

LARGE CLASSES IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION: A THREAT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALISATION OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS?

Barbara Simpson [simpson@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:simpson@ukzn.ac.za)

---

*Improved access to higher education and the increase in student numbers without a simultaneous increase in resources has given rise to numerous challenges. This reflective article considers whether large classes in social work education pose a threat to the professional socialisation of students, which requires that they internalise the values, interests, skills and knowledge of social work. Professional socialisation within social work education, the threat posed by large classes, both in the classroom and field practice education, as well as some possible solutions, are considered in this article.*

# **LARGE CLASSES IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION: A THREAT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALISATION OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS?**

**Barbara Simpson**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Since 1994 the enrolment of students at universities in South Africa has more than doubled (Department of Higher Education and Training, 2013). This has been consistent with the country's aim of building a new education and training system to meet the needs of a democratic society by overcoming unfair discrimination, expanding access and improving the quality of education.

Within this context the number of social work students has also increased. Increased access to university and specifically to social work education has been made possible by a scholarship scheme instituted by the Department of Social Development as part of its Recruitment and Retention Strategy (Department of Social Development, 2004). Other factors such as the certainty of a job at the end of one's studies, and the generally lower entrance requirements for social work, have made social work an attractive option for many young people.

No one can deny that social workers are needed in South Africa to help address the enormous burdens of poverty, HIV/AIDS and violence, and thus the increase in numbers of young people wanting to enter the profession is to be welcomed. However, if social workers are to be successful in addressing the many problems facing this country, they need to be well educated and socialised into the profession which is rooted in a specific ideological base that deeply values respect for others and social justice.

This article considers whether the increase in numbers of students without a simultaneous increase in resources for social work education might not be a threat to the professional socialisation of social work students. It begins by providing an overview of social work education globally and in South Africa, and then goes on to discuss what is meant by professional socialisation. The possible threat posed by large classes to professional socialisation is then discussed in relation to both classroom and field practice education.

## **SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION**

Formal education for social work began in the United States in the late 1890s with short training courses for social workers and by the beginning of the twentieth century, full-time year-long training programmes had been introduced (Austen, 1983). The need to be recognised as a profession played an important role in the development of social work and social work education, and in 1915 Flexner's speech, "Is social work a profession?" to the National Conference of Corrections and Charities emphasised the importance of

“an orderly and highly specialised educational discipline” (Flexner, 2001:155<sup>1</sup>) as the means through which members of a profession gain the knowledge required. He was of the opinion that there were six criteria by which to judge whether or not an occupation was a profession. These were that “professions involve essentially intellectual operations with large individual responsibility; they derive their raw material from science and learning; this material they work up to a practical and definite end; they possess an educationally communicable technique; they tend to self-organising; they are becoming increasingly altruistic in motivation” (Flexner, 2001:156).

Greenwood (1957) reiterated these criteria and summarised them as: systematic theory; authority; community sanction; ethical codes and a culture. The need for systematic theory implied that professionals acquire knowledge based on abstract principles, not just operational procedures, and that this knowledge is gained through extensive formal education.

Great strides have been made in terms of developing professional social work education worldwide. In 2001 both the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) and the International Federation of Social Work (IFSW) adopted an international definition of social work, which was revised in 2014. These two bodies also developed and adopted the “Global standards for the education and training of the social work profession” in 2004 (Sewpaul & Jones, 2005). These standards were intended to be aspirational rather than prescriptive. They sought to ensure that social work education supports the core functions and values of social work such as support for human rights, social justice and a commitment to caring for and empowering individuals, groups and communities. They also reflected a “commitment to the professional and personal development of social work students, with particular emphases on the development of the critically self-reflective practitioner and the pace of values and ethics in social work education and training” (Sewpaul & Jones, 2005:226).

Social work education in South Africa has been influenced by these global developments and in 2003 the Bachelor of Social Work degree was registered in the National Qualifications Framework.<sup>2</sup> By 2007 all universities offering the social work qualification were required to ensure that students completing the Bachelor of Social Work were able to demonstrate competence in the 27 exit-level outcomes. While the author remains critical of the BSW with its outcomes-based approach (Simpson, 2010), there is no doubt that the institution of the BSW has been a genuine attempt to improve the quality of social work education and ultimately the quality of social work practice in South Africa.

The purpose of teaching in professional disciplines differs from pedagogies in other academic disciplines. Not only must the student learn the knowledge required for the profession, but must also learn what it means to be a professional. One does therefore not “learn for the sake of knowledge and understanding alone; one learns in order to

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a reprint of the 1915 speech.

<sup>2</sup> The BSW is at present under review.

engage in practice” (Shulman, 2005:18). Professional practice must also be characterised by integrity and responsible, ethical service, and professional education must socialise the student into what this means. This is also reflected in South African policy documents such as the Higher Education Qualifications Sub-Framework, which states that professional degrees should emphasise “general principles and theory in conjunction with procedural knowledge in order to provide students with a thorough grounding in the knowledge, theory, principles and skills of the profession .... and the ability to apply these to professional or career contexts” (Council on Higher Education, 2013:32).

## **PROFESSIONAL SOCIALISATION IN SOCIAL WORK**

Miller (2013) points out that there is long-standing and general agreement about the importance of professional socialisation in social work. It can be described as that process whereby an individual entering a profession adapts both externally to the requirements of the specific career role and internally to their self-conceptualisation of that role (McGowen & Hart, 1992).

Professional socialisation takes place in different ways, which has implications for social work education. Two different views of socialisation have been identified in the literature. The first is the structural-functional perspective (Barretti, 2004; Miller, 2010), which posits that professional socialisation involves the acquisition of the values and attitudes, interests, skills and knowledge directly through didactic teaching and indirectly through interaction with significant members of the group. This can be seen as an “induction” approach through which the student learns the appropriate social roles and behaviours to participate as a member of the profession. The second view of professional socialisation is the symbolic interactionist perspective (Barretti, 2004; Miller, 2010). This focuses on the motivation, identity and commitment of the student and sees socialisation as a process whereby the student learns to adapt to the practice and organisational context.

Both these views of the way that professional socialisation occurs require that students be provided with opportunities to interact meaningfully with members of the profession, both as teachers in the classroom and as mentors and supervisors in the field. Not only do students need knowledge about what the social work profession is, but also the opportunity for self-reflection and the development of self-awareness. It is through the social interaction with significant people that socialisation is said to take place. The importance of relationships thus cannot be under-estimated and this is the aspect that large classes may compromise.

While the focus of this article is on the formal socialisation of students during their social work education, it must be remembered that socialisation is an on-going process which starts long before the student enters the formal social work education programme and continues long after the student leaves and continually adapts to changing employment and practice settings. Prior socialisation (Miller, 2010) forms the building block on which further socialisation takes place and as such has implications for the education process. Prior socialisation refers to those early experiences which influence an individual’s development and worldview, and which may impact on the individual’s

choice of a profession. For example, there is evidence that an idealistic orientation and family background play a role in career choice of social work (Lev-Wiesel, 2003). The literature also suggests that one's personal and social values also play a role in professional socialisation. For example, a student's inherent empathic ability enables him or her to acknowledge and understand the feelings of clients, while a positive sense of self and wellbeing enables them to cope with stress. The ability to differentiate between their own needs and the needs of clients is also essential (Shlomo, Levy & Itzhaky, 2012).

Prior socialisation for many South African students has been problematic and many young people entering higher education in South Africa bring with them a myriad of social, economic and academic challenges that impact on their ability to succeed academically (Cross & Carpenter, 2009) and which in turn may impact on their professional growth. The difficulties facing students has been borne out in a number of South African studies. Earle (2008) found that students at the Universities of Limpopo and Stellenbosch reported a high level of childhood trauma and a study at UNISA (Schenck, 2009) found that students experienced challenging socio-economic circumstances as well as traumatic childhood experiences. In a more recent study van Breda (2010) found a high prevalence of psychosocial vulnerability amongst social work students at the University of Johannesburg. Seventy-seven percent of these students had experienced the loss of a parent or significant other and more than half reported growing up in poverty and as continuing to struggle financially. A third of the students reported experiencing some form of abuse and nearly 14% had terminated a pregnancy. These studies found that, to varying degrees, these life challenges impacted negatively on the students' wellbeing and academic performance. Negative life circumstances are in themselves no reason to exclude students from social work studies and, indeed, overcoming such experiences may help students to develop empathy and a strong sense of service to others. However, some students may bear emotional scars that compromise their professional development (Dykes, 2011) and this has implications for the education and training of social work students.

It thus seems clear that many students entering social work require additional support during the process of professional socialisation. If, as discussed previously, it is the relationship and interaction with significant members of the profession that plays an important role in this process, large classes may be a further impediment to the development of a professional social worker.

In summary then, social work educators need to do more than help students to develop academic knowledge and skills. They also need to model professional behaviour and nurture personal and professional growth. This teaching and learning in social work education takes place in two primary contexts, the classroom and the field. Each of these contexts will now be discussed and the challenges presented by large classes will be examined.

## CLASSROOM TEACHING

Classroom teaching forms a major part of social work programmes and much important learning takes place in this context. An interesting finding from Miller's study (2013) was that students appear to develop their relationship to social work values in the classroom and those students who reported that values were emphasised in their classroom were more committed to social justice. The importance of what happens in the classroom therefore cannot be under-estimated. In this section I discuss how professional socialisation may be compromised in large classes.

The notion of what constitutes a large class varies; Mulryan-Kyne (2010) pointed out that the nature of the programme, the accommodation and facilities available, and the resources required as well as the background of the students all play a role in determining whether a class size is too large. Cuseo (2007) reported that most of the studies that he reviewed tended to rate class sizes of less than 25 as small and those with more than 50 as large. The Australian Universities Teaching Committee (Moulding, 2010) stated that any class of more than 80 students can be considered to be a large class. In reviewing what he considered to be best practice, Cuseo (2007) suggested that that ideal class size was 15. Social work classes in South Africa are certainly larger than this ideal and the first-year social work student intake for 2014 at the University of KwaZulu-Natal was 250!

One of the problems of large classes is that teaching methods are linked to class size. Cuseo (2007), quoting McKeachie (1986), wrote that they are "inextricably intertwined" and the larger the class, the more reliance on lectures as a teaching method. Lectures are certainly useful for presenting information, for introducing a topic and arousing interest, for providing the structure and context around which students can then read and engage in self-study, and for explaining, developing, summarising and synthesising information introduced in readings or after discussions and self-study (Cooper & Robinson, 2000; Mulryan-Kyne, 2010). However, a number of problems associated with lectures have been identified and it is these problems that impact on the professional socialisation of social work students.

Becoming a professional requires students to reflect on their learning and to be active thinkers. However, the physical context of large classes is not conducive to active learning (Carter, Barrett & Park, 2011). Large lecture theatres are often tiered, have fixed seating and a lectern at the front. This creates what Carter *et al.* (2011) referred to as a "physical hierarchy" which reinforces the notion of lecturer as conveying the knowledge and students as passive recipients. Large classes thus reduce the level of student involvement (Cuseo, 2007). There is insufficient opportunity for questions and answers and many students may feel intimidated to ask questions or to comment. Problems of acoustics, visibility and attention all contribute to the problem and in the South African context, where for many students the language of instruction is not their mother tongue, this situation is exacerbated. Interaction between students and teachers, and between students themselves, thus decreases. Some research has demonstrated the dangers of this and Long and Coldren (2006), for example, found that positive lecturer-

student relationship contributed to positive learning outcomes and that students who were involved with other students rated themselves as performing better.

Lack of involvement in the classroom can also lead to students becoming anonymous and more passive learners. This leads to lessened individual accountability and student engage in behaviours that would not occur in smaller classes. Noise and distraction increase, absenteeism may not even be noticed, late arrival and early leaving become common, and students engage in more off-task behaviour (sending and receiving cell phone messages, catching up on work for other courses) during lectures (Mulryan-Kyne, 2010). In preparing students for professional practice, we aim to inculcate norms of respect and consideration for others, which becomes very difficult in the context of large classes.

Considerable pedagogical barriers also exist in large classes. Because it is difficult to know students, it becomes difficult to meet the individualised needs of students. Lectures then tend to teach to the “average” student, which means that brighter students become bored and weaker students get left behind (Toepell, Cole & Lathrop, 2002). Furthermore, the development of higher-order thinking skills is hampered by large classes and Cuseo (2007) provides a summary of a number of studies that consistently support this assertion. An interesting study reported was that by Fischer and Grant (1983, in Cuseo, 2007), who demonstrated that in small classes of 15, answers to questions were on average analytical in nature, in classes of 16-45 they were characterised by comprehension, and in large classes of 46 or more students the answers reflected factual recall only. Similarly, the Australian Universities Teaching Committee Large Classes Project (Moulding, 2010) found that large classes impacted negatively on the development of higher-order thinking skills. The implications of this are dire. Social workers require more than just factual knowledge. If they are to be able to address the many complex issues facing communities in South Africa, they need to be able to think critically and creatively. Large classes do not facilitate the development of these faculties.

Helping students to internalise social work values and develop a professional identity calls for creative teaching methods. In an effort to address the personal challenges that many social work students bring to university, several universities have experimented with student autobiographies (Dykes, 2011). Students are asked to reflect on their life experiences and to identify what has impacted on their development and identity. These types of exercises are time consuming and require considerable commitment from the lecturer to read carefully and to respond in ways that will be facilitative to the student’s growth. In large classes this will simply not be possible and it may even raise ethical concerns if the lecturer is unable to deal with issues that students may raise in their autobiographies.

Large classes also present challenges with assessment. Frequent assessment with feedback to students is linked with good learning outcomes. Assessments provide a structure for learning and the opportunity to improve performance (Cuseo, 2007). The type of assessment is influenced by class size. Large classes often rely on multiple-

choice questions or questions requiring short answers. This in turn influences how students prepare for assessments as students preparing for multiple-choice questions are more likely to use surface learning techniques such as memorising (Cuseo, 2007). Large classes are also less likely to promote student writing. Given that writing promotes student learning and depth of learning (Cuseo, 2007), and that professional social workers are required to write reports for a variety of reasons, this is an issue of concern. Providing detailed and consistent feedback, which is so important in promoting student learning, is compromised in large classes.

## TEACHING IN THE FIELD

The second context for teaching social work occurs in the field and this aspect of social work education has been valued since the early days of social work education. In summarising the development of field education, Wayne, Raskin and Bogo (2010) pointed out that it was originally based on the belief that students learn how to practise through apprenticeship types of experience under the guidance and supervision of an expert practitioner. This is an essential aspect of the student's professional socialisation as they "learn to practice social work through delivering social work services in agency and community settings" (Bogo, 2006:164) and it is in the field that they begin to apply in practice the knowledge, skills and values they have been exposed to in the classroom. Many students report that field education is the most crucial component of their social work education (Shlomo *et al.*, 2012). So valued is this aspect of social work education that the Council on Social Work Education in the United States has described field education as the "signature pedagogy of the social work profession" (Wayne *et al.*, 2010:327). Field education is thus designated as the *primary* method of instruction by which the student learns to perform the role of practitioner. In South Africa the present Bachelor of Social Work is based on an outcomes-based approach to education, which requires that students demonstrate their mastery of the learning objectives or exit-level outcomes. This time and resource-intensive requirement is extremely difficult to meet in the context of large classes.

Several studies have demonstrated that the student-supervisor relationship plays a pivotal role in the development of a professional identity (Barretti, 2004; Shlomo *et al.*, 2012). The supervisor-student relationship provides the context for learning in the field and supervisors play a central role in the professional socialisation of social work students. An obvious corollary to this is that there must be sufficient field placements with suitably qualified, able and willing supervisors for all social work students. Large numbers of students limit placement opportunities and the situation is exacerbated by problems in the field of social work.

Dominelli (2004) points out that neoliberalism, globalisation and corporate managerial strategies which result in decreased funding and demands for increased productivity have serious implications for contemporary social work practice. In South Africa non-governmental organisations have been under pressure to expand their services towards addressing prevention and early intervention (in keeping with a social development paradigm), while continuing to offer statutory services to children in need of care in a



context where funding and resource provision remain static (Loffell, 2008). The NGO sector is thus facing many challenges with shortages of funding and experienced staff, while many are reluctant to accept students who are hold Department of Social Development scholarships as these students have a contractual obligation to work for the Department and are unable to take up employment with the NGO that provides the fieldwork placement. At the same time there is pressure on the Department to provide placements for all its scholarship students. It is our experience that this has resulted in some cases of students being placed in offices where there is overcrowding and generally poor working conditions. In these circumstances professional development is compromised as students, for example, struggle to make sense of how to maintain confidentiality when two clients are being interviewed in the same office and where there is insufficient filing space and files are packed on the floor. Under such circumstances, ensuring that student placements provide adequate learning opportunities and good supervision becomes a luxury and seriously threatens the professional socialisation of students.

### **WHAT ABOUT SOLUTIONS?**

It would seem that large classes may indeed threaten the professional socialisation of social work students. However, given that this is the situation that social work educators find themselves in, can anything be done to mitigate the negative effects of large classes, and what new and creative ways can be found to encourage professional socialisation in large classes?

Some efforts have been made to make large classes seem smaller; for example, Yazedjian and Kolkhorst (2007) suggested using small group activities within the large class to promote participation and active learning. Students could be asked to break into small groups in different sections of the lecture room to discuss a particular topic or answer a set of question and then return to their seats. Feedback from students is then requested and this is linked to the course content by the lecturer. Of course, this assumes that the lecture room is big enough and the layout suitable to accommodate this kind of movement of students during a lecture. On a smaller scale, students can be asked to work in groups of two and three with the students seated next to them.

The increased use of technology in providing learning support and blended learning which combines class sessions with specific web-based activities have also been mooted as a solution to some of the problems inherent in large classes (Carter *et al.*, 2011; Cooper & Robinson, 2000). Online learning activities such as tutorials and quizzes could help to reinforce course content and identify where students need additional support. Electronic discussion forums could provide students with opportunities to practise academic writing and to reflect on various aspects of the course content. Regular student postings also provide the lecturer with feedback on how students are interpreting material. While these might be ways of increasing student participation, Bryant (2005) warns that they are not without costs to the lecturer. Clear instructions and guidelines to students are essential and monitoring online discussions is time-consuming.

Efforts have also been made to address the problems of field education by exploring new possibilities for field placements. Some universities have experimented with university-community partnerships (Cook, Bond, Jones & Greif, 2002; Simpson & Sathiparsad, 2010) whereby university staff and students form partnerships with communities in order to offer social work services while at the same time providing student training. The use of non-traditional sites for student field placements has also received attention; for example, Ferguson and Smith (2012) reported on the advantages and disadvantages of placing students in social movement organisations.

These efforts are all admirable in their attempt to provide students with more meaningful learning experiences. They seek to address some of the challenges to learning and professional socialisation that are the result of large classes. However, they still require resources, both in terms of lecturers and materials. The fundamental problem remains, namely that increased student numbers has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in resources. Social work practice takes place in the context of a relationship between a social worker and the client system. The professional socialisation of social work students takes place primarily in the context of a relationship. Without a sufficient number of people to guide, mentor and teach social work students, their development as professional social workers will be compromised.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Bachelor of Social Work degree is a professional qualification and as such is intended to prepare students to enter the profession of social work. The aim of social work education is to produce graduates who have a strong sense of the mission of social work, who identify with the fundamental values of social work, who are critical thinkers and self-reflective practitioners, and who are skilled at intervening at multiple levels (micro, mezzo and macro) to help people resolve problems and create a better society. This article has considered whether large classes pose a threat to the professional socialisation of social work students. It concludes that large classes do indeed impact negatively on student learning, both in the classroom and in the field. However, it acknowledges that efforts can be made to overcome some of the barriers that large classes present in respect of the professional development and socialisation of students. Despite this, the warning of Chapman and Ludlow (2010:118) should be heeded: "There is a danger that large classes may introduce a burden to learning that is just too difficult for students and lecturers to overcome, despite their best efforts".

If we are serious about protecting the profession of social work and truly contributing to the betterment of society, we need to ensure that we either reduce the number of social work students being accepted at our universities, or that additional and sufficient resources be made available to enable social work students to develop into competent professional practitioners. The challenge to social work educators is how to bring about this change in the context of a very complex higher education terrain.

## REFERENCES

- AUSTEN, D.M. 1983. The Flexner myth and the history of social work. **Social Service Review**, 57(3):357-377.
- BARRETTI, M. 2004. What do we know about the professional socialization of our students? **Journal of Social Work Education**, 40(2):255-283.
- BOGO, M. 2006. Field instruction in social work: a review of the research literature. **The Clinical Supervisor**, 24(1):163-193.
- BRYANT, B.K. 2005. Electronic discussion sections: a useful tool in teaching large university classes. **Teaching of Psychology**, 32(4):271-275.
- CARTER, I., BARRETT, B. & PARK, W. 2011. Improving collaborative teaching in large introductory BSW classes. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 31(5):569-578.
- CHAPMAN, L. & LUDLOW, L. 2010. Can downsizing college class sizes augment student outcomes? An investigation of the effects of class size on student learning. **The Journal of General Education**, 59(2):105-123.
- COOPER, J.L. & ROBINSON, P. 2000. The argument for making large classes seem small. **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**, 81(Spring):5-16.
- COOK, D., BOND, A.F., JONES, P. & GREIF, G.L. 2002. The social work outreach within a school of social work. **Journal of Community Practice**, 10(1):17-31.
- COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION. 2013. **The Higher Education Qualifications Sub Framework**. Council on Higher Education: Pretoria. [Online] Available: <http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/HEQSF%202013.pdf> [Accessed: 15/01/2014].
- CROSS, M. & CARPENTER, C. 2009. 'New students' in South African higher education: institutional culture, student performance and the challenge of democratisation. **Perspectives in Education**, 27(1):6-18.
- CUSEO, J. 2007. The empirical case against large class size: adverse effects on the teaching, learning and retention of first year students. [Online] Available: <https://wiki.doit.wisc.edu/confluence/download/attachments/20938768/Cuseo.pdf> [Accessed: 01/09/2013].
- DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION. 2013. **White Paper for Post-School Training and Education**. Pretoria. [Online] Available: <http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/White%20Paper%20-%20final%20for%20web.pdf> [Accessed: 15/01/2014].
- DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT. 2004. **Recruitment and retention Strategy for Social Workers**. [Online] Available: <http://www.nawongo.co.za/UserFiles/Recruit%20and%20Retent%20Booklet.pdf> [Accessed: 15/01/2014].
- DOMINELLI, L.D. 2004. **Social work: theory and practice for a changing profession**. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- DYKES, G. 2011. The implications of adverse childhood experiences for the professional requirements of social work. **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 47(4):521-533.
- EARLE, N. 2008. **Social work in social change: the profession and education of social works in South Africa**. Cape Town: HSRC.
- FERGUSON, I. & SMITH, L. 2012. Education for change: student placements in campaigning organisations and social movements in South Africa. **British Journal of Social Work**, 42(5):974-994.
- FLEXNER, A. 2001. Is social work a profession? **Research on Social Work Practice**, 11(2):152-165.
- GREENWOOD, E. 1957. Attributes of a profession. **Social Work**, 2:44-45.
- LEV-WIESEL, R. 2003. Expectations of costs and rewards: Students versus practicing social workers. **International Social Work**, 46(3):323-332.
- LOFFELL, J. 2008. Developmental social welfare and the child protection challenge in South Africa. **Social Work in Action**, 20(2):83-91.
- LONG, H.E. & COLDREN, J.T. 2006. Interpersonal influences in large lecture based classes. A socio-instructional perspective. **College Teaching**, 54(2):237-243.
- McGOWEN, K.R. & HART, L.E. 1992. Exploring the contribution of gender identity to differences in career experiences. **Psychological Reports**, 70(3):723-737.
- MILLER, S.E. 2010. A conceptual framework for the professional socialization of social workers. **Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment**, 20(7):924-938.
- MILLER, S.E. 2013. Professional socialization: A bridge between the explicit and implicit curricula. **Journal of Social Work Education**, 49(3):368-386.
- MOULDING, N.T. 2010. Intelligent design: student perceptions of teaching and learning in large social work classes. **Higher Education Research and Development**, 29(2):151-165.
- MULRYAN-KYNE, C. 2010. Teaching large classes at college and university level: challenges and opportunities. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 15(2): 175-185.
- SCHENCK, R. 2009. The socio-economic realities of the social work students of the University of South Africa. **Social work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 54(3):299-313.
- SEWPAUL, V. & JONES, D. 2005. Global standards for the education and training of the social work profession. **International Journal of Social Welfare**, 14(3):218-230.
- SHLOMO, S.B., LEVY, D. & ITZHAKY, H. 2012. Development of professional identity among social work students: contributing factors. **The Clinical Supervisor**, 31(2):240-255.
- SHULMAN, L.S. 2005. Pedagogies of uncertainty. **Liberal Education**, 91(2):18-25.
- SIMPSON, B. 2010. Outcomes-based education: is it right for social work? **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 46(3):274-282.

SIMPSON, B. & SATHIPARSAD, R. 2010. A university-community outreach initiative: an innovative approach to social work practice education. **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 47(4):405-415.

TOEPPELL, A.R., COLE, N.D. & LATHROP, H. 2002. The high touch classroom: small group learning in large class contexts. **Academic Exchange**, 6(1):11-15.

VAN BREDA, A. 2011. **University of Johannesburg social work students' experiences of life challenges**. Unpublished research article. [Online] Available: [www.adrian.vanbreda.org/research/Student\\_vulnerability2011.pdf](http://www.adrian.vanbreda.org/research/Student_vulnerability2011.pdf) [Accessed: 10/04/2013].

WAYNE, J., BOGO, M. & RASKIN, M. 2010. Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. **Journal of Social Work Education**, 46(3):327-339.

YAZEDJIAN, A. & KOLKHORST, B.B. 2007. Implementing small group activities in large classes. **College Teaching**, 55(4):164-169.

*Dr Barbara Simpson, Department of Social Work, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.*

# LEARNING PROFILES OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS: WHO ARE YOU AND HOW SHOULD THIS INFLUENCE MY TEACHING?

Glynnis Dykes, Sulina Green

## INTRODUCTION

Internationally, classrooms reflect an increasingly diverse world of differing ages, abilities, cultures, interests, motivations and difficulties (Rosslyn, 2004; Tomlinson, Brighton, Hertberg, Callahan, Moon, Brimijoin, Conover & Reynolds, 2003). The situation in South Africa is no different. The majority of South African students currently in higher education are first-generation (non-traditional) students commonly (and indiscriminately) described as underprepared, coming from impoverished backgrounds in terms of economic strength, poor schooling and socio-cultural resources, and using English as additional language (Bozalek, 2013; Carelse & Dykes, 2013; Collins & Van Breda, 2010; Hlalele, 2010; Smit, 2012).

In order to facilitate learning for these diverse groups, it is vital to know who the adult learner is in terms of the role of personal circumstances in the learning endeavour, as well as to ascertain how adults learn (Merriam, Caffarella & Baumgartner, 2007; Ramsden, 1992). The current student profile at the university where the study was undertaken started to emerge during the 1980s, when the institution initiated an affirmative action admissions policy designed to broaden access particularly for students from all historically disadvantaged communities (Bozalek, 2013). For the non-traditional and adult learner, the concepts of self and self-directed learning are vital (Hyland-Russell & Groen, 2011) in that they feed into their individual learning approaches; this in turn advances the philosophy of learner-centredness (Wilcox, 1996).

Learning styles have been variously defined in the literature. For this study the overall notion of learning profile will be used to refer to students' personal traits (such as biological, cultural and societal factors; emotional and social influences; academic record and learning preferences) that optimise the individual's learning (Powell & Kusuma-Powell, 2011; Rollnick, Lubben, Lotz & Dlamini, 2002). A learning profile consists of two dimensions (Fry, Ketteridge & Marshall, 2009; Vanthournout, Coertjens, Gijbels, Donche & Van Petegem, 2013), namely, *learning styles* (stable personal characteristics of the learner), and *learning approaches* (changeable competencies related to task and context). Lecturers have to address these variances within their classrooms where "equality of opportunity" is fulfilled when the varied needs of the learners are met (Tomlinson *et al.*, 2003). Studies confirm that there is a link between self-efficacy and personal beliefs (learning styles) and the student's approach to learning of specific activities (learning approaches) (Kell, 2006).

Very few studies have been undertaken to explore or examine the link between the adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) of some social work students, their learning profiles and appropriate teaching and learning methods. Studies on the learning profiles in social work have mostly focused on the implications for fieldwork education

(Cartney, 2004, 2000). Previous studies have explicated the ACEs of some social work students at a particular university as being the following: (i) Childhood abuse epitomised by emotional, physical and sexual abuses; (ii) Troubled family life through ineffectual caregiving, parental absences, unmet needs, being left behind, substance abuse, inadequate financial/material support, and intimate partner violence. The learning profiles of these students that emerged as a result of the impact of ACEs manifested during social work teaching and learning (Dykes, 2014, 2012, 2011). Their responses were typified by their narratives of distress, tearfulness, negative and struggling emotions, rationalising, and especially a fear of their own bias and partiality regarding particular issues that closely mimic their own (Dykes, 2014).

To date, many quantitative studies have been done to examine the learning profiles of social work students mainly using Kolb's learning styles (Cartney, 2000; Chesborough, 2009; Massey, Kim & Mitchell, 2011; Williams, Brown & Etherington, 2013), which focused strongly on learning approaches. Students' overly emotional reactions within the teaching and learning environment imply that learning profile inventories that focus mainly on assessing cognition and learning approaches would not account for the impact of students' ACEs on their learning. However, there are two instruments for quantitative research that do take these aspects into consideration, namely, the Dunn and Dunn Learning Style Model, which includes emotional and psychological processing, and the Revised Approaches to Studying Inventory (RASI) which also includes affective factors in its measurement (Hawk & Shah, 2007).

Studies that gleaned teaching and learning strategies on the basis of students' self-reported ACEs and their link to students' learning profiles are scant. Consequently there is a lack in the literature of qualitative studies exploring appropriate teaching and learning strategies based on social work students' ACEs and their particular learning profiles.

The aim of this study is to explore and describe key social work teaching and learning strategies from research participants, based on the impact of adverse childhood experiences and consequent learning profiles. Therefore the research question is: *What are key teaching and learning strategies from student and staff participants, based on the impact of adverse childhood experiences on learning profiles of social work students?*

## **TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING THEORY AS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

From the myriad teaching and learning theories and approaches that exist, transformative learning theory (TLT) gained relevance because of its focus on the personal realities of the student and the possibility of transformative outcomes for the learning process.

Transformative learning theory is most often associated with Jack Mezirow (Professor Emeritus of Adult Education, Columbia University). Higher education (HE) classrooms are appropriate spaces for students to engage in activities to reflect on the roots of their

beliefs and opinions (Riggs & Hellyer-Riggs, 2009; Taylor, 2008) and TLT creates the learning spaces to undertake such reflections (Taylor, 2008). Therefore learning in TLT is based on using our previous knowledge (and experiences) to support new and/or amended learning to guide our subsequent actions or behaviour, thus contributing to a paradigm shift (Taylor, 2008).

Mezirow (1997:5) confirmed that transformative learning “is the process of effecting change in a frame of reference”. Frames of reference describe our reality, reflecting the essence of our experiences, for example, our thoughts and feelings as well as our usual responses and reactions (Imel, 1998; Taylor, 2008). Mezirow (1997:5) asserts that frames of reference “are the structures of assumptions through which we understand our experiences” and experiences consist of mental (cognitive), action (driven by impulse, desire or resolve) and affective (emotion) parts. Frames of reference are mainly constituted from our social and cultural interactions driven by our primary caregivers.

Transformative learning is achieved when we critically reflect on suppositions or conjectures that underlie our frames of reference. However, learning is only achieved when what we have to learn relates to our frame of reference. In linking frames of reference when designing teaching and learning methods, six elements that lecturers should reflect on are recommended (Imel, 1998; Mezirow, 1997; Riggs & Hellyer-Riggs, 2009; Taylor, 2011, 2008).

### ***The elements of TLT***

- The centrality of experience: Experience is gained through social interaction with other peers or in practice (work) learning environments.
- Critical reflection: Interrogating the authenticity of their suppositions that originate from previous experiences.
- Rational discourse: This is used when we have need to query the understanding, veracity or relevance (relating to norms) or genuineness (relating to feelings) underlying the conversation or discussion.
- Holistic orientation: The inclusion of different ways of learning, for example, the relevance of the rational and the emotional, as well as the interpersonal.
- Awareness of context: The consideration of traditional, cultural practices together with personal beliefs that play a strong role in the learning process.
- Authentic relationships: Creating real relationships with other students where students acquire confidence in engaging with learning on an emotional level, which can often be perceived as challenging.

These six elements have implications for the roles of educator and student.

### ***The lecturer's role***

- Structured learning: Have all necessary information ready for learning, from beginning to end, from small bits on which to base larger bits.



- Learning profiles: Not exerting undue pressure on students to learn and to scaffold learning in accordance with students' learning needs.
- Participatory learning: Provide equal and frequent opportunities for students to participate and offer their opinions and viewpoints.

### ***The student's role***

- Learning to use the imagination: To be able to delineate problems from diverse viewpoints; to be critically reflective, as well as to be able to fathom the best possible solution in a given situation.
- Participating in discourse: Discourse with others is essential to substantiate the core of one's perceptions and decision making.

The transformative qualities of learning in TLT are shown through the roles of the educator and student juxtaposed with the elements of TLT. Proposed classroom teaching methods include learning contracts, group projects, role play, case studies and simulations, while learning activities include critical incidents, metaphor analysis, concept mapping, consciousness raising, life histories, repertory grids and participation in social action. The over-reliance on critical reflection (and therefore too logically focused) can be tempered with emotions and intuition which can be facilitated through discernment (Imel, 1998). Of note for this study, Mezirow (2011:26-27) affirms "that Transformative Learning often occurs as the result of an adult gaining insight into unresolved traumatic experiences occurring in childhood". Therefore, the essential elements of TLT tie in well with the focus of the study on ACEs and learning profiles of social work students. It is evident that to achieve personal transformation outcomes for students, both teaching and learning have to create opportunities for these specific outcomes.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The qualitative case study design (Creswell, 2013) was used to explore how third-year social work students at a specific university experienced ACEs in relation to teaching and learning and the students' learning profile. The research population consisted of 86 third-year students in the module. Data were sourced from student and staff participants. Students were asked whether they would volunteer their reflexive assignments in a specific third-year social work module. Data were collected from 20 reflexive assignments, selected from an initial volunteer sample of 30 students. The purposive sampling method (Creswell, 2013) was used to select a further sample of 10 student participants (from the above sample of reflexive assignments) for individual interviews. Two staff participants who taught the sample of students within the same time frame (excluding the researcher) were also interviewed.

The purpose of the writing of formative, reflexive assignments and individual interviews was to connect students with the role and influence of their own childhood experiences in their professional learning context. Students were asked to do personal introspection by reflecting on seven questions focusing on the role of their own childhood and family experiences in their social work learning. The aim with staff interviews was to obtain their perspectives on their teaching activities and experiences with students who might

have endured challenging circumstances, and the possible impact within the class context.

Thematic analysis was used to gain understanding of the patterns, forms and configurations of the data sets. The data were analysed in accordance with the steps in within-case analysis (Babbie, 2014; Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Creswell, 2013; De Vos, 2011) and used thematic analyses of: (i) each reflexive assignment, individual student interview and staff interview; (ii) each data set (20 reflexive assignments, ten individual student interviews and two staff interviews); and (iii) comparisons of data sets for data synthesis, comparing and contrasting. Four validity strategies were undertaken to enhance the trustworthiness of the study, namely member checking, rich descriptions, triangulation and researcher self-reflexivity especially with regard to bias and power differentials (Creswell, 2013). Consent and ethical clearance for the study were obtained from two institutions before the study was undertaken.

## **KEY FINDINGS: PARTICIPANTS' SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE CONTEXT OF ADVERSE CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCES**

The data that emerged from student and staff interviews supplied three key suggestions by these two distinct sets of role players in relation to teaching and learning strategies as well as methods regarding the role and effect of ACEs (Table 1).

### **KEY SUGGESTIONS BY PARTICIPANTS**

**TABLE 1  
KEY SUGGESTIONS (MAIN THEMES AND SUB-THEMES) BY  
PARTICIPANTS FOR SOCIAL WORK TEACHING AND LEARNING**

<b>1. Teaching and learning activities</b>	<b>2. Lecturer immediacy behaviours</b>	<b>3. Fieldwork and placement learning</b>	<b>SUB-THEMES</b>
Extend participatory learning methods and activities	Encourage student self-disclosure	Ensure efficient fieldwork coordination and supervision	
Expand use of real-world issues that students face	Respond to students' emotional reactions	Incorporate fieldwork educational approaches	
	Create debriefing opportunities	Teach students self-assessment of strengths	
		Focus on mindfulness	

The table shows the three main suggestions derived from the data (main themes) and the nine different components of the main suggestions (sub-themes). Each key suggestion (main theme) is explored separately in the following sections.

#### **Teaching and learning activities**

The suggestions about teaching and learning methods in class that are pertinent to the experiences of student and staff participants are explicated in two sub-themes.

### **Extend participatory learning methods and activities**

Participants identified participatory methods such as reflective assignments, case study use and movies as conducive to learning and suggested that lecturers should include more of these in teaching and learning.

- *“I think that there should be like more exercises on more stuff like the reflective summary where you can be in touch with your feelings and you can share your experience.”* [Student participant]
- *“I think the lecturer should just continue those case studies where people can unpack and discuss in small groups because in that way yes you’ll be in pain or you’ll be uneasy but at least you will be in the company of your friends and your class mates.”* [Student participant]

These narratives show participants’ views on what they relished as learning activities. Participatory methods can provide a springboard for experiential learning activities (Bozalek & Biersteker, 2010; Lee & Fortune, 2013; Norton, Russell, Wisner & Uriarte, 2011; Wehbi & Strake, 2011). Examples of transformative and experiential learning methods are reflection and reflexive exercises (Mezirow, 1997; Wehbi, 2011). These exercises have been extolled as being central to social work education for promoting deep (and new) learning and critical thinking skills (Hinett, 2001; Hussain, Mehmood & Sultana, 2011; Ringel, 2003). The benefit of reflection is that it can be the means of integrating and making sense of cognitive (rational and factual) and metacognitive (self-awareness, personal assumptions and insight) experiences (Baum, 2012; Hinett, 2001; Pallisera, Fullana, Pandarias & Badosa, 2013) and socio-political learning constraints (Chapman & Clegg, 2007). Pertinent to the research findings of this study, reflexive exercises enhanced insight into the emotions of learning to facilitate awareness of students’ own feelings, actions and values. These exercises develop their professional responses and reactions (Furman, Coyne & Negi, 2008; Hussain *et al.*, 2011). In participatory methods the use of case studies and movies, and written exercises are often cited as means to facilitate deep and reflective learning (Gibbons & Gray, 2004; Hussain *et al.*, 2011; Pallisera *et al.*, 2013). The value of this suggestion is that participatory and reflective methods should not be an inconsistent application at the will of individual lecturers, but should be structured as part of the teaching philosophy of the social work programme, with appropriate debriefing embedded.

### **Expand use of real-world issues that students face**

Participants expressed the need for lecturers to use real-world issues (authentic learning) to better prepare them for practice. A real-world context refers to concrete or realistic learning experiences in contrast to the often intellectual, academic or model-type context of the classroom (Random House Kernerman Webster’s College Dictionary, 2010).

- *“I can say to my lecturers, yes it is good work that they are doing but I think they should elaborate more on these issues, elaborate more that these things these are things that are real, these are the things that we face and that you should expect in the future.”* [Student participant]

- “...bringing in more issues at the same time will also trigger those personal experiences, maybe like the issues of rape it is quite a traumatic situation.”  
[Student participant]

Here the narratives showed participants’ desire to learn through issues that they could strongly relate to (and identify with) in theory and in practice. The narratives also show that there was a need to bring students’ own personal (and family) issues into the broader discussions so that they could relate to and learn from them. These suggestions present an opportunity for classroom learning to be structured around a different orientation to the learning that already takes place in classrooms on similar issues. The difference here is that students want their own experiences to also be included. Their suggestions have trust and ethical implications as to the way in which these needs could be facilitated within classroom learning. The participants expressed the need for their learning to be real-world based (in terms of the students’ real world); this seems common sense but should be structured in a way that learning and students’ privacy are not compromised for those who do want to disclose personal experiences.

Theme 1 contained suggestions that are relevant to learning as participatory methods can be the conduit for *reflective* (reflecting on direct experiences) and *reflexive* (reflecting on personal experiences) learning. Reflective/reflexive learning facilitates critical thinking and deep learning. Significantly in terms of this study, reflexive tasks enable students to gain insight (self-awareness) into the emotions of learning. Using real-world issues presupposes that students would be better prepared for practice and that the learning context be based on realistic learning tasks positioning students’ personal experiences within their general learning.

### **Lecturers’ immediacy behaviours**

The second suggestion clarified participants’ views about lecturers’ personal and professional behaviours within the classroom (called immediacy behaviours). A positive lecturer-student relationship is conducive to learning and predicated on *proximity* (the level of cooperation and closeness) and *influence* (the balance between dominance and compliance) (Brekelsman, Den Brok, Van Tartwijk & Wubbels, 2005; Myers & Anderson, 2010). Janis Anderson (in 1979) identified these actions as immediacy behaviours and key components in classroom communicative behaviours that foster student engagement and the social presence of the lecturer (Burroughs, 2007; Gendrin & Rucker, 2007; Reupert, Mayberry, Patrick & Chittleborough, 2009; Sibii, 2010). This suggestion revealed three sub-themes that focused on self-disclosure, lecturer reactions and debriefing imperatives.

### **Encourage student self-disclosure (sharing/talking)**

Participants suggested that lecturers encourage sharing and talking about students’ personal experiences.

- “Well I would actually say is you could encourage people to talk more in class, to share their stories.” [Student participant]

- *“I also suggest that maybe instead of doing case studies or like in terms of activities, they would just ask maybe because there are students in class that also went through similar situations.”* [Student participant]

The narratives unmistakably illustrated the need of participants to share their life experiences and to listen to those of fellow students within the classroom context. Good teaching should not only facilitate academic success, but also life success by being aware of the interrelatedness of socio-emotional skills and academic outcomes (Grauerholz, 2001; Zins & Elias, 2007). Meyer and Turner (2002) confirm that emotions are entangled in the responses of both students and lecturers, and therefore are central in the relational aspects in the classroom. By teaching holistically, lecturers can link academic teaching to students’ personal experiences and, in this way, deep learning takes place (Grauerholz, 2001). Although there are boundaries to student self-disclosure (student protection, stigma and discrimination), the notion of self-disclosure is a shared and necessary activity that would consequently influence class interactions (Rosenbloom & Fetner, 2001).

Furthermore, the lecturer’s role is to manage the process of student self-disclosure in relevant ways and take into account its possible implications and impact on the students themselves (Tardy & Dindia, 2006; Ward, 2008). Self-disclosure is determined by certain principles, such as the amount to disclose, level of information to share, timing of disclosure and types of information (Jeffrey & Austin, 2007). This finding shows that self-disclosure is necessary, but that it should be structured and purposeful in terms of teaching and learning and professional outcomes.

### **Respond to students’ emotional reactions**

Recommendations were obtained about the responses that student participants expected to their emotional reactions.

- *“And even if you know that you’re going to encourage them, you know you must have a back-up plan if someone gets emotional, what am I going to do.”* [Student participant]
- *“If you’re walking around you can actually see and ask them okay maybe you should stay behind, I noticed during the lecture while I was walking around and while you were engaging with other group members that you were actually maybe uncomfortable with the topic. Maybe if you do that you could give the person some recommendations to speak to people.”* [Student participant]

Participants show through these narratives that they want lecturers to engage with them on a more intimate level and to be able to see them as real people with personal histories and not only as learning vessels. Historically, universities have been the site for intellectual and logical reasoning, underscoring the pre-eminence of the Cartesian dualities of, for example, cognitive vs affective, mind vs body, and the gender split, rendering the context for higher learning devoid of feelings and passion (Blomberg, 2013; Leathwood & Hey, 2009; Varlander, 2008). Therefore the place of emotion in learning in higher education has been strongly impugned (Leathwood & Hey, 2009).

However, studies have confirmed the significance of emotion in learning and the necessity for HEIs to recognise its influence and role within the learning context (Cartney & Rouse, 2006; Kasworm, 2008; Storrs, 2012) and for lecturers to respond fittingly to students' emotions (Storrs, 2012; Varlander, 2008).

Participants proposed that suitable lecturing skills included, for example, being sensitive to students' viewpoints; preparing students beforehand regarding the emotional content/possible impact of topics; being empathic and observant; providing personal examples; and allowing voluntary student participation. Some strategies that lecturers could use in the classroom in emotionally charged situations are: cultivating a supportive culture in the class, for example, respect for other's histories and feelings; adhering to the principles of confidentiality and boundaries; recognising the distress of others; initiating dialogues as co-constructions of meaning; facilitating reflection; taking the student's perspective; and active listening (Agllias, 2012; McLaughlin, 2000; Storrs, 2012). Varlander (2008) used Crotty's (1998) definition of constructivism to link the role of emotions in learning to the constructivist notion of learning where knowledge building is socially constructed out of the interactions between people and their environment.

The cited literature has presented very meaningful ways in which the personal narratives of students can be elicited, providing a structure for confidentiality, respect and trust. The suggestion clearly indicates that structured responses to students' emotions in learning will form part of future teaching and learning in HEIs.

### **Create debriefing opportunities**

Recommendations included suggestions for debriefing opportunities for emotionally-laden discussions and reflective tasks. Debriefing will provide space for students to reflect on their knowledge and practice in order to consider and integrate their perceptions, feelings and behaviour during the learning exercise (Dreifuerst, 2009; Rudolph, Simon, Raemer & Eppich, 2008).

- *“I felt that we should have had a space where we could have discussed it (the movie) afterwards.”* [Student participant]
- *“Even if it was just some friends making groups and going to discuss the movie and then writing up some of the things that came up.”* [Student participant]

Participants' suggestions reveal that they want lecturers to embed suitable outlets after emotive learning sessions within module outlines. Koster (2011) argues that student self-disclosures alter the lecturer-student relationship boundaries because the need to help students overrides the purely academic role. Cantrell (2008) confirms that course content and (simulation) exercises can ignite a powerful need for debriefing and thus social work students (in particular) should be prepared for the nature of the learning and possible emotional reactions (Didham, Dromgole, Csiernik, Karley & Hurley, 2011). Debriefing should be a vital component of the curriculum and should take place after the exercise to assist with disengagement and to assimilate the academic and emotional experiences into learning (Didham *et al.*, 2011; Garrett, MacPhee & Jackson, 2010; Reese, Jeffries &

Engum, 2010; Sieminski & Seden, 2011). Debriefing, including critical reflection, should therefore be included in academic planning (Garrett *et al.*, 2010) because it is vital for experiential learning (Fanning & Gaba, 2007; Rudolph, Simon, Rivard, Dufresne & Raemer, 2007). Debriefing can be free-form, for example, through email and telephone conversations with the lecturer, but it will depend on the lecturer-student ratio in the class (Agllias, 2012). Debriefing can also be open in the classroom, where the lecturer may ask students to explore their own socio-emotional histories that could lead to countertransference issues or vicarious traumatisation (Didham *et al.*, 2011). The findings again denote that participants are clear about their needs. Debriefing in the class (or after) is essential and the literature verifies this task; whether free-form or structured (or both), this must be part of the mind-set of the social work lecturer.

Theme 2 involves lecturers' immediacy behaviours, which prompted three suggestions. These suggestions encouraged student self-disclosure; exhorted lecturers to institute structured responses to students' emotional reactions in class; and recommended the creation of structured debriefing opportunities. The suggestions are relevant with regard to the ACEs of students and their resultant heightened emotions, and they clarify the role of lecturers in this context.

### **Fieldwork and placement learning**

Staff participants suggested that students be sufficiently oriented and prepared for theory and practice. Fieldwork learning is a purposeful plan for practice learning that takes place in professional work settings in order for students to integrate theory and practice under the tutelage (supervision) of a qualified social worker (Bogo, 2006; Dhemba, 2012). Fieldwork learning is often cited as social work's signature pedagogy (Wayne, Bogo & Raskin, 2010). Social work fieldwork emerged from the apprenticeship model of learning by doing and through role modelling by the practitioner (Cleak & Smith, 2012). The aim of social work fieldwork supervision is to facilitate opportunities for theory and practice integration and the development of a professional persona (Cleak & Smith, 2012; Everett, Miehl, Dubois & Garran, 2011). There are four sub-themes.

### **Incorporate fieldwork education approaches**

Suggestions for the inclusion of teaching and learning approaches for the practicum programme, namely the student-centred philosophy and the human capabilities approach, were particularly geared to the learning needs of students.

- *“I think it is more student-centred .... we should really hone in on that approach to supervision and to our curriculum. I know it's aimed at clients... But I think we could draw on the theoretical philosophy of it more for our students as well.”*  
[Staff participant]
- *“...we should look at human capabilities approach when we re-curriculate [denoting curriculum redesign] because of the uniqueness of the [university's] BSW in that we have a particular number of our student cohort that should be RPL [Recognition of Prior Learning], that comes with experience and also our young newly matriculated students, they come with a variety of different”*

*backgrounds and experience... And then hand in hand with that would go strength-based...* [Staff participant]

These suggestions mention appropriate theories that would relate to students' learning profiles. The capabilities approach is based on welfare economics originally developed by Amartya Sen and further developed by the philosopher Martha Nussbaum (Maddox, 2008; Nussbaum, 2006; Robeyns, 2003; Walker, 2012; Wood & Deprez, 2012). A key principle is the focus on what people are able to do and to become, emphasising the values of autonomy and freedom (Robeyns, 2003), which can counteract an adverse past, present circumstances, and feed into educational needs (Wood & Deprez, 2012). The constructivist approach to teaching and learning is not dissimilar to the capabilities approach in that the principles of student-centred learning and active learning are particularly geared towards developing the students' capacities through flexible, self-directed, collaborative, problem-based and experiential learning (Mascolo, 2009; O'Neill & McMahon, 2005). The suggestion that the fieldwork programme be underpinned with a specific learning approach is positive and the suggestions are worth considering as they link with a particular student profile.

### **Teach students self-assessment of strengths**

To inform the learning contract, students should be assisted from the first year to assess their own strengths and to scaffold and reflect on them on a regular basis, instead of supervisors fulfilling this task.

- *“In the first year already maybe in every year level that the students write for us that will go onto their personal file, what are my strengths and it comes from them... [and not] from the perspective of the supervisor.”* [Staff participant]
- *“I think I would definitely next year want to focus more in having them believe and accept that when they go into an agency that they're coming to add some value. Because some of them do feel that what am I doing here? What can I really do? I've been abused can I really do this? I have such a failed self-esteem, can I really do this?”* [Staff participant]

These suggestions focused on the skill of self-assessment by students which would advance their notions of self-efficacy and self-belief. Research has confirmed that self-assessment (where it operates as a mechanism for learning) can be a means for enabling students to accurately identify their strengths and weaknesses (Andrade & Valtcheva, 2009; Eva & Regehr, 2005). Benefits for students are professional self-regulation, appropriate goal setting, confidence boosting and increased motivation (Andrade & Du, 2007; Langendyk, 2006; Ross, 2006). For the most part students generally linked self-assessment to their perception of the time and effort invested in the task, not necessarily related to the standard of work (Taras, 2003). However, accurate self-assessment was linked to a deep approach to learning (Cassidy, 2006). This suggestion is sporadically used in social work at the specific university, but in a somewhat inconsistent and unstructured way. The cited literature has expanded the thinking around student self-assessment that, when used in the suggested way, will assist in achieving deep learning,



but not in its current form. Therefore to develop deep learning, self-assessment must be embedded in modules across year levels for scaffolding of this skill.

### **Focus on mindfulness in learning**

To focus on the self in the first year of study, with topics on self-development allowing students to reflect on who they are and “what they’re about”, will form the basis for their professional self and identity. These learning endeavours have been identified as mindfulness. Mindfulness in the classroom is a cognitive activity for raising students’ awareness of their internal and external lenses that would enable them to pay unencumbered attention to their emotions and to the various viewpoints in the class as the learning process unfolds (Coholic, 2011; Napoli & Bonifas, 2011; Napoli, Krech & Holley, 2005).

- *“I think there should be something more maybe built into 101 [first-year fieldwork module] on self-development, personal development, just for that student from first year to know who they are, what they’re about, more intense work with that so that they can determine whether this is for me, there already you know instead of coming to third year and working with all these different types of issues and then dropping out to say that because it’s too hectic.”* [Staff participant]
- *“I say it must start from their first year so that they can develop into this practitioner when they come to third and fourth year. So I think it’s definitely a matter of having to – I don’t want to say overcome – but having to accept their past and what has happened and having tools to manage that past and I think that would be a good investment.”* [Staff participant]

These suggestions clearly reflect the significance of students’ early exposure to learning tasks that would provide opportunities for them to learn more about themselves. This focus will assist students in developing intra-personal awareness and strengths to manage their past, as well as assess whether social work is the appropriate career for them. The outcomes of mindfulness include self-acceptance, trust, non-judgmentalism and self-awareness (Birnbaum, 2008; Birnbaum & Birnbaum, 2008; Dekeyser, Raes, Leijssen, Leysen & Dewulf, 2008). The suggestion is an important one as it reflects and acknowledges the personal struggles of students especially in the social work learning context.

In Theme 3 fieldwork and placement learning were the dominant focus. The suggestions were attentive to the needs of students within their fieldwork and placement settings and the ideas that emerged essentially centred on enriching the learning experiences in this context. Furthermore, these suggestions are important as they are helpful strategies to sufficiently induct students into fieldwork practice for the year level, as well as for ongoing preparation sessions so that students could feel more self-contained, knowledgeable and confident about expectations and requirements.

## **DISCUSSION AND STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The three key suggestions from participants emphasised that students in HEIs (mostly adult learners) desire to be active participants in class; that they want lecturers to be

more meaningfully engaged with them as whole human beings; and that their fieldwork and placement learning must not only take their needs (their “wholeness”) into account but also their learning needs for fieldwork/placement learning, with particular reference to mindfulness practices that would teach and enhance self-awareness. However, the findings do not suggest that all social work students have endured harrowing childhood experiences. The majority of students in the population, however, did indicate levels of adverse childhood experiences.

The findings also show the need to rethink and reorganise the curriculum structure and design, as well as to incorporate aspects to familiarise staff with students’ learning profiles and what these mean for teaching and learning. The value of knowing social work students’ learning profiles lies in increased understanding of both context (social circumstances) and personal characteristics, because it is the combination of the two that determines students’ emotional reactions within the learning environment. The impact of ACEs is particularly linked to the learning profiles of social work students. Consequently this study has contributed to the knowledge relating to the significance of the learning profiles of social work students.

Participants’ suggestions have supported the notion of lecturers understanding students’ learning profiles in teaching and learning. These suggestions have strongly related to TLT as a learning philosophy and theory. The use of transformative learning methods is vital because of the personal transformative impact on the student. Therefore when one considers their experiences prior to their HE studies, the choice of TLT becomes clear.

The following teaching and learning recommendations can be made on the basis of the findings.

### **The professional use of self in the context of professional learning**

The study’s findings and conclusions have converged to produce the following considerations for the professional learning context.

- The professional use of self (including the focus on counter-transference, intersubjectivity, self-disclosure and empathy) in an appropriate place in the existing social work curriculum to maximise optimal learning in terms of theory and practice.
- Introduction of contemporary psychodynamic theories (for example, intersubjectivity theory or relational theory) that would refocus attention on the socio-emotional factors forming the basis of behaviour, feelings and emotions, and development of awareness of how these link with early experiences, both in terms of students’ self-awareness and their understanding of how they affect their clients.
- The inclusion of mindfulness practices in fieldwork learning to support students’ post-traumatic growth, and teach self-awareness (such as facilitating self-observation and introspection regarding personal reactions, strengths, motives and histories) to develop insight and perceptiveness regarding feelings, behaviours and virtue ethics. These activities would contribute to the development of a professional identity, specifically developing a personal philosophy of practice. Examples of teaching practices are: journaling, reaction papers (after an exercise), seminar discussions, role

plays, video/films, genograms, ecomaps and life history timelines (Heydt & Sherman, 2005).

- Consider the capabilities approach especially to support fieldwork education, which facilitates the focus on self-efficacy and which addresses students' past and present experiences and relates to their learning needs.
- Use the transformative learning approaches, for example, problem-based learning methods such as case studies of real-world issues, and critical reflective tasks such as thought-provoking interchanges, observations, reflective recall activities, and journal writing to facilitate introspection and future perspectives (looking backward, inward, outward and forward).
- Promote student self-development through facilitating skills regarding student self-assessment of personal strengths, social work and academic abilities that will be authentic and based within a growth and development context. In addition, all teaching staff should encourage and implement structured appraisals of students for a composite view of student profiles to be used to inform teaching and learning responsiveness.

### **Development of lecturers' immediacy behaviours**

This refers to lecturers' immediacy behaviours which relate to the lecturer-student relationship and interaction. Therefore it is recommended that lecturers:

- Extend lecturer presence in the class context through open and active interaction and engagement with students during class activities (alongside the use of constructivist teaching methods);
- Increase lecturer credibility and trustworthiness in interactions with students through behaviours that show values (such as consistency, fairness, non-judging and non-discrimination) for students to endorse and affirm lecturers' trustworthiness;
- Develop the use of lecturers' self-disclosure that links up with the topic under discussion to benefit from the lecturers' experiences and knowledge.

### **Responding to students' emotional needs and vicarious traumatisation**

Based on the study's findings and conclusions, three tasks concern the appropriate response to students' emotional needs and vicarious traumatisation. It is recommended that lecturers:

- Incorporate structured debriefing sessions in class using case vignettes for discussion, reflection and (appropriate) self-disclosure;
- Manage student self-disclosure to preserve confidentiality (taking place in consultation) and/or maintain principles of non-judging and acceptance (taking place in class), where discussion is structured and topic-specific;
- Clarify appropriate lecturer and fieldwork supervisor responses to students' emotional reactions that include timeliness, appropriateness and sensitivity.

These recommendations provide an alternative framework from which to view social work students' past and present learning experiences. These recommendations could contribute to students fulfilling their potential and completing their studies despite the effects of childhood adversities. In the assessment of the social work competencies of students, Gibbons, Bore, Munro and Powis (2007) identified two vital factors, namely the resolution of adverse experiences and the lack of narcissism. The implementation of the recommendations from the study would directly address these factors.

## REFERENCES

- AGLIAS, K. 2012. Keeping safe: teaching undergraduate social work students about interpersonal violence. **Journal of Social Work Practice**, 26(2):259-274.
- ANDRADE, H. & DU, Y. 2007. Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. **Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education**, 32(2):159-181.
- ANDRADE, H. & VALTCHEVA, A. 2009. Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment. **Theory into Practice**, 48(1):12-19.
- BABBIE, E. 2014. **The basics of social research** (6<sup>th</sup> ed). California, USA: Cengage Learning.
- BAUM, N. 2012. Reflective writing assignment to help social work trainees work through poor supervisory relationships. **Social Work Education**, 31(1):110-124.
- BERNARD, H. & RYAN, G. 2010. **Analyzing qualitative data: systematic approaches**. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- BIRNBAUM, L. 2008. The use of mindfulness training to create an 'accompanying place' for social work students. **Social Work Students**, 27(8):837-852.
- BIRNBAUM, L. & BIRNBAUM, A. 2008. Mindful social work: from theory to practice. **Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought**, 27(1-2):87-102.
- BLOMBERG, D. 2013. "The heart has reasons that reasons cannot know": thinking, feeling, and willing in learning. **Journal of Education and Christian Belief**, 17(1):61-77.
- BOGO, M. 2006. Field instruction in social work: a review of the research literature. **The Clinical Supervisor**, 24(1-2):163-193.
- BOZALEK, V. 2013. Equity and graduate attributes. In: BONI, A. & WALKER, M. (eds.). **Human development and capabilities: Re-imagining the university of the twenty-first century**. London: Taylor and Francis.
- BOZALEK, V. & BIERSTEKER, L. 2010. Exploring power and privilege using participatory learning and action techniques. **Social Work Education**, 29(5):551-572.
- BREKELSMAN, M., DEN BROK, P., VAN TARTWIJK, J. & WUBBELS, T. 2005. An interpersonal perspective on teacher behavior in the classroom. In: BARNES, L. (ed). **Contemporary Teaching and Teacher Issues**. New York: Nova Science.

- BURROUGHS, N. 2007. A reinvestigation of the relationship of teacher nonverbal immediacy and student compliance-resistance with learning. **Communication Education**, 56(4):453-475.
- CANTRELL, M. 2008. The importance of debriefing in clinical simulations. **Clinical Simulation in Nursing**, 4(2):19-23.
- CARELSE, S. & DYKES, G. 2013. Integrating theory and practice in social work: challenges and triumphs. **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 49(2):165-182.
- CARTNEY, P. 2000. Adult learning styles: implications for practice teaching in social work. **Social Work Education**, 19(6):609-626.
- CARTNEY, P. 2004. How academic knowledge can support practice learning: a case study of learning styles. **Journal of Practice Teaching**, 5(2):51-72.
- CARTNEY, P. & ROUSE, A. 2006. The emotional impact of learning in small groups: highlighting the impact on student progression and retention. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 11(1):79-91.
- CASSIDY, S. 2006. Learning style and student self-assessment skill. **Education & Training**, 48(2-3):170-177.
- CHAPMAN, F. & CLEGG, P. 2007. Bridging the theory practice gap: an innovative approach to praxis in professional education. **Assessment, Teaching & Learning Journal**, 1(1) Spring.
- CHESBOROUGH, S. 2009. Do social work students learn differently? MBTI® implications for teaching strategies that address social work students' current learning styles. **Journal of Psychological Type**, 69(2):23-41.
- CLEAK, H. & SMITH, D. 2012. Student satisfaction with models of field placement supervision. **Australian Social Work**, 65(2):243-258.
- COHOLIC, D. 2011. Exploring the feasibility and benefits of arts-based mindfulness-based practices with young people in need: aiming to improve aspects of self-awareness and resilience. **Child Youth Care Forum**, 40(4):303-317.
- COLLINS, K. & VAN BREDA, A. 2010. Academic support for first-year social work students in South Africa. **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 46(2):14-25.
- CRESWELL, J. 2013. **Qualitative inquiry & research design. choosing among five approaches** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DEKEYSER, M., RAES, F., LEIJSEN, M., LEYSEN, S. & DEWULF, D. 2008. Mindfulness skills and interpersonal behavior. **Personality and Individual Differences**, 44(5):1235-1245.
- DE VOS, A. 2011. Qualitative data analysis and interpretation. In: DE VOS, A. STRYDOM, H. FOUCHÉ, C. & DELPORT, C. (eds). **Research at grass roots: for the social sciences and human service professions** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

- DHEMBA, J. 2012. Fieldwork in social work education and training: issues and challenges in the case of Eastern and Southern Africa. **Social Work and Society. International Online Journal**, 10(1):1-16.
- DIDHAM, S., DROMGOLE, L., CSIERNIK, R., KARLEY, M. & HURLEY, D. 2011. Trauma exposure and the social work practicum. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 31(5):523-537.
- DREIFUERST, K. 2009. The essentials of debriefing in simulation learning: a concept analysis. **Nursing Education Perspectives**, 30(2):109-114.
- DYKES, G. 2011. The implications of adverse childhood experiences for the professional requirements of social work. **Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk**, 47(4): 521-533.
- DYKES, G. 2012. Phronesis and adverse childhood experiences of social work students. **Social Work Practitioner-Researcher**, 24(3):331-348.
- DYKES, G. 2014. **An enquiry into the role of adverse childhood experiences on teaching and learning in social work**. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University. (PhD thesis)
- EVA, K. & REGEHR, G. 2005. Self-assessment in the health professions: a reformulation and research agenda. **Academic Medicine**, 80(10):46-54.
- EVERETT, J., MIEHLS, D., DUBOIS, C. & GARRAN, A. 2011. The developmental model of supervision as reflected in the experiences of field supervisors and graduate students. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 31(3):250-264.
- FANNING, R. & GABA, D. 2007. The role of debriefing in simulation-based learning. *Simulation in Healthcare*. **The Journal of the Society for Simulation in Healthcare**, 2(2):115-125.
- FRY, H., KETTERIDGE, S. & MARSHALL, S. 2009. **A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education. Enhancing academic practice** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). New York: Routledge.
- FURMAN, R., COYNE, A. & NEGI, N. 2008. An international experience for social work students: self-reflection through poetry and journal writing exercise. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 28(1-2):71-85.
- GARRETT, B., MACPHEE, M. & JACKSON, C. 2010. High-fidelity patient simulation: considerations for effective learning. **Nursing Education Perspectives**, 31(5):309-313.
- GENDRIN, D. & RUCKER, M. 2007. Student motive for communicating and instructor immediacy: a matched-race institutional comparison. **Atlantic Journal of Communication**, 15(1):41-60.
- GIBBONS, J. & GRAY, M. 2004. Critical thinking as integral to social work practice. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 24(1-2):19-38.

- GIBBONS, J., BORE, M., MUNRO, D. & POWIS, D. 2007. Using personal quality assessment for selection of social work students. **Australian Social Work**, 60(2):210-221.
- GRAUERHOLZ, L. 2001. Teaching holistically to achieve deep learning. **College Teaching**, 49(2):44-50.
- HAWK, T. & SHAH, A. 2007. Using learning style instruments to enhance student learning. **Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education**, 5(1):1-19.
- HEYDT, M. & SHERMAN, N. 2005. Conscious use of self: tuning the instrument of social work practice with cultural competence. **The Journal of Baccalaureate Social Work**, 10(2):25-40.
- HINETT, K. 2001. **Improving learning through reflection – part one**. The Higher Education Academy [Online] Available: [www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/resources/database/id485\\_improving\\_learning\\_part\\_one.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/resources/database/id485_improving_learning_part_one.pdf) [Accessed: 19/02/2015].
- HLALELE, D. 2010. Do learning skills acquired in the university access programme enhance participation in academic practice? **South African Journal of Higher Education**, 24(1):98-110.
- HUSSAIN, M., MEHMOOD, A. & SULTANA, M. 2011. An inquiry into benefits of reflective practice in open and distant learning. **Turkish Online Journal of Distant Education**, 12(2):51-59.
- HYLAND-RUSSELL, T. & GROEN, J. 2011. Marginalized non-traditional adult learners: beyond economics. **The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education**, 24(1):67-79.
- IMEL, S. 1998. **Transformative learning in adulthood**. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Digest No. 200. [Online] Available: [www.Calpro-online.org/ERIC/docs/dig200.pdf](http://www.Calpro-online.org/ERIC/docs/dig200.pdf). [Accessed: 23/05/2015].
- JEFFREY, A. & AUSTIN, T. 2007. Perspectives and practices of clinician self-disclosure to clients: a pilot comparison study of two disciplines. **The American Journal of Family Therapy**, 35:95-108.
- KASWORM, C. 2008. Emotional challenges of adult learners in higher education. **New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education**, 120:27-34.
- KELL, C. 2006. Undergraduates' learning profile development. What is happening to the men? **Medical Teacher**, 28(1):16-24.
- KOSTER, S. 2011. The self-managed heart: teaching gender and doing emotional labour in a higher education institution. **Pedagogy, Culture & Society**, 19(1):61-77.
- LANGENDYK, V. 2006. Not knowing that they do not know: self-assessment accuracy of third-year medical students. **Medical Education**, 40(2):173-176.
- LEATHWOOD, C. & HEY, V. 2009. Gender/ed discourses and emotional sub-texts: theorising emotion in UK higher education. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 14(4):429-440.

- LEE, M. & FORTUNE, A. 2013. Do we need more “doing” activities or “thinking” activities in the field of practicum? **Journal of Social Work Education**, 49(4):646-660.
- MADDOX, B. 2008. What good is literacy? Insights and implications of the Capabilities Approach. **Journal of Human Development**, 9(2):185-206.
- MASCOLO, M. 2009. Beyond student-centred and teacher-centred pedagogy: teaching and learning as guided participation. **Pedagogy and the Human Sciences**, 1(1):3-27.
- MASSEY, M., KIM, S. & MITCHELL, C. 2011. A study of the learning styles of undergraduate social work students. **Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work**, 8(3):294-303.
- McLAUGHLIN, C. 2000. The emotional challenge of listening and dialogue. **Pastoral Care in Education**, 18(3):16-21.
- MERRIAM, S., CAFFARELLA, R. & BAUMGARTNER, L. 2007. **Learning in adulthood: a comprehensive guide** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.
- MEYER, D. & TURNER, J. 2002. Discovering emotion in classroom motivation research. **Educational Psychologist**, 37(2):107-114.
- MEZIROW, J. 1997. Transformative learning: theory to practice. **New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education**, 74:5-12.
- MEZIROW, J. 2011. Transformative learning theory. In: MEZIROW, J. & TAYLOR, E. (eds). **Transformative learning in practice. Insights from community, workplace, and higher education**. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- MYERS, A. & ANDERSON, S. 2010. How teacher positioning in the classroom affects the on-task behavior of students. **E-Journal of Student Research**, 2(1):1-9.
- NAPOLI, M. & BONIFAS, R. 2011. From theory towards empathic self-care: creating a mindful classroom for social work students. **Social Work Education**, 30(6):635-649.
- NAPOLI, M., KRECH, P. & HOLLEY, L. 2005. Mindfulness training for elementary school students. **Journal of Applied School Psychology**, 21(1):99-125.
- NORTON, C., RUSSELL, A., WISNER, B. & URIARTE, J. 2011. Reflective teaching in social work education: findings from a participatory action research study. **Social Work Education**, 30(4):392-407.
- NUSSBAUM, M. 2006. Education and democratic citizenship: capabilities and quality education. **Journal of Human Development**, 7(3):385-395.
- O’NEILL, G. & McMAHON, T. 2005. Student-centred learning: what does it mean for students and lecturers? In: O’NEILL, G., MOORE, S. & McMULLIN, B. (eds). **Emerging issues in the practice of university learning and teaching**. Dublin: Aishe Publishing.
- PALLISERA, M., FULLANA, J., PANDARIAS, J. & BADOSA, M. 2013. Personal and professional development (or use of self) in social educator training. An experience



based on reflective learning. **Social Work Education: The International Journal**, 32(5):576-589.

POWELL, W. & KASUMA-POWELL, O. 2011. **How to teach now: five keys to personalized learning in the global classroom**. Alexandria, Virginia (USA): ASCD (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

RAMSDEN, P. 1992. **Learning to teach in higher education**. London: Routledge.

RANDOM HOUSE KERNERMAN WEBSTER'S COLLEGE DICTIONARY. 2010. **Real-world issues** [Online] Available: [www.thefreedictionary.com](http://www.thefreedictionary.com). [Accessed: 21/03/2014].

REESE, C., JEFFRIES, P. & ENGUM, S. 2010. Learning together: using simulations to develop nursing and medical student collaboration. **Nursing Education Perspectives**, 31(1):33-37.

REUPERT, A., MAYBERRY, D., PATRICK, K. & CHITTLEBOROUGH, P. 2009. The importance of being human: instructors' personal presence in distance programs. **International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education**, 21(1):47-56.

RIGGS, L. & HELLYER-RIGGS, S. 2009. Beyond information, through participation, to new learning for personal and cognitive growth in Higher Education: focusing on the process. **The International Journal of Learning**, 16(5):399-408.

RINGEL, S. 2003. The reflective self: a path to creativity and intuitive knowledge in social work practice. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 23(3-4):15-28.

ROBEYNS, I. 2003. **The Capability Approach: an interdisciplinary introduction**. Training course preceding the Third International Conference on the Capability Approach, Pavia, Italy, 2003.

ROLLNICK, M., LUBBEN, S., LOTZ, S. & DLAMINI, B. 2002. What do underprepared students learn about measurement from introductory laboratory work? **Research in Science Education**, 32(1):1-18.

ROSENBLOOM, S. & FETNER, T. 2001. Sharing secrets slowly: issues of classroom self-disclosure raised by student sex workers. **Teaching Sociology**, 29(4):439-453.

ROSS, C. 2006. Brain self-repair in psychotherapy: implications for education. **New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education**, 110:29-33.

ROSSLYN, F. 2004. The emotional background to learning: a university experience. **Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties**, 9(1):70-76.

RUDOLPH, J., SIMON, R., RAEMER, D. & EPPICH, W. 2008. Debriefing as formative assessment: closing the gaps in medical education. **Academic Emergency Medicine**, 15(11):1010-1016.

RUDOLPH, J., SIMON, R., RIVARD, P., DUFRESNE, R. & RAEMER, D. 2007. Debriefing with good judgment: combining rigorous feedback with genuine inquiry. **Anaesthesiology Clinics**, 25(2):361-376.

- SIBII, R. 2010. Conceptualizing teacher immediacy through the companion metaphor. **Teacher in Higher Education**, 15(5):531-542.
- SIEMINSKI, S. & SEDEN, J. 2011. An exploration of how some tutors use learning materials to enable student social workers to link theory to practice while learning in the workplace. **Social Work Education**, 30(7):797-810.
- SMIT, R. 2012. Towards a clearer understanding of student disadvantage in higher education: problematising deficit thinking. **Higher Education Research & Development**, 31(3):369-380.
- STORRS, D. 2012. 'Keeping it real' with an emotional curriculum. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 17(4):1-12.
- TARAS, M. 2003. To feedback or not to feedback in student self-assessment. **Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education**, 28(5):549-565.
- TARDY, C. & DINDIA, K. 2006. Self-disclosure: strategic revelation of information in personal and professional relationships. In: HARGIE, O. (ed). **The Handbook of communication skills** (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). London: Routledge / Taylor & Francis.
- TAYLOR, E. 2008. Transformative Learning Theory. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. **Special Issue: Third update on Adult Learning Theory**, 2008(119):5-15.
- TAYLOR, E. 2011. Fostering transformative learning. In: MEZIRROW, J. & TAYLOR, E. (eds). **Transformative learning in practice. Insights from community, workplace, and higher education**. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- TOMLINSON, C., BRIGHTON, C., HERTBERG, H., CALLAHAN, C., MOON, T, BRIMIJOIN, K., CONOVER, L. & REYNOLDS, T. 2003. Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: a review of literature. **Journal for the Education of the Gifted**, 27(2-3):119-145.
- VANTHOURNOUT, G., COERTJENS, L., GIJBELS, D., DONCHE, V. & VAN PETEGEM, P. 2013. Assessing students' development in learning approaches according to initial learning profiles: a person-oriented perspective. **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, 39(1):33-40.
- VARLANDER, S. 2008. The role of emotions in formal feedback situations. **Teaching in Higher Education**, 13(2):145-156.
- WALKER, M. 2012. Introduction. **Journal of Human Development and Capabilities: A Multi-disciplinary Journal for People-Centred Development**, 13(3):331-334.
- WARD, A. 2008. Beyond the instructional mode: creating a holding environment for the learning about the use of self. **Journal of Social Work Practice: Psychotherapeutic Approaches in Health, Welfare and the Community**, 22(1):67-83.
- WAYNE, J., BOGO, M. & RASKIN, M. 2010. Field education as the signature pedagogy of social work education. **Journal of Social Work Education**, 46(3):327-339.

WEHBI, S. 2011. Reflections on experiential teaching methods: linking the classroom to practice. **Journal of Teaching in Social Work**, 31(5):493-504.

WEHBI, S. & STRAKE, S. 2011. Revaluing student knowledge through reflective practice on involvement in social justice efforts. **Social Work Education**, 30(1):45-54.

WILCOX, S. 1996. Fostering self-directed learning in the university setting. **Studies in Higher Education**, 21(2):165-186.

WILLIAMS, B., BROWN, T. & ETHERINGTON, J. 2013. Learning style preferences of undergraduate social work students. **Social Work Education. The International Journal**, 32(8):972-990.

WOOD, D. & DEPREZ, L. 2012. Teaching for human well-being: curricular implications for the Capability Approach. **Journal of Human Development and Capabilities: A Multi-disciplinary Journal for People-Centred Development**, 13(2):471-493.

ZINS, J. & ELIAS, M. 2007. Social and emotional learning: promoting the development of all students. **Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation**, 17(2-3):233-255.

*Dr Glynnis Dykes, PhD graduate, Prof Sulina Green, Department of Social Work, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa.*