currently employed at a social work agency in the Inland Empire?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

83. If the answer to question 82 is yes, did your employer make any arrangements in terms of release time or other arrangements to support your studies?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

84. Did you receive any financial grants?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, which grants? \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.

Any further comments about the program and/or your experiences here? (Use other side of page, if required).

## APPENDIX B

### Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1992 Questionnaire

#### Introduction:

The purpose of this inventory is to provide an opportunity for you to evaluate your experience as a student in the Department of Social Work. The information that you and your fellow students provide will assist the faculty and administration in ongoing review and further development of the Department's programs. Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous and will in no way affect the evaluation of your performance as a student. We need, want, and very much appreciate your help.

#### Instructions:

Listed in this part are a number of statements representing variables that are believed to have significance for professional education in social work. These statements are grouped in nine general categories: (A) curriculum, (B) Faculty, (C) Administration, (D) facilities and resources, (E) student services, (F) educational milieu, (G) School as a Reference Group, (H) overall perceptions, and (I) Educational Equity. In responding to the statements, please rely on your own experiences. Be sure to respond to all statements.

1) Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with each question by using the following scale:

- 4 = SA (Strongly Agree)
- 3 = A (Agree)
- 2 = D (Disagree)
- 1 = SD (Strongly Disagree)
- 0 = DT or NA (Don't know or not applicable)

2) Where you are asked for your comments and suggestions, please answer on the survey form.

A. Curriculum:

1. The objectives and content of the curriculum have been clear and relevant to my development as a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. My social work courses have been sequenced in a way that facilitated manageable and progressive learning for me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. My social work courses have been sequenced in a way that facilitated integration between courses.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. For me, there has been adequate opportunity for both cognitive and experiential learning in the program.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. In the courses I have taken this year, my performance has been evaluated with fairness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. In the courses I have taken this year, the feedback has been adequate and helpful.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA



7. The curriculum has been flexible enough to meet my educational needs and interests.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. Opportunities to evaluate the social work courses I have taken have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

9. Opportunities to evaluate the field component of my course have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

10. Generally, the quality of classroom instruction has met my expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

11. My field placement(s) has provided me with learning opportunities related to my learning needs and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

12. My field placement(s) provided me with learning opportunities for developing skills that are essential to my career plan.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

13. For me, there has been a link between classroom instruction and my field placement education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

Questions 14 to 16 should be answered by graduating students only.

14. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to practice at an advanced level in my chosen specialty.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

15. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene with individuals, families, and groups.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

16. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene on behalf of clients at the community and policy levels.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

17. Comments and suggestions regarding the curriculum: (Use other side of page, if required).

B. Departmental Faculty:

1. I have found members of the faculty to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. My impression is that members of the faculty exemplify the attitudes and behaviors expected of professional social workers.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. Comments and suggestions regarding the faculty: (Use other side of page, if required).

C. Administration:

1. I have found administrators to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The attitudes of administrators toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Comments and suggestions regarding administration:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

D. Facilities and Resources:

1. Reference materials and services of the library have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The locations of the classrooms have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Comments and suggestions regarding facilities and resources: (Use other side of page, if required).

E. Student Services:

1. The Departmental advising process and procedures have assisted me in my professional education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that influence my education (i.e., Student Association).

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. I believe my rights as a student have been respected and protected.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. The Department has assisted me to make use of educational services (e.g., registration, placement, financial aid, etc.).

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. Comments and suggestions regarding student services:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

F. Overall Departmental Educational Milieu:

1. The overall environment of the Department has reflected a humanistic orientation which manifests the mission and concern of a helping profession.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I have been encouraged to be actively involved in my education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Generally, the social climate among students and faculty in the Department has fostered in me a sense of aspiration and security.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. The Department has provided adequate information about its curriculum, policies, and procedures.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. The Department has provided adequate information about professional activities in the community.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. The Department has an orientation that emphasizes the basic equality of all persons, while appreciating and respecting cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

7. The process of decision-making and governance in the Department has reflected the values of the profession, especially the democratic principles.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. Comments and suggestions regarding the educational milieu in the Department: (Use other side of page, if required).

G. The Department as a Reference Group:

1. In my contacts with students from other departments in the University, I have had a sense of pride in identifying myself as a student of the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I feel that the local social work community has looked to the Department for leadership in matters related to social work education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. The Department has significant impact upon the community in relation to issues of concern to social work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. Comments and suggestions regarding the Department as a Reference Group: (Use other side of page, if required).

H. Overall Perceptions:

1. I think that social work is an important profession making significant contributions to human betterment.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I am being adequately prepared to develop the competence required of a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. I would feel comfortable recommending the CSUSB Department of Social Work to anyone interested in social work education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. I have derived a sense of personal satisfaction from my involvement in the overall educational experiences in the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA



6. Comments and suggestions regarding overall perceptions:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

I. Educational Equity:

This section of the inventory invites you to evaluate the Department's cross-cultural educational base and issues of educational equity. (Educational equity refers to a system of education extending comparable opportunities to all students regardless of culture, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual preference, age, class, or ability.) Educational equity is premised on the basic equality of all persons.

The statements in this section are intended to tap your perceptions of the Department's cross-cultural educational emphasis and the ways the Department puts into effect the objectives of educational equity in its curriculum policy and practices.

Your views in these areas will assist us in further review and development of the Department's programs. We have provided space at the end of this section for you to include comments and suggestions not already covered by the statements.

1. My social work courses have included adequate content and bibliographic references on the cultural and ethnic populations of our society.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. Generally, a strength of the social work curriculum lies in the attention it has given to the concerns and needs of cultural and ethnic groups.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Library collections and reference materials pertaining to culture and ethnicity have been adequate to support the Department's goal of cross-cultural education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. I feel I have been given adequate opportunity to offer input for planning or changes in the social work curriculum.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. The social work curriculum has been flexible enough to respond to the needs and interests of its diverse body.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. The attitudes and behavior of Department faculty have reflected sensitivity to the educational aspirations of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

7. The Department and faculty have given enough care and attention to minority and non-minority students in helping them achieve their educational goals.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. I would use the sensitivity of my faculty as a role model for myself.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

9. I would use as a role model a faculty member whose ethnicity is?

1 \_\_\_\_\_ Anglo      2 \_\_\_\_\_ Asian      3 \_\_\_\_\_ African/  
American  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ Latino      5 \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity not relevant

10. My general impression is that the Department has given comparable attention to the needs and requirements of minority and non-minority students in the use and allocation of field work placements.

0	1	2	3	4
-----				
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

11. I feel the Department's advising process and procedures were meant for me; they seem to have been designed for students like me.

0	1	2	3	4
-----				
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

12. I feel that I had appropriate personal support services made available when I needed them.

0	1	2	3	4
-----				
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

13. I feel that student-faculty relationships in the Department have not been strained.

0	1	2	3	4
-----				
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

14. Student-faculty relationships have reflected neutral recognition and equal acceptance of different cultural backgrounds and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
-----				
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

15. The Department's overall environment has been non-discriminatory and non-prejudicial to its students regardless of their personal characteristics or abilities.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

16. The social atmosphere in the Department has reflected a respect and acceptance of cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

17. I feel my ethnic heritage (minority or non-minority) has been valued by the Department.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

18. The educational milieu of the Department has manifested the objectives of educational equity for all students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

19. I feel the Department has had a significant impact on the University in relation to recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

20. I take pride in the Department's commitment to the objectives of educational equity as they have been reflected in its educational mission, policy, and practices.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

21. The Department has taken clear steps to promote and sustain the ideals of educational equity.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

22. The Department's grading policy and practices have given adequate consideration of the linguistic and cultural differences of the students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

23. In evaluating student performance, Department faculty have been sensitive to the differing abilities, potential, and aspirations of the culturally and ethnically diverse student population.

0	1	2	3	4
D		DT/NA	SD	D
				A

24. Additional comments regarding educational equity as you experienced it and ways it might be enhanced: (Continue comments on back of this page, if needed).

Now we would like to ask you some background questions.

NOTE: WE DO NOT LOOK AT INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRES, RATHER WE LOOK AT AGGREGATE FINDINGS ACROSS THE TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION. HOWEVER, IF YOU PREFER NOT TO ANSWER ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BECAUSE IT MIGHT IDENTIFY YOU, THEN SKIP THAT QUESTION.

1. Are you a:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time student (First Year)
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time student (Second Year)
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (First Year)
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (Second Year)
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (Third Year)

2. Is your concentration in:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Children, Youth, and Families
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Mental Health

3. What was your undergraduate major?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Social work/welfare
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many months/years of paid social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

5. How many months/years of unpaid (volunteer) social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

We would also like to have some personal background information.

6. Age: \_\_\_\_\_ years

7. Gender: \_\_\_\_\_ female \_\_\_\_\_ male

8. Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_ African/American \_\_\_\_\_ Latino  
\_\_\_\_\_ Asian \_\_\_\_\_ Anglo  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

9. Marital Status:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Single  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Married or Couple  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ Separated  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed  
(6) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you have any children?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

11. During the past year, have you been employed? (Do not count paid field placement).

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, \_\_\_\_\_ Number of hours per week

12. If the answer to question 11 is no, skip to question

15. If the answer to question 11 is yes, has your employment been at a social work agency in the Inland Empire?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

13. If the answer to question 12 is yes, did your employer make any arrangements to facilitate your studies?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

14. Did you receive any financial grants during the past year?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, which grants? \_\_\_\_\_

15. (For graduating students only) Have you accepted a position yet?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, please write in your title, agency, and contact numbers. If no, as soon as you do accept a position, please let the Department know your title, agency, and contact numbers.

---

---

---

---

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

Any further comments about the program and/or your experiences here? (Use other side of page, if required).



## APPENDIX C

### Inventory of Student's Assessment of Educational Experience 1993 Questionnaire

#### Introduction:

The purpose of this inventory is to provide an opportunity for you to evaluate your experience as a student in the Department of Social Work. The information that you and your fellow students provide will assist the faculty and administration in ongoing review and further development of the Department's programs. Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous and will in no way affect the evaluation of your performance as a student. We need, want, and very much appreciate your help.

#### Instructions:

Listed in this part are a number of statements representing variables that are believed to have significance for professional education in social work. These statements are grouped in nine general categories: (A) curriculum, (B) Faculty, (C) Administration, (D) facilities and resources, (E) student services, (F) educational milieu, (G) School as a Reference Group, (H) overall perceptions, and (I) Educational Equity. In responding to the statements, please rely on your own experiences. Be sure to respond to all statements.

1) Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement with each question by using the following scale:

- 4 = SA (Strongly Agree)
- 3 = A (Agree)
- 2 = D (Disagree)
- 1 = SD (Strongly Disagree)
- 0 = DT or NA (Don't know or not applicable)

2) Where you are asked for your comments and suggestions, please answer on the survey form.

A. Curriculum:

1. The objectives and content of the curriculum have been clear and relevant to my development as a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. My social work courses have been sequenced in a way that facilitated manageable and progressive learning for me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. My social work courses have been sequenced in a way that facilitated integration between courses.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. For me, there has been adequate opportunity for both cognitive and experiential learning in the program.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. In the courses I have taken this year, my performance has been evaluated with fairness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. In the courses I have taken this year, the feedback has been adequate and helpful.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

7. The curriculum has been flexible enough to meet my educational needs and interests.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. Opportunities to evaluate the social work courses I have taken have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

9. Opportunities to evaluate the field component of my course have been adequate.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

10. Generally, the quality of classroom instruction has met my expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

11. My field placement(s) has provided me with learning opportunities related to my learning needs and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

12. My field placement(s) provided me with learning opportunities for developing skills that are essential to my career plan.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

13. For me, there has been a link between classroom instruction and my field placement education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

Questions 14 to 16 should be answered by graduating students only.

14. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to practice at an advanced level in my chosen specialty.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

15. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene with individuals, families, and groups.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

16. Overall, I feel that I have been prepared to intervene on behalf of clients at the community and policy levels.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

17. Comments and suggestions regarding the curriculum:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

B. Departmental Faculty:

1. I have found members of the faculty to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The attitudes of faculty toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. My impression is that members of the faculty exemplify the attitudes and behaviors expected of professional social workers.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. Comments and suggestions regarding the faculty: (Use other side of page, if required).

C. Administration:

1. I have found administrators to be competent in terms of the functions and responsibilities assigned to them.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The attitudes of administrators toward me have reflected concern and responsiveness.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Comments and suggestions regarding administration:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

D. Facilities and Resources:

1. Reference materials and services of the library have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. The locations of the classrooms have been adequate and accessible to me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Comments and suggestions regarding facilities and resources: (Use other side of page, if required).

E. Student Services:

1. The Departmental advising process and procedures have assisted me in my professional education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. There have been opportunities for me to participate in the formulation of policies that influence my education (i.e., Student Association).

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. I believe my rights as a student have been respected and protected.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. The Department has assisted me to make use of educational services (e.g., registration, placement, financial aid, etc.).

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. Comments and suggestions regarding student services:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

F. Overall Departmental Educational Milieu:

1. The overall environment of the Department has reflected a humanistic orientation which manifests the mission and concern of a helping profession.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I have been encouraged to be actively involved in my education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Generally, the social climate among students and faculty in the Department has fostered in me a sense of aspiration and security.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. The Department has provided adequate information about its curriculum, policies, and procedures.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. The Department has provided adequate information about professional activities in the community.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. The Department has an orientation that emphasizes the basic equality of all persons, while appreciating and respecting cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA



7. The process of decision-making and governance in the Department has reflected the values of the profession, especially the democratic principles.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. Comments and suggestions regarding the educational milieu in the Department: (Use other side of page, if required).

G. The Department as a Reference Group:

1. In my contacts with students from other departments in the University, I have had a sense of pride in identifying myself as a student of the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I feel that the local social work community has looked to the Department for leadership in matters related to social work education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. The Department has significant impact upon the community in relation to issues of concern to social work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. Comments and suggestions regarding the Department as a Reference Group: (Use other side of page, if required).

H. Overall Perceptions:

1. I think that social work is an important profession making significant contributions to human betterment.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. I am being adequately prepared to develop the competence required of a professional social worker.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. I would feel comfortable recommending the CSUSB Department of Social Work to anyone interested in social work education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. I have derived a sense of personal satisfaction from my involvement in the overall educational experiences in the Department of Social Work.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. In summary, my overall assessment of this educational experience for me is positive.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. Comments and suggestions regarding overall perceptions:  
(Use other side of page, if required).

I. Educational Equity:

This section of the inventory invites you to evaluate the Department's cross-cultural educational base and issues of educational equity. (Educational equity refers to a system of education extending comparable opportunities to all students regardless of culture, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual preference, age, class, or ability.) Educational equity is premised on the basic equality of all persons.

The statements in this section are intended to tap your perceptions of the Department's cross-cultural educational emphasis and the ways the Department puts into effect the objectives of educational equity in its curriculum policy and practices.

Your views in these areas will assist us in further review and development of the Department's programs. We have provided space at the end of this section for you to include comments and suggestions not already covered by the statements.

1. My social work courses have included adequate content and bibliographic references on the cultural and ethnic populations of our society.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

2. Generally, a strength of the social work curriculum lies in the attention it has given to the concerns and needs of cultural and ethnic groups.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

3. Library collections and reference materials pertaining to culture and ethnicity have been adequate to support the Department's goal of cross-cultural education.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

4. I feel I have been given adequate opportunity to offer input for planning or changes in the social work curriculum.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

5. The social work curriculum has been flexible enough to respond to the needs and interests of its diverse body.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

6. The attitudes and behavior of Department faculty have reflected sensitivity to the educational aspirations of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

7. The Department and faculty have given enough care and attention to minority and non-minority students in helping them achieve their educational goals.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

8. I would use the sensitivity of my faculty as a role model for myself.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

9. I would use as a role model a faculty member whose ethnicity is?

1 \_\_\_\_\_ Anglo      2 \_\_\_\_\_ Asian      3 \_\_\_\_\_ African/  
American  
4 \_\_\_\_\_ Latino      5 \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity not relevant

10. My general impression is that the Department has given comparable attention to the needs and requirements of minority and non-minority students in the use and allocation of field work placements.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

11. I feel the Department's advising process and procedures were meant for me; they seem to have been designed for students like me.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

12. I feel that I had appropriate personal support services made available when I needed them.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

13. I feel that student-faculty relationships in the Department have not been strained.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

14. Student-faculty relationships have reflected neutral recognition and equal acceptance of different cultural backgrounds and expectations.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

15. The Department's overall environment has been non-discriminatory and non-prejudicial to its students regardless of their personal characteristics or abilities.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

16. The social atmosphere in the Department has reflected a respect and acceptance of cultural and ethnic differences.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

17. I feel my ethnic heritage (minority or non-minority) has been valued by the Department.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

18. The educational milieu of the Department has manifested the objectives of educational equity for all students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

19. I feel the Department has had a significant impact on the University in relation to recruitment and retention of ethnic minority students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

20. I take pride in the Department's commitment to the objectives of educational equity as they have been reflected in its educational mission, policy, and practices.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

21. The Department has taken clear steps to promote and sustain the ideals of educational equity.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

22. The Department's grading policy and practices have given adequate consideration of the linguistic and cultural differences of the students.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

23. In evaluating student performance, Department faculty have been sensitive to the differing abilities, potential, and aspirations of the culturally and ethnically diverse student population.

0	1	2	3	4
DT/NA	SD	D	A	SA

24. Additional comments regarding educational equity as you experienced it and ways it might be enhanced: (Continue comments on back of this page, if needed).

Now we would like to ask you some background questions.

NOTE: WE DO NOT LOOK AT INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRES, RATHER WE LOOK AT AGGREGATE FINDINGS ACROSS THE TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION. HOWEVER, IF YOU PREFER NOT TO ANSWER ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BECAUSE IT MIGHT IDENTIFY YOU, THEN SKIP THAT QUESTION.

1. Are you a:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time student (First Year)
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time student (Second Year)
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (First Year)
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (Second Year)
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time student (Third Year)

2. Is your concentration in:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Children, Youth, and Families
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Mental Health

3. What was your undergraduate major?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Social work/welfare
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many months/years of paid social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

5. How many months/years of unpaid (volunteer) social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

We would also like to have some personal background information.

6. Age: \_\_\_\_\_ years

7. Gender: \_\_\_\_\_ female \_\_\_\_\_ male



8. Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_ African/American \_\_\_\_\_ Latino  
\_\_\_\_\_ Asian \_\_\_\_\_ Anglo  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

9. Marital Status:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Single  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Married or Couple  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ Separated  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ Divorced  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ Widowed  
(6) \_\_\_\_\_ Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you have any children?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

11. During the past year, have you been employed? (Do not count paid field placements).

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, \_\_\_\_\_ Number of hours per week

12. If the answer to question 11 is no, skip to question 15.  
15. If the answer to question 11 is yes, has your employment been at a social work agency in the Inland Empire?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

13. If the answer to question 12 is yes, did your employer make any arrangements to facilitate your studies?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
-

14. Did you receive any financial grants during the past year?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, which grants? \_\_\_\_\_

15. (For graduating students only). Have you accepted a position yet?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ No

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Yes

If yes, please write in your title, agency, and contact numbers. If no, as soon as you do accept a position, please let the Department know your title, agency, and contact numbers.

---

---

---

---

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

Any further comments about the program and/or your experiences here? (Use other side of page, if required).

# APPENDIX D

## Frequencies Related to Significant Items 1991 (N=76), 1992 (N=63), 1993 (N=44)

Item		1991		1992		1993	
		FT <sup>1</sup>	PT <sup>2</sup>	FT	PT	FT	PT
Curriculum was relevant to my professional development.	D <sup>3</sup>	8	7	5	4*	5	5
	A <sup>4</sup>	26	34	11	41	23	11
Courses sequenced to promote progressive learning.	D	10	9	10	8***	10	3
	A	25	31	6	39	17	13
Courses sequenced to promote course integration.	D	14	12	9	7***	7	3
	A	21	29	6	40	21	13
Curriculum was flexible enough to meet my needs.	D	16	14	11	16*	8	9
	A	19	26	5	31	20	7
Instruction quality met my expectations.	D	20	13*	7	12	9	3
	A	15	28	9	35	19	13
Field placement provided opportunities related to my needs.	D	7	3	6	3*	5	1
	A	28	15	10	27	23	8
Field placement provided opportunities for career skills.	D	8	4	6	3*	3	1
	A	27	14	10	26	25	8
There was a link between class and field.	D	16	8	10	8*	11	5
	A	19	10	6	22	17	4
Administrators were competent.	D	14	26*	3	5	4	2
	A	20	13	11	34	19	11

Appendix D - Continued.

Administrators showed me concern.	D	6	19**	3	4	4	3
	A	27	17	11	32	19	10
Library resources were adequate and accessible.	D	22	22	12	14***	13	6
	A	11	19	3	31	13	10
Classrooms were adequate and accessible.	D	12	21	1	19*	15	5
	A	22	20	15	28	13	11
I had opportunities to participate in policy formulation.	D	13	26*	6	12	11	11*
	A	21	15	8	29	13	3
The Department assisted me with educational services.	D	14	30**	7	11	7	6
	A	20	10	9	31	15	7
The Department reflected mission of a helping profession.	D	5	15*	2	8	2	3
	A	30	26	14	38	26	13
Department provided adequate program information.	D	15	20	9	13*	6	4
	A	20	21	7	34	20	12
Department decision-making reflected professional values.	D	16	25	4	10	4	8**
	A	19	14	8	26	20	5
Social work community looked to the Department for leadership.	D	12	22*	2	6	4	4
	A	20	13	10	26	12	6
Department had an impact on social work community.	D	10	20*	1	6	5	4
	A	22	15	11	25	11	7

Appendix D - Continued.

I was prepared to develop competence as a social worker.	D	5	7	7	5**	5	2
	A	29	34	9	39	19	14
Courses included adequate content on ethnic populations.	D	10	11	5	3*	4	5
	A	25	29	11	42	24	10
Student-faculty relations were not strained.	D	20	25	4	17	7	10*
	A	15	13	11	25	19	5
Department impacted the University in regard to minority students.	D	11	14	5	4*	8	2*
	A	21	22	6	28	6	9

NOTE: The strongly disagree/disagree and strongly agree/agree categories were collapsed for a dichotomous rating. The neutral category used in 1991 was collapsed into the strongly disagree/disagree category. Frequencies were adjusted for missing data.

\*  $p < .05$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

- 1 Full-time student
- 2 Part-time student
- 3 Disagree
- 4 Agree

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, H. R., F. H. Gelber, and J. Wayne. "One School, Four Programs: A Longitudinal Descriptive Study of MSW Students," Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 4, 1987, 29-32.
- Baird, L. L. "Teaching Styles: An Exploratory Study of Dimensions and Effects," Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, 1973, 15-21.
- Brawley, E. A. "Upgrading the Social Service Work Force in Britain: Lessons for Part-time Social Work Education in the U. S.," Journal of Social Work Education, 21, 2, Spring/Summer 1985, 74-83.
- Brennan, E. M. and E. A. Black. "On Finding a Workable Balance: The Multiple Roles of the Part-time Student," Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 3, 1984, 19-46.
- Butler, A. C. "The Impact of the 1-Year-Residency Requirement on Students Preferring Part-time Study," Journal of Social Work Education, 29, 2, Spring/Summer 1993, 212-223.
- Davis, L. V. and E. Sherman. "Intolerance of Ambiguity and Student Performance in Social Work Education," Journal of Social Work Education, 23, 1, Winter 1987, 16-23.
- Elmore, P. B. and K. A. LaPointe. "Effect of Teacher Sex, Student Sex, and Teacher Warmth on the Evaluation of College Instructors," Journal of Educational Psychology, 67, 1975, 368-374.
- Feldman, K. A. "The Superior College Teacher from the Students' View," Research in Higher Education, 5, 1976, 243-288.
- Fortune, A. E. "Multiple Roles, Stress, and Well-Being Among MSW Students," Journal of Social Work Education, 23, 3, Fall 1987, 81-90.
- Fortune, A. E., C. E. Feathers, S. R. Rook, R. M. Scrimenti, P. Smollen, B. Stemerman, and E. L. Tucker. "Student Satisfaction with Field Placement," Journal of Social Work Education, 3, Fall 1985, 92-104.

- Heppner, P. P. and H. J. Roehlke. "Differences Among Supervisees at Different Levels of Training: Implications for a Developmental Model of Supervision," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, January 1984, 76-90.
- Hepworth, D. and B. E. Oviatt. "Using Student Course Evaluations: Findings, Issues, and Recommendations," Journal of Social Work Education, 3, Fall 1985, 105-112.
- Hofman, J. E. and L. Kremer. "Attitudes Toward Higher Education and Course Evaluation," Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 5, 1980, 610-617.
- Koeske, R. D. and G. F. Koeske. "Working and Non-Working Students: Roles, Support and Well-Being," Journal of Social Work Education, 25, 3, Fall 1989, 244-256.
- Kramer, H., G. Mathews, and R. Endias. "Comparative Stress Levels in Part-time and Full-time Social Work Programs," Journal of Social Work Education, 23, 3, Fall 1987, 74-80.
- Kruzich, J. M., B. J. Friesen, and D. Van Soest. "Assessment of Student and Faculty Learning Styles: Research and Application," Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 3, Fall 1986, 22-30.
- Mayer, J. and A. Rosenblatt. "Sources of Stress Among Student Practitioners in Social Work: A Sociological View," Journal of Education for Social Work, 10, 3, 1974, 56-66.
- Munson, C. E. "Stress Among Graduate Social Work Students: An Empirical Study," Journal of Education for Social Work, 20, 3, 1984, 20-29.
- O'Connor, I. and L. Dalglish. "The Impact of Social Work Education: A Personal Construct Reconceptualization," Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 3, Fall 1986, 6-21.
- Patchner, M. A. "The Practitioner Becomes a Student: The Stress of Transition," Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 2, 23, 1983.
- Petchers, M. K. and J. C. Chow. "Sources of Variation in Students' Evaluations of Instruction in a Graduate Social Work Program," Journal of Social Work Education, 24, 1, Winter 1988, 35-42.

- Piechowski, L. D. "Mental Health and Women's Multiple Roles," Families in Society, 73, 3, March 1992, 131-139.
- Potts, M. K. "Adjustment of Graduate Students to the Educational Process: Effects of Part-time Enrollment and Extracurricular Roles," Journal of Social Work Education, 28, 1, Winter 1992, 61-76.
- Richman, J. M. and L. B. Rosenfeld. "Advanced Standing Versus Regular Two-Year MSW Graduates: Program Evaluation and Employment History," Journal of Social Work Education, 24, 1, Winter 1988, 13-19.
- Rosenthal, J. A., K. R. Wedel, and M. V. K. Wilson. "The Working Part-time Student: A Study in Student Satisfaction," Arete, 14, 2, Winter 1989, 32-41.
- Tomasco, A. T. "Student Perceptions of Instructional and Personality Characteristics of Faculty: A Canonical Analysis," Teaching of Psychology, 7, 1980, 79-82.
- Weinbach, R. W. "Manipulations of Student Evaluations: No Laughing Matter," Journal of Social Work Education, 24, 1, Winter 1988, 27-34.
- Weinbach, R. W., J. T. Gandy, and L. J. Tartaglia. "Addressing the Needs of the Part-time Student Through Interactive Closed-Circuit Television: An Evaluation," Arete, 9, 2, Fall 1984, 12-20.
- Yamatani, H., M. Page, G. Koeske, C. Diaz, and L. Maguire. "A Comparison of Extended and Traditional Master's of Social Work Students: A Repeated Measures Analysis," Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 3, Fall 1986, 43-51.