AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF MENTOR: A NEW CLINICAL TEACHING CONCEPT FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADVANCED PROFESSIONALS

A dissertation submitted to the Institute for Clinical Social Work in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Social Work

by

RUTH EHRLICH BRO

January 1980

INSTITUTE FOR CLINICAL SOCIAL WORK

We hereby approve the Project Demonstrating Excellence

AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE OF MENTOR:
A NEW CLINICAL TEACHING CONCEPT FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADVANCED PROFESSIONALS

Title

by

Ruth Ehrlich Bro

candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Social Work

Signed:

Doctoral Committee:

Mentor

Animateur

External Member

Date: 1/4/80

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to acknowledge heartfelt appreciation to many whose help, support and encouragement facilitated the completion of this project.

My doctoral committee Jean Sanville, chairperson, Beatrice Sommers and Bernice Augenbraun, who provided encouragement, invaluable clarification, suggestions and frequently necessary limits to my meandering struggles.

Many dear Institute colleagues, in various roles, who shared with me a rich creative experience in which we mutually learned from and taught each other.

Most particularly the students whom I mentored for their generosity in allowing me to learn from our work together and from whom I have learned as much, if not more, than they from me.

Rae Freed, for her careful editorial help as well as her patient attempts to teach me the mysteries of research design and language.

Charles Stone, whose always empathic encouragement of my delayed blooming processes made possible this latest surprising and satisfying experience among many others.

Most of all, my dear Maurice whose patience,

protectiveness, genuine pride and true comradeship provided the essential emotional climate without which periods of inner doubt and stumbling discouragement could never have been overcome and completion of the work would not have been possible.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

History

The Institute for Clinical Social Work was developed in California as an extramural doctoral program for advanced clinicians. It grew out of a grassroots interest on the part of the clinical social work community for a doctoral program which would offer a mode of study with appeal to practicing clinicians. There had been increasing recognition that MSW training, followed by practice under institutional auspices, could not provide either the quality of or opportunity for education and training adequate for independent practice. It was also clear that the many continuing education opportunities offered in the community through extension courses, analytic institutes and the Society for Clinical Social Work offered only a fragmented experience despite their high quality. Nevertheless, many interested clinicians upgraded their competence and pursued special interests in this fashion, utilizing what was available to them. It was left to the individual to integrate learning with practice in a

relatively solitary fashion and there was, in addition, no way in which there could be formal recognition or external acknowledgment for the investment in continuous learning.

The program of the Institute was designed as a school without walls which would serve highly individualized needs and interests, emphasizing self-directed study within a broadly conceived curriculum. Opportunity was provided for an individually designed learning program and flexible patterns by which each candidate could demonstrate achievement and satisfy requirements for graduation. Current clinical practice was to be used as the practicum, and the student was to assume responsibility not only for determining his learning goal and pathways toward achieving these but for self-evaluation during this process as well. Students would be both learners and teachers, having the opportunity to share with peers what had been learned and participating in peer as well as self-evaluation. Faculty was to serve primarily as facilitators of the learning process. Active learning and the learning stances of exploration, curiosity and the search for refined questions rather than facile answers and dogmatic closure were characteristics which we hoped both to locate and foster in our student body.

We, thus, did design a new educational model for the use of experienced clinicians who were self-motivated

learners, who could participate in both student/teacher roles with peers and who could participate in setting their own educational goals as well as in monitoring and evaluating their learning progress. The model included a combination of independent study plus large and small group meetings, the latter under leadership of an Animateur. This format, utilized during the program planning phase of development of the school the previous year, had proved productive so that it was adopted as our basic design. A fourth modality was added to learning structure in the first operational year. This was the assignment of each student to a Mentor who occupied a pivotal faculty position.

The Mentor role was described as follows:

> An individual consultant assigned to accompany the student from entrance into the application process through candidacy to graduation. With the Mentor the student carries on a self-evaluation which is the guide to learning, plans ways in which mastery of core curriculum is to be acquired and demonstrated, and plans for his Project Demonstrating Excellence (P.D.E.). The Mentor coordinates the work of the P.D.E. committee and is in regular contact with the Animateur.

Purpose of the Study

My intention is to explore the significance and the dimensions of the role of Mentor, which is a new clinical teaching function in a particular educational

setting--The Institute for Clinical Social Work. Through the process of describing, examining and studying my experience as it developed over time in the first operational year, it should be possible to draw from this unique experience some understanding as to the clinical and teaching dimensions of the role as well as its particular function in this innovative learning institution. Since the Mentor was the only untested organizational dimension in an evolving educational program, a process of appraisal, clarification of aims and purposes as well as identification of issues should make possible some conclusion as to the components of the role and its value and relevance in such a program.

The challenge of translating an idea and a design into an operational reality characterized all aspects of the Institute's program in the first year. It is hoped that by analyzing, clarifying and understanding the Mentor role, I can make some contribution to the continuing growth of the school as its organic form develops out of experience with this different type of education process. The problems posed by my task appear integrally related to the dialectic of the goals of the institution. Our purpose was to develop a system supportive of and validating independent study combined with participation and

exchange with fellow clinicians in a creative learning process while at the same time promoting standards of excellence in clinical practice.

In addition to delineating the usefulness of the Mentor role in this particular educational setting, it is hoped that this exploration may suggest the applicability of such a teaching function to a staff development process in a variety of settings where clinicians practice.

Since the Mentor represents the only one-to-one faculty/student relationship within the institution and since it is generally accepted that such a relationship is a significantly important context for clinical learning, it is important to consider how this role may contribute to the needs of advanced learners as they attempt to meet their own learning goals and institutional expectations and requirements. Relevant questions which will be addressed in this study include the following:

1. From study of the experience in which the role was both created and modified over time, is it possible to conclude with a reasonable description of the Mentor function?

2. How may contemporary thinking on institutional roles and the application of psychoanalytic ideas to an examination of organizational processes contribute to the

understanding of my experience as a faculty member and to the complexity of the mentoring process in an educational setting?

3. How does the faculty role of Mentor mesh with the goals of the Institute for Clinical Social Work with its emphasis on self-directed learning for advanced, independent students?

4. What particular functions does a one-to-one relationship serve in the learning process and structure of the Institute, which otherwise utilizes a group process?

5. What are the characteristics of an advanced adult learner and how may these modify the needs for an external structure for learning?

6. What are the implications and significance of the Mentor role and the relationship of this role to general issues of independent study for advanced clinicians?

Significance of the Study

Much attention is presently being given to clinical teaching and learning for advanced professionals in non-academic and non-institutional settings. The Mentor role, which includes aspects of clinical teacher/preceptor/supervisor/consultant/advisor/ombudsman, may thus have

critical significance not only to faculty and students in the Institute for Clinical Social Work but more generally for those interested in innovative approaches to clinical learning and teaching. It is anticipated that these findings may be relevant to faculty development tasks and formats designed to meet educational needs of the advanced professional. More broadly, beyond considerations of the field of clinical practice, contemporary trends in adult education and the realization of the crucial importance of lifelong learning to the process of human growth and self fulfillment suggest the need for an advisory person as a facilitator of the learning experience. The Mentor could well provide for this aspect, a concept defined as "pedagogue" by Illich (1970) and Faure (1972).

Methodology

The study utilizes a formulative or exploratory research design allowing for participant observation and an unstructured, retrospective excursion through the first year of the task. I intend to describe the experience of one faculty member serving in the role of Mentor in the first operational year of the Institute, to examine how the role shifted over the course of time, to attempt to analyze the dynamics that made for the changes that emerged and to consider the impact of the experience on

the students, on the Mentor and on the Mentor's perception of self within the setting and in relation to the teaching goals and self-defined purposes. Sources of data will be my own experience, both internal as a learner and creator of my function and external in relation to the students to whom I was assigned. I kept notes of the process as it unfolded and through a review of these notes will illustrate problem areas by way of vignettes and descriptive encounters with students or other faculty which illustrate teaching issues that were confronted. I intend to use my own conceptual understanding of the process of clinical learning and teaching derived from many years of supervisory and consultative experience. I will also review relevant major themes in literature on clinical teaching, adult education, innovative learning structures and organizational theory for the purpose of clarifying and illuminating this multi-faceted experience. These data will be analyzed for their significance as they relate to the goals and purposes of the role of Mentor.

As I address this study, Kubie (1969) expresses best my sense of the task when he states, " . . . the primary data of behavioral research consists of fallible reports of fallible recollections of fallible perceptions." It is on this foundation that I presume to proceed, hoping

that analyzing and ordering this personal experience may contribute to conceptualizing the process.

Limitations of the Study

The experience of the year to be examined was unique not only in its creative opportunity to work innovatively without charts and maps but also in regard to the characteristics of the students most of whom had been part of the planning year and were in that sense different from future students who would be accepted to candidacy. Their earlier participation made them both more totally identified with the ideals and goals of the Institute as well as less ready to shift from the role of peer to that of student. The personality, point of view and teaching style of this Mentor add other highly individual and subjective dimensions to the views expressed and conclusions drawn.

An important dimension not yet referred to is the fact that I was myself a student in the program at the same time that I functioned in a faculty role. Although the material of the study is derived from and examined from the vantage point of my mentoring experience, the complication of this additional variable to an already complex and confusing process must be acknowledged. It is clear that both the experience of the Mentor and the characteristics of the students will never again be replicated

in the life of the institution. This makes more complex the attempt to tease out general issues that are relevant to the ongoing institutional process as well as the attempt to draw from the experience recommendations for a teaching model for professional educators. It may be premature to formally evaluate the role of Mentor in view of the fluid, richly interwoven process by which the internal needs of all participants were externalized in a continuing interactive experience. It is hoped, however, that this retrospective analysis may be a source of insight producing creative ideas and stimulating further innovations in educational methods with adult learners.

Chapter 2

THE MENTOR: A TEACHING ROLE

Origins of the Concept

The idea of a faculty position labeled Mentor developed during the organizational planning year for the Institute, 1976-1977. It was during this year that interested professionals met in five task oriented groups to design organizational structure, curriculum content, evaluation procedures, practicum requirements, etc. These groups were composed of experienced clinical social workers who had had varying degrees of earlier relationship to the Institute idea. Some were the original group of pioneers who had dreamed of the idea of the Institute, established themselves as a board of trustees, met repeatedly and spearheaded the task. A second group were experienced practitioners in the community who had been invited to join as consultants to contribute to preliminary discussions in the year 1975-1976. In the formal organizational year 1976-1977, applications were invited from advanced practitioners who wished to participate in a dry run of an organizational process, functioning simultaneously as

creators of the design of the school and as participating students.

Five groups met during that year, contributing material to the emerging design of an educational program. At the same time they were experiencing and testing tentatively a learning format which included individual study, work in a colloquium of peers and participation in a convocation that met four times a year.

The Animateur, the title designated for the leader of the group, was responsible for stimulating the group and monitoring progress toward defined goals. During the phase being described, the purpose was to facilitate completion of the organizational design, documentation and materials that would serve as the procedural and structural base for the following year, which was to be the first year of operation of the school. The group or Colloquium, as it came to be called, was considered to be an essential element of the teaching/learning structure of the Institute and was thus tested and tried in the planning year. In the process of this work experience, the value of the Colloquium was validated both as a learning medium and as an opportunity for an evaluation of student progress to take place. The Animateur's function was in this fashion also tried out to a considerable degree and its value tested and appreciated so that when school started this

faculty function was a familiar and well-accepted part of Institute structure.

The history of the faculty role of Mentor was entirely different. There was nothing which corresponded to it in any way during the first planning year. The idea originated and was developed in the Colloquium attending to structural design and organizational format. The task of this group had been to develop an educational model with supportive procedures and devices for the purpose of operationalizing the educational ideals, goals and philosophy of the institution. As this group addressed itself to issues of teaching and learning needs of students and to a faculty design which would provide opportunity for a growth experience without an infantilizing authority structure, the concept emerged of a faculty person who would have an individual relationship to the student and would serve various purposes within our overall program design. The person was referred to as a preceptor, an advocate, a guide and a coordinator of evaluations. An ambitious view described this person as a wise and trusted counselor, ideally chosen by the student; neutral, totally free from either the administrative or the evaluative process and as holding no authority but as having freedom to follow and counsel the candidate through his program. Another idea was that this person would provide a chain of

accountability to the institution with regard to issues of standards and evaluation and, at the same time because of the partnership on behalf of learning, would have the purpose of enabling the student to fulfill his contract with the institution as well as his educational goals for himself. In the work papers of the planning Colloquium, the description of the faculty positions includes one for the doctoral Mentor:

> These persons act as guides throughout the academic experience for the candidate. They help in assessment of learner and learner's needs, provide counsel in choosing independent study in courses taken outside the Institute and are responsible for coordinating the learning experience and progress of each candidate. Responsibility for continual evaluation and assessment and further planning in concert with others involved with each student rests with this position. Mentors serve on all doctoral committees and provide a channel of communication between the Institute and each candidate; they function as Chair of the Doctoral Committee, as well as coordinators of student evaluation.

In another report of the same Colloquium, dated March 1977, listing methods of teaching within the Institute, the relationship with the Mentor is not listed as a modality. The Mentor, however, is referred to in the following sections:

> Independent study will primarily be the responsibility of the doctoral Mentor. Purposes are to encourage self-learning and pursuit of special interests and needs.

> Courses given outside in other institutions of learning must be undertaken with the advice and consent of the Mentor.
>
> Evaluation and quality assessment is an ongoing integral process throughout. It is lodged specifically in the doctoral committee composed of Mentor, Animateur, consultant and peer. The doctoral Mentor is responsible for assessment of progress for the purpose of evaluating the learner, not what is learned.

In this same document discussing qualification of core faculty, it is suggested that the Mentor should be a person with more than average administrative experience since required functions are (1) review of documents for admission, (2) chair of doctoral committee, (3) coordinator of evaluations, and (4) faculty advisor.

It is interesting that Jean Sanville, in her address to the final convocation in May of 1977, concluding the planning year and accepting the role of Dean for the following year, discussed at considerable length the philosophy of education of the Institute. In her paper, she refers to the role of the Colloquium in the educational process and the function of the Animateur as special contributor to learning. No mention of the Mentor role appears in her paper. In May 1977, a fact sheet printed by the Institute invited applications for the next fall and announced the opening of the school. In describing the educational format and the faculty, the document

refers to the process of individual study as one aspect of the Institute's educational format, but again the word Mentor does not appear except as an indirect reference to a core faculty position which "serves to coordinate the individualized program for each participant including all learning activities."

This then describes the historical development of the task to which I was appointed in the summer of 1977. The Institute was moving into an operational reality that fall. The role of the Mentor had been described in terms of a title, goals and idealized design in relation to the educational philosophy of the school, but the process and function had not been defined or developed. The role was clearly conceived out of recognition that within the many unstructured aspects of our process a student would need some source of continuity and guidance or what might be described as a participant/observer in the learning process. The concept, however, in contrast to the other educational structures, including the large and small group modalities, was untested and untried so that the task in the first year was to function in the role at the same time one was experimenting with exploring its parameters and defining its boundaries. The vicissitudes of such a task appeared then, as it does even more strongly in retrospect,

to require not only the capacity to live with ambiguity but to relish and explore it.

Clarification of Terms

For precision in communicating ideas, it is considered important to make explicit the particular sense in which terms are used. In the process of program development the Institute adopted certain in-house words for parts of organizational structure and various faculty functions.

Animateur: a faculty member responsible for facilitating and stimulating the various dimensions of the small group educational process (see Colloquium).

Colloquium: a small group of students at various stages in candidacy, who meet regularly in an ongoing group learning experience. In these meetings work in progress is presented, clinical issues are addressed, developing competence is demonstrated and self-assessment is facilitated.

Project Demonstrating Excellence (PDE): a clinical research project, equivalent to a dissertation in a more traditional doctoral program. It is expected that this project be conceived and developed on a sound theoretical base and be relevant to the profession of clinical social work. The form and scope of the

PDE may be flexible in relation to the individualized learning needs and professional interests of the candidate.

Mentor: a faculty role which is the subject of this research. It is hoped that the study will ultimately provide a definition which conveys the precise meaning of this faculty function, both within the institutional setting of the ICSW and with possible potential for larger application to the teaching/learning process of advanced clinicians in large organizations or to those seeking consultation and independent guidance regarding their professional growth. As we have seen in the material quoted at length from the planning year, a precise meaning for the term had not evolved and consequently the Mentor role was referred to as equivalent, wholly or in part, to a variety of functions as follows: teacher/supervisor/administrator/consultant/evaluator and coordinator of evaluations/therapist/coach/preceptor/enabler/resource person/ombudsman/advocate/catalyst/facilitator of inquiry.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1971) provides a definition: "A close, trusted and experienced counselor and guide who, because he is detached and disinterested, can hold a mirror up to us." Webster reminds us that Mentor was the tutor of Odysseus' son Telemachus. As reported by Homer, Mentor was a loyal and trusted

adviser of Odysseus, who was entrusted with the care and education of Telemachus while Odysseus set sail on his voyage to Troy.

Fielding Institute, a school without walls in Santa Barbara, offers mid-career study programs in psychology, education and human service areas. Their faculty includes a Mentor whose main concern is to guide the student's achievement in a supportive, demanding and instructive fashion, pointing out weaknesses and suggesting how to improve work.

In attempting to define the role of Mentor one needs clarity about how to address the concept of role, the purpose for which definition is being sought. Stanton and Schwartz (1954) define role as a cultural phenomenon, or product, an organized pattern carried out by a person and retaining the same character over an appreciable period of time. In the context of an institution, roles are continuously relearned, re-asserted and modified. If the focus of examination is the institutional integration of roles, they will often be analyzed in terms of formal jobs with job descriptions, neglecting the purpose or need fulfilling aspects. Many formal job descriptions fall into the category of humanly impossible behavior; and in studying the culture of an institution they considered it necessary to differentiate between ideal roles which may,

to the view of some, appear actual and role constructs, which are generalizations from observed practice, derived from a systematic investigation by the researchers.

For the purposes of this study my own concept, as well as that of the students with whom I interacted, of the role of Mentor evolved over time as uses and purposes were experimented with and patterns were modified. It is frequently believed that a social role defines the nature of the person filling it. A lack of definition often results in identity confusion, and examples of this are evident in the diary (Chapter 4), particularly in the early phases.

Chapter 3

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELEVANT THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

In the vast literature on education, clinical teaching and the learning process, certain facets seem most relevant to the aims of this study; that is, to examine the various dimensions of the Mentor's task and to assess the significance of the Mentor's contribution to the purpose of the Institute for Clinical Social Work. In addition, a selected review of the literature can suggest possibile applicability of the Mentor's role to clinical consultation and continuing education for advanced practitioners in various clinical professions.

Educational Theory and Philosophy

A number of writers on the theory and philosophy of education emphasize themes which seem very related to the goals and teaching philosophy of the ICSW. Bruner, for example, a developmental psychologist who has researched and written on his theories of education, emphasizes the acquisition of knowledge as an active process, one in which the learner is not a passive recipient of facts but

an active pursuer of his own goals. He sees man as an information processor, a thinker and a creator, describing a generic education as one in which men are trained to be "good guessers" (1973). He describes the accumulation of facts and passive registration of data as "sheer brute learning" and suggests teachers' goals for students include not only that they come to understand the known but also that they develop the capacity to ask questions about the unknown, a process which he labels as leaping the barrier from learning to thinking (1959).

Hilgard and Bower (1966) in their discussion of major theoretical positions on the nature of learning describe principles emphasized within cognitive theory, including that of the goal-setting by the learner as an important element of motivation.

Knowles (1975) who primarily directs his attention to adult education, defines the teacher not as a transmitter of content but as a facilitator of inquiry whose attention is fixed on the student rather than on the content. His interest is the self-directed learner who is an active initiator with his own terms, speed, style, value system and background experience. Motivation for study, according to Knowles, should not be fear of failure or external rewards but internal incentive, including fulfillment of curiosity, satisfaction at accomplishment

and enhanced self-esteem. The teacher therefore needs to understand the learning needs of the individual student to enable realistic non-threatening self-assessment and to participate in feedback which is consonant, not dissonant, with the learner's needs and capacity for self-validation. His goal is to help the learner experience other learners as collaborators rather than competitors and to see learning resources outside themselves residing in teachers, experts and books. In this schema the teacher is not the authority figure but rather a helpful human being with resources to share.

Kadushin (1976) describes special attributes of adult learners, including their long attention span and ability to postpone gratification. He also finds them resistive to temporary dependency. He notes their participation is on a maximum level, and the learning required is not primary learning but rather in the nature of re-learning, unlearning and new learning.

Gardner (1963) sees the ultimate goal of an educational system to be that of shifting to the individual the burden of pursuing his own education. The continuing conviction that education is what goes on in school buildings and nowhere else, or in classes and nowhere else, limits the wider acceptance of this concept.

Edgar Faure (1972) describes learning to learn as a pedagogic experience that teachers must themselves master if they want to be able to pass it on to others. The school of the future, says Faure, must make the object of education the subject of its own education. Man submitting to education must become the man educating himself. Education of others must become the education of one's self. Faure believes this fundamental change in the individual's relationship to himself is the most difficult problem facing education for the future decades of scientific and technical revolution.

Toffler (1970) writes of the implications for learning and education of this present world of rapid change. Skills, according to Toffler, now have a half life; and old methods of learning, such as pure accumulation of subject matter, are no longer useful. The purpose of contemporary education must be to develop skills of inquiry and the ability to easily acquire new knowledge. We, therefore, must see education as a lifelong process of adapting to change--to new ideas. Thus, this becomes a new characteristic of professional life, both in the sciences and in the humanities, as well as a challenge in our field.

Hearn (1958), in his analysis of theory building in social work, discusses the interaction of the processes

of practice and theory building which he considers to be indispensable and interdependent aspects of the process of knowing. Professional practice in his terms is a "combination of believing, knowing and doing"; that is, the "performance of prescribed functions with integrity, knowledge and skill." In his view a clinical profession exists to promote these processes, and the function of a profession is to continually define and redefine the value assumptions on which practice is based by increasing understanding, extending knowledge and subsequently helping members acquire and progressively expand their skills. Hearn defines the process of knowing as a complex structure composed of various interdependent, circular and interrelated items including experiencing or intuition; well-ordered inquiry or scientific research; conceptualizing, testing and verifying theories; concretizing or translating this data into the language of practice; and communicating or teaching. He defines a teacher as part of this network of interaction surrounding a student.

These authors' philosophic approach to contemporary education is most congruent to the general educational ideals the ICSW with particular relevance to the stance the Mentor may maintain vis-à-vis students. Since, however, we are an institution concerned with the advanced education of clinicians, it is also pertinent to review

literature related to clinical learning, clinical supervision and professional teaching.

Clinical Teaching and Learning

Many authors from the fields of social work and psychoanalysis have addressed themselves to issues of clinical teaching and supervision, the learning process for practitioners and the nature of the student/supervisor relationship. There is a body of psychodynamic material related to learning and teaching, particularly relevant to teaching clinical casework, psychotherapy and psychoanalysis. The following authors and their basic premises are reference points which illustrate some of these basic concepts and illuminate the teaching function of the Mentor.

Fleming and Benedek (1966) believe that pedagogic events in psychoanalytic supervision have general application to all clinical fields. They base their theory of supervision and philosophy of psychoanalytic education on three broad assumptions: (1) an analyst's education is necessarily more experiential than cognitive; (2) the basic objective of his educative experience is the development of himself as an analytic instrument; and (3) each phase of his training contributes in different ways to this basic objective. The educational process can be seen

as an experiential process of teaching and learning, wherein learning by experience in the training analysis is coupled with learning about experience in studying theory and becomes integrated with learning from practicum and supervision. It is true that the content of the Clinical Social Work Institute's educational program does not include the described tripartite model of analysis, didactic theory and supervision, although the student may seek these specific channels for learning from outside the program. However, the process of learning described regarding growth and change that takes place as the student's desire for change is allied with progressive forces of his personality in a structure which is nonrestrictive provides a most relevant framework for understanding and analyzing our work.

Ekstein (1969) describes the learning process as a steady ebb and flow of progression and regression. He states that mastery is never conflict-free even though there may be aspects during the rapid growth of ego faculties which are conflict-free and which will make the struggle easier. Only he can master who has doubts about mastery. Teaching techniques and a teaching philosophy which are based on psychoanalytic insights regarding learning will provide a system designed to mobilize and make available experiences for growth. He talks about mature

learning as learning for the sake of learning rather than for love, approval and external rewards. He considers it important for the teacher not to offer himself as a model for imitation but to provide fragments or patterns of self which include an approach to the task of learning which will provide for a model for identification. He refers to Erikson's description of latency as a phase of struggle between inferiority and industry and reminds us that in adult learning this conflict can be reactivated. It can either serve to instigate a driving force toward learning or a goal-inhibited conclusion of total inferiority. The statement, "I do not know nor do I know if I can master it," is a necessary accompaniment to learning, whereas a lack of realistic self-appraisal or a belief that one knows all, and therefore needs to learn nothing, can only abort the process.

Ekstein also reminds us that learning requires that we function on the basis of the reality principle; that is, we can accept present deprivations in the hope of greater future satisfaction. This postponement requires a strong superego able to work and to wait for future rewards.

Harris (1954) defines learning as the modification of psychological characteristics of an individual resulting from his experience. He talks about learning as an ego process and discusses inhibition of this learning potential

as an emotional block. He describes three types of blocking: (1) a defiant refusal to learn which is conscious and frequently derived from a value conflict with the teacher or the educational system; (2) a conditioned response in which a panic reaction overwhelms the ego; and (3) a subtle unconscious block resulting from fear of damage aroused by the threat of success. In the latter situation anxiety is produced by the uncomfortable anticipation that success will result in retaliation. This underlines the dynamic implications that successful learning implies growing up and hence competition with adults.

From the field of social work teaching, Bandler (1936) reminds us that learning is mediated by the ego and that perception, attention, memory, conceptualization and judgment are ego functions and activities. Although it would seem that there could be no such thing as teaching which is not ego centered, we must remember that in teaching clinical material we are dealing with the psychological core of the human personality and thus confronted with specific difficulties that no other educator shares. That is, we ask students to assimilate concepts which relate to powerful forces in their own personalities as well as to problems and conflicts whose existence and solution take place in their unconscious and towards whose revival they have the strongest resistances. We are looking towards not

mere intellectual understanding but an imaginative associational affective comprehension which reflects the translation of theory into perception, intuition, insight, understanding and practice. Although such results may be anticipated from a successful psychoanalysis of educators, we are challenged to facilitate students' accomplishing these goals by educational means. Bandler further explores the difficulties of our task in that we are often presenting ego dystonic material to students and assisting in its integration. We therefore need to fully enlist the healthy aspects of the student's personality in overcoming resistance and pain in the learning experience.

Bandler formulates a schema of an educational process in which he applies psychoanalytic principles and techniques as an educational device. He suggests that the teacher first address the ego capacity of the student and that addressing the ego derivatives supports forward movement. Gradually dystonic content can be introduced in dosages that do not exceed the ego's capacities. The issue is timing and dosage to avoid excessive mobilization of defenses and resistance to new ideas. A working through process facilitates application of knowledge to wider areas and exploring new and unfamiliar possibilities.

Hilgard (1954) defines learning in analytic terms as a composite deposit of superego and ego experiences.

The superego component may be in relation to either a benevolent or a despotic relationship. In superego learning, motivation is derived from the environment at the expense of the ego maturation of the individual. An example is rote learning, which Hilgard equates with superego indoctrination. In Hilgard's view the ideal type of mature learning is egoistic and one in which the superego role is minor.

Fliess (1941) described various essential prerequisites for analytic training including the capacity for empathy, making possible a transient introjection and trial identification with the object for the purpose of understanding and sharing the emotion of the patient on an unconscious level. He speaks of the analyst's work ego, his capacity for detachment and critical self-observation as well as his voluntary submission to deprivation and restriction of all spheres of perception other than hearing and seeing. This, according to Fliess, is ultimately the source of the intense superego gratification experienced in therapeutic work.

In parallel fashion, I think, one might say that teacher or supervisor needs to attend to the progress of the student with as much free-floating attention and as little self-serving subjectivity as possible. Empathy for the student's experience is an essential aspect in the

supervisory stance along with identification through memory of one's own past learning struggle. Narcissistic gratification must be postponed on behalf of the student's own experience while progress and critical self-observation will hopefully limit counter-transference issues. Rewards will most often come from satisfying the working conscience and in retrospective assessment of demonstrated mastery.

In a research project exploring the parameters of psychoanalytic training, Goldberg and Spotnitz (1978) describe the following crucial personality dimensions characteristic of therapists: (1) integrity as a person; (2) capacity for empathy and sensitivity; and (3) capacity for nonpossessive and nonmanipulative concern with an emotional relatedness to the patient. I believe the same personality qualities are required of the supervisor or teacher in this field in relation to the student.

The Nature of the Student/ Teacher Relationship and the Learning Alliance

Many writers have addressed themselves to the issue of the complex relationship between teacher and student, or clinical supervisor and student, and have explored the concept of a learning alliance as a way of conceptualizing the process. Fleming and Benedek (1966) make explicit reference to this term. Lazerson (1972) describes the

alliance as a relationship between student and teacher characterized by mutual respect and joint dedication to a learning task. It enables the student to maximize mastery of a new and difficult experience. In using the term, he refers to the friendliness, mutual respect, rapport and trust which can exist between teacher and student. He writes of this relationship as follows:

> Trust is necessary to enable the student to experiment with, practice new behaviors, and to feel supported as he and his teacher go through the difficult process of discarding old comfortable modes of thought and behavior and trying to learn new and unfamiliar ones . . . . Such an alliance is vital for the student to experience the teacher as a model for identification, as one who has not only a favorable attitude toward questioning and a critical attitude toward investigation but also an infectious enthusiasm for learning and an unbounded contagious curiosity.

Lazerson (1972) highlights the importance of the supervisor/teacher's continuing self-scrutiny. In addition to understanding that intense, unconscious forces can be stirred up in the student by the learning situation, it is also necessary for the teacher to monitor motivations for the role, to be sensitive to the impact of the student as well as to be aware of the extent to which the student may be used for needs and gratifications, defenses and personal dissatisfactions. Narcissistic needs may interfere with the learning alliance; the need to be loved and loving, to be admired and successful, to enjoy the power

of the role may all be defended against by a variety of mechanisms. These counter-transference aspects of teaching suggest that for a successful learning alliance to develop and bear fruit the teacher must maintain a consistent concern for the rights of the students throughout the learning experience. Since we are clear that clinical learners are bound to have areas of neurotic or maladaptive interference with learning under the stress of the situation, a good learning alliance can contribute toward minimizing this interference.

Clemence and Allan (1960) in discussing their philosophy of teaching casework also stress the relevance of a psychodynamic understanding of personality functioning. To attain the objective of developing professionals who acquire and use knowledge not as an end in itself but for use as art, casework education must be student-oriented not content-oriented. They stress the importance of understanding the complex relationship between student and teacher. They describe the educational reality of the transference and its utilization toward enhancing the student's security, learning readiness and self-awareness. All these are vehicles through which learning is integrated coming under the service of the ego. The training process inevitably accentuates and reactivates conflicts, but at the same time it provides for a learning-teaching

relationship which hopefully serves to minimize the interference of conflict in the learning process.

Kadushin (1976) stresses that the learner risks in both internal and external spheres: internal related to his self-image and his value system; external in relationship to his peers. He considers motivation important, noting one must assess whether learning is participated in for the purpose of mastery, aggrandizement or possession in that these purposes will very much influence the student's processes and accessibility. In discussing conditions conducive for learning, he highlights the motivation of the learner and his supervisory relationship which he considers of primary importance. Kadushin views all teaching as a problem in human relationships. When the emotional interaction is positive, learning can take place best because a positive relationship reduces anxiety. Learning is the bridge over which material passes. If the relationship is negative, communication is blocked. Positive identifications with the teacher heighten motivation to learn, emulate, imitate and ultimately develop a professional identity.

Although it is recognized that identification is a vital ego function operating at all levels of learning, its mechanisms and processes are not fully understood. Since identification takes place unconsciously we can only

see the effects rather than the process. We recognize the source and motivational determinants in the shadows of persons and events belonging to childhood development. However, identification plays a part in learning experiences throughout life. It is a powerful force in every teacher/student relationship, at all levels of education, and in other life situations as well. Fleming and Benedek (1966) stress that because identification is a pervasive force operating unconsciously, it is an issue to be looked at for both the teacher and the student in clinical education. If the teacher assumes a narcissistic stance that elicits a superego rather than an ego related response, that teacher encourages students not only to identify with but to imitate his own point of view and techniques. Consequently, the teacher may be contributing to a dependent and immature process for the student. The problem is related to the question of insight and self-awareness regarding resistance in both teacher and student.

Towle (1954) also stresses the relationship between the teacher and the learner as an integral part of the learning process. This context provides the medium for growth. Her notion is that a good teacher appreciates the student's individuality, avoids intrusion between the learner and the content and provides a relationship which affirms student growth through strengthening of ego and

superego integration. As the teacher fosters security without dependency, anxiety is eased, need for defenses are lowered and the integrative capacity of the student is widened.

Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) describe four models of understanding and dealing with problems that arise in supervision: (1) considering the student as sick and referring him for treatment; (2) considering the student as uninformed and giving him didactic technical instruction; (3) considering the problem as a learning one aroused in work with the patient (countertransference to the patient); and (4) considering the problem to be one of learning from the teacher (transference to the supervisor). I would add a fifth problem area as either emanating from the supervisor's blind spots, derived from transference to the student, or from subjective needs which interfere with neutral self-awareness; that is, countertransference. Consultation should be utilized in this circumstance.

Langs (1979) comments on the important differences which arise when a supervisor is assigned to the supervisee rather than being selected by him. Conditions which include the reputation and orientation of the supervisor as well as the evaluative power inherent in the role contribute to the anxiety-provoking interactions inevitable

in the relationship. These may be considerably mitigated when the supervisee has selected the supervisor and anticipates a positive learning experience. Langs believes this latter procedure can have both a positive and negative effect on the supervisor, at times playing into undue narcissistic needs and blind spots while at other times promoting the development of a secure supervisory alliance that enables him to be candid and direct. In such circumstances there may as a rule be fewer supervisory crises.

Kutzik (1977) stresses the consensual collegial relationship of the consultant-supervisor who is involved in an advisory collaborative process with the student-therapist rather than in a master-apprentice role where there is decision-making power. He considers that the source of power comes more from the prestige and expertise of the supervisor who, however, needs to attend to both the process and the content of the student's work. It seems to me that the Mentor in the Institute for Clinical Social Work is in the enviable position of being able to attend to the process without being responsible for teaching content. The acquisition of knowledge and skills is left to the student, who is expected to achieve a particular level of mastery of knowledge, but the process is monitored, reviewed and assessed by the Mentor.

Gene Abroms (1977) develops the concept of supervision as a metatherapy or the therapy of therapy. It is a therapy in which neither the student nor the student's patient is the focus of attention but rather their relationship. He sees this as analogous to the family therapy approach in which the patient is the family relationship system. He considers supervision appropriately focused on the therapist/client relationship rather than on the pathology of either. Thus, he appears to be describing a transactionally conceived format in which both therapy and supervision are looked at in interpersonal rather than intrapsychic terms. Just as therapy is a combination of supportive and interpretive processes from the neutral standpoint of the therapeutic alliance, supervision provides the same functions within the relationship of the supervisor and the therapist. It is Abroms' intent to shift the focus of supervision from an exclusive emphasis on client pathology and therapist technique to a wider concern with the therapist/client relationship. At advanced levels of supervision the countertransference/transference phenomena of therapy are found to be reflected in the supervisor/therapist relationship. These phenomenon must be examined and dealt with with no imputations of individual pathology but with the focus upon facilitating the elimination of learning blocks. Ekstein (1958) refers

to this phenomenon in his concept of the parallel process, which he locates in the parallels between patient/therapist and therapist/supervision processes.

It is evident that complex issues involved in defining the parameters of supervision and teaching in the clinical field are further complicated by the necessity that learning be an emotional experience taking place within a feeling state. This process is accompanied by fresh memory traces, increased sensitivity and a wide range of feelings. We must recognize that teaching which emphasizes affective learning is inevitably an emotional process continually bombarding the parameters of the learning alliance and the neutrality of stance of the supervisor.

Most clinical educators are clear in differentiating and separating teaching and supervision from therapy but discuss this issue from a variety of perspectives. The appeal of the parallel process and the pull of personality issues, adaptive mechanisms, etc., promote a constant fascination with the similarities and differences. Most writers testify to the difference and need to go on record with this testimony. Lazerson (1972) describes it as follows:

> In supervision we aim at a change in skills, a change in the use of the professional self, while in psychotherapy we aim at changes which embrace the total adaptive functioning of the individual.

> The differences between student and patient result from their different goals, the extent of change necessary to reach that goal and the eternal resistance to that change.

Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) in addressing relationship issues remind us that supervision is not therapy but teaching and should never be a disguised form of therapy. Zetzel (1953) discusses the same issue, describing that we use our knowledge of emotional factors to inform our activity rather than to intervene as if we were dealing with transference phenomena. These phenomena may arise but addressing them is incompatible with the didactic purpose which is primary. She stresses, however, the importance of the supervisor/clinical teacher is understanding the impact of what arises in the relationship and the individual student's modes of learning as well as defensive style. Nonetheless, the educational transference, as she describes it, remains implicit and we stay with what is conscious. Solnit (1970) considers that the educational experience is enhanced by the relationship but suggests supervisors attend to issues of identification rather than transference and regression. The supervisor's role is to enhance learning, promote curiosity and stimulate the search for understanding.

Innovative Educational Designs and Radical Philosophies of Education

A variety of articles which report on the McMasters University concept of medical education, a radical design of a medical curriculum now in its fifth year, in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, describe educational process and goals similar to that of the ICSW. Goals for McMasters' medical students include becoming self-directed learners, recognizing personal educational needs, selecting appropriate learning resources and evaluating progress. In this program the student is assumed to be a responsible, motivated adult preparing to be a lifelong learner to enable him to keep up with changing concepts in health care, new knowledge and developing the skills required for continuing adaptation of performance. Curriculum is structured to facilitate this approach to learning rather than to provide didactic teaching or content. Faculty members are described by Neufeld and Barrows (1974) in a fashion very similar to that of a Mentor in our system; that is, as an advocate, career counselor and sounding board. This person at McMasters is called the faculty advisor. The tutor, another faculty position similar to some degree to the Animateur in the Institute, is a generalist and facilitator in the process. They report that it has often been

difficult for students to accept the tutor's nonexpertise. Hamilton (1976), in an article on the McMasters curriculum, quotes Flexner's article on medical education published by the Carnegie Foundation in 1910 as follows: "In methods of instruction out and out didactic teaching is hopelessly antiquated; it belongs to an age of accepted dogma or supposedly complete information when the professor knew and the students learned." Hamilton points out that although the system being experimented with in Ontario, Canada, appears revolutionary, the ideas are not. He describes the goals of the curriculum and the educational process as one which is "to develop an attitude of mind and accessibility of affect; a balance of educational expertise and scientific rigor; active rather than passive learning as a crucial contribution of the experiment."

There are some radical philosophers of education who look at the role of education in broad sociological and political terms and as crucial to a process of growth and change toward the hope of improving the quality of life, both material and spiritual. Some of their attitudes and perspectives, particularly with regard to the role of adult education and continual learning, are remarkably congruent with some of our educational philosophy in the Institute. As they are reviewing the methods and rethinking the function of education in today's world, some

tend to propose major reforms to our present educational system, whereas others are convinced we must totally abolish the structure we have and redesign for today's and tomorrow's world. All, however, stress the significance of self-motivated learning, adult learning and the liberating, creative and humanizing potential of a teaching/learning parternship.

Illich (1970) proposes the de-institutionalizing of our educational system since it is currently so subject to conflicting social and political forces that it is no longer capable of being an instrument of true education, serving mankind and promoting creativity. He proposes that teaching materials ("the artifacts of education"), which are currently locked up in classrooms and storerooms, be made generally available as part of a process which enables mankind to resume the initiative in his own education and to regain the freedom and control of all social institutions. He speaks of the gap divorcing our present educational system and the real world, resulting in confusion, frustration, boredom and nonlearning. His goals are to break the vicious circle in which both education and man is trapped. He proposes to provide a learning web; that is, a network of new educational resources which would enable the student to gain access to any educational resources which might help him define and achieve goals.

These resources include: (1) reference to services of educational objects; that is, facilitating access to things or processes used for formal learning which may be stored in libraries, laboratories, museums or factories and made available to students as apprentices or during off hours; (2) skill exchanges; that is, permitting persons to list their skills and the conditions under which they are willing to serve as models for others who want to learn; (3) peer matching; that is, communications network, permitting persons to describe the learning activity in which they wish to engage in the hope of finding a partner for this inquiry; and (4) reference services to educators at large; that is, professionals and free-lancers to be chosen by the students. Illich differentiates skilled teachers from peers from whom one could also learn. The skill model is a person who possesses a skill and is willing to demonstrate its practice thus becoming a necessary resource for a potential learner. The skill model provides the resource for demonstration as well as the wisdom based on experience. The teaching elite Illich conceives of would be those who earn their education by sharing it; that is, more advanced training would be available to those who share their minimum or modest or sophisticated skills with others. Illich talks also of professional educators who would provide the experienced leadership learners

require in rough terrain; these he calls pedagogues. Those operating the outlined educational exchanges and networks and guiding students and their parents in their use would be educational administrators. The pedagogical counselor would respond to special complications and educational needs.

Another radical educator, Paulo Freire (1972), a historian and educator in Brazil, visiting professor at Harvard and consultant educator to the World Council of Churches, describes our present educational system as a banking concept in which education is an act of depositing. The teacher is the depositor, not the communicator, and the student the container or the receptacle to be filled. Freire searches for solutions to the contradictions about reality which prevent education from being a humanizing force, both in sophisticated cultures and in the Third World. He states that a libertarian education must solve this teacher/student contradiction which promotes polarization. The way to do this is to develop a situation which reverses the polarity so that both are simultaneously teachers and students involved in a partnership, rather than in a dichotomy, thus using their efforts toward a quest for mutual humanization. This dichotomy can be eliminated through a dialogue in which both parties teach and are taught; a joint process in which both grow and

the student is no longer a docile listener but a critical co-investigator in dialogue with the teacher.

Edgar Faure (1972) stresses the importance of the ties between education and social progress, arguing in favor of lifelong education. In the report submitted by the Commission which he chaired for UNESCO, he says:

> Only an overall lifelong educational system can produce the kind of complete man the need for whom is increasing with the continually more stringent constraints tearing the individual asunder. We should no longer assiduously acquire knowledge once for all but learn how to build up a continually evolving body of knowledge all through life--thus learning to be.

The Commission adopted a dialectical stance proposing both improvements in existing systems and alternatives to these. As this process proceeds all that is learned must be continually reinvented and renewed as one of the main goals of education is to prepare mankind for change, which is the predominant characteristic of our times. Out of school education is proliferating. No progressive pedagogue can disdain this stance, maintaining a stance which is a relic of times past. The role of the pedagogue is to expand reflective operations and cognitive faculties. The Commission stressed two fundamental ideas: (1) lifelong learning to reduce insecurity and enhance professional mobility, and (2) the development of a learning society in which learning will involve all of one's life and all

of society. They propose innovations all aimed at evolving effective and flexible modes of education. Among these is a self-service educational system which is based on a concept of personal diagnosis, setting of aims and the practice of self-assessment and self-education. This would modify the teacher's role from that of an authoritarian deliverer of knowledge to one who provides a psycho-educational diagnosis of learning needs, motivation and encouragement of study as well as assessment of knowledge acquired, deliberative action and a liberating power which will inspire maximum potential participation of all people in their life.

Social Psychological Processes and Organizational Functioning

A great number of contemporary theorists are using psychoanalytic ideas and theories of psychological processes to enrich their understanding of organizational dynamics and to expand the parameters in which human adaptation to inner and outer stress is conceptualized. Although this focus has not been the main thrust of this study, such material does serve to illuminate certain important aspects of my experience as well as to emphasize and clarify the dialectical view I hold of the process as it unfolded for me.

Riegel (1976), who calls himself a dialectical psychologist, reminds us that the human being is a changing being in a changing world. Dialectical psychology, concerned with the application of dialectic theory to the psychology of human development, attempts to incorporate the individual's relationship to his environment and culture in an integrated view of the processes of human growth. Riegel sees development as consisting of simultaneous movements along the following four dimensions: (1) inner-biological; (2) individual-psychological; (3) cultural-sociological; and (4) outer-physical. Growth and progression within one particular and between two or more different dimensions are not always synchronized. When two sequences are out of step it might be said that a crisis takes place. Crises should never be exclusively evaluated as negative since they may represent constructive confrontations leading to new developments. Riegel is critical of what he calls the contemporary preference for stability, balance and equilibrium in human interaction and relationships. He states that people particularly in the behavioral sciences prefer the equilibrium model in which the assumption is that tranquility is more desirable than conflict and change. Within that value system the psychological aim is directed towards satisfaction rather than excitement. Riegel sees a sequential

flow of events in a continuous flux of contradiction and change. The flux and contradictions promote action, synchrony, progress and then new discrepancies. He uses the prototype of the infant-mother dyad, operating interactively over time and thus growing and developing together, as the model for questions, adaptation and growth, which creates new questions, doubts and then a move into a new level of balance and reciprocal interaction.

It is Riegel's thesis that a dialectical interpretation of human development does not emphasize the plateaus at which equilibrium or balance is achieved. Development is rather seen as consisting in continuing changes along several dimensions of progressions as noted above. Critical changes occur whenever two sequences are in conflict; that is, when coordination fails and synchrony breaks down. These contradictory conditions are the basis for developmental progressions. Stable plateaus of balance, stability and equilibrium occur when a developmental or historical task appears completed. However, he states, developmental and historical tasks are never completed. At the very moment when completion seems to be achieved, new questions and doubts arise in the individual and in society. The organism, the individual, society and even outer nature are never at rest, and in their restlessness they are rarely in perfect synchrony; nevertheless,

synchrony remains the goal. It can only be achieved through continuous human efforts; there is no pre-established harmony.

Read (1966), in developing his own dialectic philosophy of education, describes education as a dialectical process mediating between self-will and law, discipline and disorder as well as identification and counter-identification.

Menzies (1967) explores the issue of how the psychological needs of members of a social organization contribute to determining its culture, structure and mode of functioning. Her study of the anxiety level among personnel in a teaching hospital revealed how they were using the organization and their relation to it in their struggle against anxiety. She analyzed the process by which various unconscious defense mechanisms of personnel were externalized onto the hospital system and how these defenses became ritualized by the manner in which responsibilities were divided. She observed the process of interaction and the satisfactory matching between the individual and social defense systems, emphasizing how these both helped to modify the individual's psychic defenses. Adequate process of matching and fit depended on the repeated projections of the individual psychic defense system onto the social structure and the repeated

introjection of the social structure and its system back into the individual defense system. Inefficient task performance resulted when the social defense system did not function well and facilitated evasion rather than modification and reduction of anxiety. Menzies views anxieties evoked by stress situations in work as essentially connected with primitive psychological remnants in the personality. A good working system needs to support individual struggle toward mastery while techniques provided to contain anxiety have a profound impact on the success of any organization. An innovative process releases anxieties which need to be tolerated. A healthy creative structure needs to be built to contain and to facilitate mastery and resolution of conflict.

Reiss, Costell and Almond (1976) also report on a study of the staff situation in a psychiatric hospital. They explore the degree to which employees attempt to satisfy personal needs and values in an organizational setting and to express personal preferences through the technical design, theory and ideology of the program. These then may reflect an externalization of unconscious and internal issues, although they may be expressed through conscious theoretical identifications and choices. The authors hypothesize that organizational objectives are formed by process of externalizing specific individual

views and values through the selection of particular technical preferences. They, therefore, see that the nature and magnitude of technical preferences in any organizational structure are consistently determined by personal needs and values of the participants. In looking at an organization, one needs to understand the fit between the individual and the organization as well as the way in which personal objectives influence structure and interactional processes within that organization.

Newton and Levinson (1973) write from a combined social and psychodynamic view of organizational processes. They have developed a theoretical perspective from which organizational or group process can be examined. Elements include: (1) the task or the end purpose of the work; (2) the evolving social structure, including roles, positions, hierarchy and stakes; (3) the developing culture, including core value assumptions, beliefs that provide a framework for group action and the struggle among conflicting, emerging and competing values; and (4) the social process, including the mode of functioning, how it works and the interaction between rational, productive forces and those that are irrational and destructive. These four elements, as these authors describe and conceptualize them, interact and interpenetrate. The first three will affect the fourth. These theorists further

consider these elements to be the properties of all human social systems. The importance for the individual is how he influences the system. They believe that in attempting to analyze a group process within a structure, we need to examine the operative psychodynamic forces as well as how the features of individual personality exert influence on the evolution, functioning, task definition and boundaries within the system. They emphasize that in analyzing an organizational structure it is inappropriate to see problems only as a product of intrapsychic dynamics rather than in intrastaff relationships. Disagreement and complaints are too easily explained in psychodynamic terms; that is, resistance to authority problems, neurotic difficulties, disabilities of the individual, etc. They also take issue with group dynamic theorists within the Tavistock tradition, such as Bion and Menzies, who view organization and social structure from the standpoint of defense against individual anxiety. Newton and Levenson consider this perspective a reduction of complex social phenomenon to individual psychological constructs problematic and simplistic because the rubrics of external culture and social process are not included. It is their view that a combined sociological and psychological perspective is required in order to develop an adequate social psychology of work groups and organizations.

Mental health professionals and investigators, operating from the model of the individual or the dyad, have usually focused on personal feelings and interpersonal events to the exclusion of task, culture, social structure and process both within the small group and the social environment. Newton and Levinson believe this approach reduces group phenomena to an individual or dyadic level rather than starting with the group as a social fact. It is their belief that a comprehensive theory of the work group cannot be limited to a single level of analysis but must conjointly utilize multi-level constructs such as task, culture, social structure and process as well as those relating the group to its organizational and wider social contacts on the one hand and to individual members on the other.

Miller and Rice (1967) make use of psychoanalytic ideas to enrich their understanding of organizational processes. In their study of systems of organization they speak of the "anatomy of an organization," which includes its structure and regulations, and the "physiology of an organization," which includes purpose, operation and process. In their conceptualization the individual, small group and larger group are seen as progressively more complex manifestations of the basic structural system, each having an internal world, an external world and a

boundary which functions as controlling the transactions between the inside and the outside. They equate the boundary function with ego functions which operate and negotiate between the internal world, the individual and the environment. The leadership in an organization performs the same ego function or boundary negotiation for the organization, and the authors discuss the inevitable mutual dependency between leaders and followers. They consider that the nature of this relationship may make it necessary to defend against the destructive power of their potential hostility toward each other by splitting and projection mechanisms. The performance of an organizational task provides overt rewards, satisfactions and prestige at the same time as it either deprives or satisfies unconscious needs for defense against anxiety. Finally, these writers raise questions as to the extent to which the experience of satisfaction derived from task performance tends to inhibit change and creativity within an organizational structure.

Zaleznik and Kets de Vries (1975), in their psychoanalytic inquiry on the effect on an organization of the personality of the executive, examine both moral and practical dilemmas inherent in the exercise of power. The contribution of the administrator's character and personality to the leadership assumptions and organizational

structure is developed. They describe three leadership assumptions: (1) man is stubborn and must be forced to work; (2) man wants to grow and to live cooperatively; people respond to positive image of themselves; and (3) one can function by serving as advisor and consultant rather than as boss. The relationship to power and mastery in an organization all involve character and personality. The charismatic emotional leader may reflect the failure to modify the grandiose self; identity is preserved via megalomanic ideals. Oedipal struggles are often reflected in passive acquiescence to power or competition. Splits in the self, with the pose of excising undesirable self-images, may be reflected in structural design and work assignments. Healing can be reactivated by incorporating fragments of lost objects. Pre-oedipal issues often are reflected in the passive mode, subordinate, masochistic and submissive acquiescence to power.

Jay Galbraith (1973) describes two basic forms for complex organizations, a mechanistic pyramid versus a flat, lateral, organically designed structure. He considers an organization to be an information processing network. The crucial issue is to design a strategy commensurate with the nature of the task, whether static and predictable or fluid and unpredictable. The degree of uncertainty implicit in the organization will affect the

amount of and form of communication to be processed and the decision-making requirements. Rigid rules eliminate the necessity for constant communication. Is it possible to substitute hierarchy for rules and procedures? This will depend on the capacity of the hierarchy for handling information, which in any reality must be finite.

Breger and Specht (1973) discuss the inevitability of conflict in organizational relations in order for growth to take place and problems to be solved. They consider that an absence of organizational conflict does not mean that positive ties exist, stability often results from repressed hostility, flowing from control and domination. This mock bureaucracy, as they describe this design, reflects spurious cooperation and subservience to power arrangements. They, as other authors, comment that mental health professionals in general and social workers in particular appear to prefer a cooperative, even spuriously cooperative, model to one which reflects dynamic interactive conflict.

Kernberg (1978) has been interested for some time in applying psychoanalytic object relations theory, a psychoanalytic theory of group processes and an open systems theory of social organizations to the study of psychiatric institutions. He states that traditionally the analysis of institutional effectiveness has focused

predominantly on the leader's personality and that such efforts suggest the carrying out of tasks in the areas of treatment, research and education appears to be occasionally limited by personality problems of the leader. In his opinion, in addition to the personality and characteristics of an institutional leader, effective functioning in any organization requires an adequate relationship between the organization's overall task and its administrative structure, adequacy of human and material resources and appropriate and positive interaction between the organization and the environment. When any of these conditions are not met, such as resources are insufficient, boundaries break down, or contradictory goals and priorities between tasks and administrative structure develop, personnel morale consequently deteriorates and the group process tends to become regressive. This regressive process in turn powerfully influences the effectiveness of leadership. In analyzing or examining an institutional process, Kernberg regards it as essential to differentiate the symptomatic activation of emotional regression in the leader, reflecting problems of the institution, from the deterioration of organizational functioning, which reflects psychopathology in the leader. Such a study thus involves analysis of complex processes including the interaction of the personality of the leader, his behavior and the

perception of his behavior by the staff as well as the mutual induction of regressive behavior of staff and leader under the influence of regressive group processes. At this point in the process Kernberg thinks a systems approach may be helpful in clarifying not only the mutual influences of these various dimensions but also in pointing toward the major origin of distortions. He affirms this view which contrasts to the analysis of organizational conflicts either exclusively in terms of individual psychopathology, group processes and organizational structure or political factors. He agrees that distortions in organizations can be caused by individual psychopathology at crucial administrative points within the organizational structure but that this diagnosis can only be made after eliminating all other possible causes of emotional regression within the organization.

Chapter 4

THE DIARY OF THE YEAR

This chapter contains a diary of my experiences as Mentor for the year under study. Following a brief introduction, the chapter consists of a description of each trimester, a log of my teaching experiences and my commentary about the process as it occurred.

Beginning the Task

The invitation to join the faculty of the Institute, which came in July 1977, was extremely gratifying. The planning year's experience had been stimulating and exciting; I felt optimistic at the prospect of participating in an opportunity for advanced training for social work clinicians provided from within the discipline. The prospect of continuing as a student toward my own advancing accreditation as well as contributing as a faculty member provided for both continuity with a challenging experience of the previous year and optimism for future progress. I found myself less enthusiastic at the task to which I was assigned, that of Mentor; given my choice, I would have preferred to be an Animateur. I now suspect this was

based on some familiarity with that role as it had been demonstrated and experienced in the group process of the previous year. The concept of Mentor was much less clear since it had neither been experienced nor had much time been spent discussing its dimensions. It had its familiar aspects since I have had many years experience in clinical supervision on a one-to-one basis with both pre- and post-masters students in social work and trainees from psychology and psychiatry.

As the actual planning for opening of school got under way, there were assignments and re-assignments of students to various faculty members. Students initially assigned to me, whom I had seen in August, were subsequently removed and assigned elsewhere and replaced by other students who had originally had beginning contact and planning with a different Mentor. These changes, necessitated by practical reality, added a sense of dislocation to beginning uncertainties experienced by me as well as by students; and it was not truly until the first convocation that the necessary shuffling and re-assignments were completed, and I could settle in to some knowing of the students who were my assigned task.

I was eager for first meetings with my students, curious about who they were as people and as learners, wondering what our work together would mean, uncertain as

to what I would be contributing. I prepared for my first conferences by reviewing the case material submitted by each student to get a feeling of the level of clinical practice and the quality of self-awareness and by reviewing in my own mind the educational philosophy and goals of the Institute. I thought with relief of the student lost in the re-assignment shuffle who had clearly an over-idealized attachment from the admissions conference--what a relief not to have to live up to unreal expectations. On the other hand, I pondered, some of my assigned people are peers and colleagues; how would our working relationship develop; would I have something to give them; would they be disappointed in being assigned to me; could they not have just as easily been invited to serve as faculty and what would be the implications of this for our work? A couple of others appeared rather unsophisticated in their level of practice. I was surprised and wondered how we would do together; could I help them meet the curriculum standards of the Institute?

I started, therefore, to confer with my students in a rather manicky state composed of a sense of idealism and perfectionism carried over from the planning year, vagueness and confusion as to my role, curiosity and some trepidation about my performance. My fantasy of what was anticipated was a combination of the Oxford Don in

all his dignity setting high ideals for learning before his students and an English play "Butley," which I had seen recently, in which a brilliant but disturbed, seedy and rapidly decompensating Cambridge tutor is so distraught by the disintegration of his personal relationships that he is barely able to respond to students who come to read with him.

Description of Students

There were eight students assigned to me as Mentor. Of these, only two had come into the program fresh through the admissions process of that summer. The other six had all actively participated in the previous planning year in which they had demonstrated their interest in the development of an educational program, the Institute, and additionally were prepared to devote energy, time and money to participate in planning and development. Of that group, all who wished to continue as candidates toward the degree were invited to continue without any additional admissions procedure. Students were advised by letter dated July 26, 1977 as follows:

> The Board of Trustees has affirmed that because of the quality of your participation in the 1976-77 planning year you have been officially admitted to the Institute's Post-Masters Program. You will not, therefore, have to go through Part II of the admissions procedure.

There was, in fact, a rather wide range and level of competence and practice skills as well as theoretical orientations reflected in this body. It had, nevertheless, been determined that all would be eligible to become candidates if such was their choice.

Prior to my participation in Institute planning, I had not been personally or professionally acquainted with any of my students, although they were familiar to me from some organizational meetings and I had come to know them in a limited sense during the planning year. Of the six second-year candidates assigned to me, three had worked together in the colloquium on curriculum content under the leadership of the same Animateur to whom they were assigned this year. Two had been members of another colloquium comprised largely of people from Northern California under the direction of another Animateur. They had worked on issues of practicum and were now added to the Southern group because of their Southern residence. One student had been a colleague and peer in the administrative colloquium to which we had both been assigned, and we had worked closely together. I had learned and come to respect her contribution and participation. The two newly admitted students came through our structured admissions procedure and were again assigned for geographical reasons. One of these had many ties of friendship

and collegial relationships with some members of the colloquium to which she was assigned. The other was a total stranger, both to the group and to the Institute. As it happened he and I had known each other remotely a number of years ago in two collaborative agencies where we were employed although we had never had any direct working relationship.

Of the eight students who started the year, one, as a result of extraordinary expenditure of time and energy, was able to complete the PDE and to graduate in June. Three of the students left the program for various reasons; the remaining four continued into 1978-79. The three who left the Institute did so for highly individual reasons which appeared related to both personal and professional issues and followed a rather thoughtful assessment of their learning needs and professional goals.

A complicating factor was the anticipation by the Dean and Board of Trustees that many of these candidates would complete work towards their degree in this first year of operation (their second year of relatedness to the program). They had, in fact, been advised in the letter of acceptance to candidacy of July 26, 1977 of the expectation that the first quarter in residence would be focused on proposal writing for the PDE, thus conveying the expectation that curriculum requirements had already

been completed and would require little attention. As it turned out, this was an unrealistic distortion which, however, added to the confusion of students as they began the year and found themselves recipients of contradictory expectations from faculty that conflicted with their own expectations, plans and wishes.

First Trimester

Introduction

School opened with excitement and anticipation. The new students felt the stress of not being connected to an ongoing process where relationships and identifications were perceived as solid. Those students who were now entering the second year carried over a high momentum from the previous year's work and a sense of urgency to complete their studies in the current year.

Students were presented with new forms and procedures which had been developed to operationalize the continuing process of self and peer evaluation, a cornerstone of our learning process. They were also given a grid design which served the purpose of making concrete the student's demonstrated progress toward competence in the curriculum content required for graduation. Students were instructed to begin assessment of curriculum competence using the grid with the Mentor and to plan with the

Mentor how these competencies would be demonstrated and would mesh with individual learning interests and educational goals. The evaluation forms were to be utilized in the colloquium, the convocation and any other place where presentations would be made. The reality of forms which would objectify and record data for the purpose of reflecting the reality of our learning philosophy was experienced by some as a jarring intrusion of reality into a state of elation. The assessment forms created bewilderment and became a magnet for ambivalence and anxiety. Instead of proving useful, it soon developed that they disrupted the flow of presentations so that a student seemed unable to present a case or theoretical discussion to his colloquium without asking that it be accredited for a "4," which would in turn contribute toward his demonstration of curriculum competence. Learning needs and intellectual curiosities were bypassed in the rush to demonstrate achievement with the goal of graduation. It soon became evident to the Animateurs that this distorted and unexpected reaction to evaluation forms became so disruptive to the group process that they were ultimately abandoned. As the colloquium group retreated from this formal responsibility for recognizing each other's expertise, more responsibility flowed toward the Mentor-student team. The Mentor had always been considered to have some

role in assessment but was now asked to take this on in addition to curriculum discussion and planning. A variety of other housekeeping and procedural devices quickly developed, inevitable in a new institutional system, and it seemed that the Mentor was the logical person to communicate and instruct the students in these matters. Thus, the Mentor's function appeared to quickly attract a variety of administrative tasks which involved checking, instructing and directing students. For the first time, I experienced myself in the middle, between the students and the institution. This was a startling revelation. My identification with the school had been total. As faculty I had started as if there were no difference; I was the school. Now, suddenly, I was forced into another space and place which felt for the moment like a funnel and buffer to and from the administration and the student body.

Students were coming to their conferences with me confused and anxious about assessment issues as well as intimidated and resentful regarding curriculum expectations, because these opened up the whole question of exposure of practice to one's peers. Inner doubts were stirred, vulnerabilities which had not been confronted the previous year because the group had been task-oriented focused on completing assignments and the self as learner

had not been the focus of attention. Now, for the first time, students began to take in the changes they needed to face. The colloquium was no longer to be a peer group united around a common task; that is, to produce certain documents, lists, charts and schedules which would then represent a task well-completed. Instead the colloquium was now one of the learning media for the student to utilize in his own journey as a student, and it would not serve as a didactic teaching medium per se, although learning would certainly flow from it. There ensued a shock of recognition that each student was alone with individual learning needs and educational goals and was ultimately responsible for this process. This confrontation with being really a student produced in many a state of regressive anxiety. Under the stress of exposure and the expectation of autonomy, students responded in a variety of ways depending on their personal characteristics. There were disappointments, recriminations and complaints. The Mentor began to be seen as a stumbling block who would prevent the student from quickly moving through the process to graduation. Curriculum assessment, which needed to be not only planned but documented, was considered an affront particularly by those who were experienced and had many years of responsible professional activity, often in public roles. It had perhaps been secretly wished by some that

widespread community knowledge of their effectiveness would suffice the documentation. In all this turmoil, when meeting with a student, if I dared to propose that we might appropriately discuss subjective interests or areas of curiosity to pursue for learning, this was considered an attempt to divert them from their main task of getting through the curriculum. In the bewilderment and confusion, splitting developed with students complaining to me about the colloquium and to others about the unhelpfulness of the Mentor. For some the Animateur was experienced as the inspiring, idealized teacher, while the Mentor was the critical and restrictive superego figure who would depreciate and disquality competence and stand in the way of progress. For others the Animateur was the disappointment because she did not attend to group process, and the Mentor was the only one who understood, valued and enabled the student to feel heard, comfortable, etc.

Log of Teaching Experiences

Conference with Student H

A bright, enthusiastic learner solidly based in skills and practice, grades herself down very low on the curriculum assessment, giving herself mostly 2's, an elementary level reflecting a speaking knowledge. I wonder

whether this reflects her sense of being a beginner since she has just entered the program. She expresses hope for feedback, direction and challenge, describes herself as frustrated by a lack of theoretical knowledge, has come into the program because she feels she has gone as far as she can alone. She appears already to be struggling with issues of perfection and boundless expectation. It will be a challenge to assist in locating and defining her needs as well as restoring acknowledgment of obvious competence and experience. Will demonstrating it through our curriculum process restore and re-enforce her sense of her own capabilities?

Conference with Student B

Resenting assignment to me, since she already had a good start with another Mentor with whom she felt an alliance. This competent, experienced and conscientious person appeared to anticipate I would be critical and not support her treatment philosophy or her fierce determination to finish in a year. She had marked herself 4 in everything, had no interest in further learning but was eager to get her past experiences accredited. After our conference, she complained to the Dean about her disappointment in the research orientation we were taking and the tyranny of forms and structures being imposed on students.

Conference with Student F

An average level practitioner, defines her learning goals in positive terms as a wish to organize and synthesize much disparate knowledge she has accumulated. At the same time, her anxiety and ambivalence is expressed in complaining about her colloquium, where she feels she will not get her share of time, and in expressing doubts as to the validity of the degree--will it be respected in the community? I attempt to help her with some specifics in terms of a learning plan, relating it to her goals for herself. She wonders what will be taught in colloquium; experiences shock at recognizing how much self study will be required. I recognize her expectation and preference for feeding and teaching from outside and wonder how much she can begin a different approach to work to meet her own needs. She acknowledges the conflict but projection and externalization of complaints continue through the trimester. Her dependent appeals for emotional support also continue. I try to hold to my focus of an educational not a therapeutic relationship by concentrating on review of submitted materials and relating these to her learning goals and attempts at mastery.

Conference with Student G

New to the program, a relatively experienced practitioner, gives himself 4's in most of the grid since he considers himself solidly based in understanding of dynamics, theories of personality and techniques. His anxiety about how to present case material so as to make it "interesting" belies his self-contained facade, but becomes exposed as time passes and subsequent conferences reveal that the student feels confused, uncertain and overwhelmed by the necessity of independent study. Anxiety did not diminish with the passage of time and ambivalence about the usefulness of a degree from this institution loomed large. The student moved toward withdrawing almost as he was beginning. My efforts to help him understand concerns and to test his adaptive capacities by focusing on a learning task did not reduce anxiety. He was, however, able to respond to suggestion that he not act on impulse but give himself time to consider options and to think them through. By the end of the trimester a decision was made to withdraw, based on his need for more structure and his feeling that our learning design was not useful to him. Our unstructured mode, his preference for a more academically oriented program and increasing anxiety over exposure of his practice were all factors. Decision to withdraw was made with a positive sense of taking care of his own

interests. His admission into the program had validated something for himself which he did not wish to disrupt and so he had entered. However, his decision to leave was extraordinarily relieving and an appropriate solution. It was my feeling that he was dealing with an initial stress reaction to his finding himself in the student role, after years of autonomous practice. However, anxiety was so overwhelming that the student was not able to focus on learning issues, and my efforts to break up the proliferation of anxiety via attention to some specific learning did not provide any binding. G's early departure was a positive action reflecting his unique learning needs. My impression was that this was ultimately a constructive experience.

Student D

A very experienced practitioner and teacher with skills and expertise in administration and community organization. Student appropriately graded herself with many 4's, was startled at the need to validate these competencies. There was shock and resentment. This student reflects one dilemma raised by candidates who are advanced clinicians. How do I deal with this issue of documentation? I have no personal knowledge of the student's clinical performance; merely comments from other faculty regarding her reputation

and status. How does she validate competence? Does my expectation that she document and demonstrate it, just as the other students are expected to do, mean that I disbelieve her? How would the same issue apply to another equally senior and competent practitioner who was not known to any of the faculty by reputation? Should this student be an exception? Am I being stubborn and unrealistic? I am filled with doubt and questions even as I acknowledge these issues. As time passes the resentment diminishes and the student accepts the need for participation in colloquium and demonstration of practice, getting into the role of student in which she finds herself.

Student A

A capable clinician, has questions about her PDE. She has had a topic in mind for some time, an issue related to her practice but now wonders what we mean by research. It sounds as if our ideas are changing and we are becoming more demanding. Will her material be acceptable? She also complains gently about the use of colloquium for assessment, is dissatisfied that there will not be more teaching. I have no idea at this moment what "we" mean by research, beyond knowing that we have more flexibility and room for creativity than academia. I share my present ignorance and optimism that clarification will come; sense her disapproval

masked by a pleasant impenetrable surface. I acknowledge her disappointment that I am lacking and that we will need to learn together. She denies these feelings and retreats from being involved with me around her learning and curriculum issues.

The Mentor is asked by the Dean to take up issues of available study time with students. It is considered that one-quarter time is the minimum requirement for participation in the program. I know that two of my students are employed full-time and that I am concerned for them as to how they will manage. It is unrealistic to be introducing this requirement at this stage of the game. As we discuss it together, we acknowledge that it will simply take them that much longer to complete their studies unless they can free up more time than currently seems possible. I am also asked to explore available library facilities and ensure that students not only can document library membership but utilization. This relates to our accreditation application.

Commentary - First Trimester

In retrospective summary, the first convocation and first trimester were marked by elation, excitement, upheaval confusion and self-doubt. The uncertainties and stress affected all of us, faculty and candidates, as we

tried to find our place, re-define our roles and goals. Reaction to the stress ranged widely, dependent on the individual personality pattern and characteristic ways of coping. Faculty, new in their role, had not had much time to prepare and were continually making decisions and developing procedures under the gun, barely one day ahead of the timing of the student body. The whole task of translating ideals and intent into an operating program was like a breathless race against time. For the students, most of whom had participated in planning and building, it was a major shifting of gears from being part of a pioneering group effort where the relationships were collegial to the role of individual student appropriately focused on internal issues and goals for self. Further, they were expected to relate in some fashion to faculty who, although they were still peers, now had a different function as well as the power and authority inherent in their newly acquired roles and exaggerated by the student's projections.

Students' anxiety about the new place in which they found themselves, the true beginning of an academic year, coinciding with the early introduction of the assessment process triggered off defensiveness about how they would be viewed and measured in comparison with others and, in truth, within themselves. The concurrent introduction of the curriculum grid and the expectation that specific

learning plans would be designed and competence determined sharply increased the anxiety reactions of some to being observed and evaluated. Old feelings of being supervised became attached to the evaluation forms and the grid as well as to the Mentor who ended up with both these functions. There was concern about how differences would be dealt with, not only differences in age, sex and experience but in theoretical orientation. There was some denial of differences as well as challenges that someone from another orientation could understand. Modifications and changes in structure, administrative procedures and forms shook the students' hope for stability of structure. Feelings of dissatisfaction surfaced in that courses were not being offered. The basic concept that students needed to seek out their own sources of learning content, either through reading, outside courses or workshops and discussions with colleagues, was understood and taken in by some for the first time. There was a sense of almost too much freedom and an appeal for and a resistance to forms and authoritarian structure which both served to fill a vacuum and defend against anxiety but at the same time ran counter to ideals and philosophies. As a Mentor, I found myself troubled with some students' resistance to being individualized and their inability to focus on learning needs and wishes. They appeared obsessed with filling in the demands of the

grid, at the same time they saw it as a tool for criticism rather than praise and demonstration of achievement. I tried to hold to my role as facilitator of exploration, to encourage questions and not provide answers, to function as an enabler for an ego-mastery task, but experienced the drift to turning me into a Superego figure which would be both protective and familiar and against whom struggle could take place.

Much in the situation seemed ripe for anxiety, distortions and projections about individual differences, whether in degree of competence or orientation, and competition and criticism between one colloquium and another, North and South, one Mentor and another, etc. The changes or introduction of new pieces of structure and administrative procedures were further shaking to the stability of the students. The faculty uncertainty and instability impinged on student awareness and contributed to the unsettled state. The students who were pressuring themselves for speed, racing the clock with the hope of graduation in June, were particularly sensitive to administrative uncertainty and experienced it all as deliberate attempts to block their progress. It may well be, as Katie Kolodziejski (1979) has hypothesized in her PDE, that these paranoid-like reactions are healthy adaptive mechanisms used by students faced with the stress of clinical learning,

although I did not experience their responses in those terms at the time. Perhaps if I had the benefit of her thinking then as I do now, the beginning phase would have been less alarming. The experiences of the students, however, fed into my own sense of confusion, self-doubt and lack of clarity. My sense of discomfort as I began to take on what everyone saw as the role of authority and enforcer was in gross contrast with my original expectations. In retrospect one can wonder how much of this was received projections from students and how much was my own reaction to stress and my characteristic ways of adapting to change, including my delay in recognizing and acknowledging the degree of authority in my assigned task. There had as yet been no explicit attention given to this significant issue in faculty discussions.

My experience of myself during this period was very parallel to much I observed in the students. My task seemed vague and I felt a need to design forms and define structures which I could hold onto. There were feelings of confusion, anxiety and insecurity as to whether I could either identify my role or adequately fill it. While I experienced the lack of boundaries and the need to establish some, my students also felt anxiety at the lack of structure and lack of clarity as to what they might expect of me. It was my hope and purpose to retain some freedom

of internal decision-making for them and at the same time find my own self definition. I found myself looking at other faculty members for comparison to learn from their experience to reassure and validate my own difference.

Faculty met fairly regularly for the purpose of maintaining some perspective on the beginning process, dealing with the issues that arose and developing procedures as the need for them evolved. By the end of November it had been decided that the evaluation forms were counter-productive because many students were determined to use them for grading purposes rather than in the search for understanding their own functioning and presentation. A change in curriculum design was developed at about this time, which, although providing solutions to earlier difficulties, was experienced by some students in a paranoid-like way as further blocking their progress rather than providing support.

In mid-December I felt overwhelmed with uncertainty. My students were demanding, dissatisfied at not getting enough and at the same time resistant to providing time to meet with me. Past experiences reminded me that confusion reflects a transition point in learning, perhaps, I thought, this state is in the service of learning my job. In order to define something for my students as well as for myself, I introduced the idea of a log system asking them to keep

records of their activities, clinical meetings they attend and also reading lists, which would reflect library usage and studies they were pursuing. These formal requirements appeared to provide relief and served as a focus and organizer of their thinking. This system was later expanded in a faculty meeting where it was decided that in addition to the log and reading lists quarterly self-assessments and case material would be submitted. In January, as students began to use these forms and found them helpful they also liked the improved grid. I found my confusion also receding; an external organizer reduced ambiguity and provided strength until ego forces could take over. The Animateur and I developed a collaborative process which enabled us to share and present a united front to the students, thus interrupting any further tendency to split and use us destructively rather than helpfully. This worked to support the task and reduce distortions. I found with relief that by the end of the trimester my panic and anxiety had been reduced to the level of signal anxiety, a much more comfortable and also useful adaptive state.

Second Trimester

Introduction

A letter from the Dean to the students dealt with issues around assessment, clarifying that the colloquium could not take full responsibility for this process but could only be one source of feedback, since it must also provide an environment for the presentation of learning in process rather than proving. The student had responsibility and autonomy for self-evaluation and was instructed to share feedback and documentation with the Mentor as part of the process of self-assessment as well as demonstration of progress in curriculum. Formal instructions were given regarding regular documentation to be expected periodically from all students. These were to include an ongoing case study, self-assessment essays, log of reading and educational activities.

This communication from the Dean, describing an orderly and rather complete structure for submitting reports for the purpose of review and demonstrating progress, had a reassuring and organizing effect. It provided specific vehicles for reflecting and recording a variety of learning activities, thus building a file in support of both the student's candidacy as well as the accreditation process for the Institute. It appeared to re-enforce,

however, a trend that had already begun in the first trimester; that is, shifting the assessment process more and more to the arena of the student's relationship with the Mentor since the colloquia had given up using the forms and were further disclaiming major responsibility for the evaluation process. The peers and the Animateur would participate in feedback and evaluative comments, but assessment would no longer be focused primarily in the colloquium. This prompted students to turn to the Mentor for this validation and to see the Mentor more and more as a powerful authority figure who could accredit, sanction demonstrations of competence, approve mastery of core curriculum, etc. This trend, plus the fact that this was a one-to-one relationship, proved ripe and fertile ground for regressive fantasies to earlier experiences in field work supervision and the ambivalently experienced power of the field supervisor. This contributed to the pressure I experienced from the students; that is, to shift the focus of the Mentor/student relationship away from the process of the learning experience to the learning product. My effort during this period was to hold to both aspects, to try to maintain an open-ended interest in educational goals and to attempt to develop a learning alliance. At the same time, students were more and more beginning to experience me as a gatekeeper and polarized around me their struggles

with structure, which was experienced as both too bureaucratic and too formless. This was particularly the case for the senior students from the previous year who were still pressuring themselves for speedy completion during this academic year and were racing the clock to attain their goal. In this trimester they began to be aware of the enormous undertaking involved in such a timetable, and their disappointment and bitter struggle around this issue was expressed in various ways.

Log of Teaching Experiences

Meeting with Student B

It is clear that her self-imposed timetable is becoming an albatross. All her doubts and questions are externalized onto me as Mentor representing administration, imposing forms, procedures, processes and structures all designed to persecute the student and interfere with her timetable for completion of her goal. The student maintains her earlier position that her theoretical work in the program is completed. Ultimately, it was necessary for me to accept that beyond the area of her PDE, in which she was deeply invested, she did not wish to expand or deepen knowledge during this year. However, the competency and adequacy of her practice more than qualified her to graduate. I am aware of my own inner doubts and sense of

failure--my expectation of my role is to stimulate the student to stretch rather than to settle for proving. Am I correct in expecting this? I feel disappointed in both the student and in myself.

Student F expresses discomfort in giving in to the role of student, having her work looked at. She has had too many years of successful practice and finds herself extraordinarily confused as she attempts to apply any new knowledge she is gaining. She is alarmed, fears she is losing what she knew and has nothing to substitute. I interpret confusion as a normal part of any learning process; it means learning is actually taking place and is experienced prior to a new level of integration. This does not reassure her, she is in conflict about remaining in the program, finds her outside work in other organizational settings more satisfying and is less and less pulled to her studies. The idea of a regular log is reassuring; she will experiment and see if this organization can be helpful.

Student H responds positively to the idea of an ongoing case summary. It will help her with application of newly learned ideas. She is enthusiastic, has no complaints. What a relief! Should I enjoy it or look further?

Student A proposes to substitute an ongoing case conference of several students for the individual conferences. I openly acknowledge her change of status this year to the role of student, whereas last year she had felt herself to be a contributory peer. In a letter to the Dean, her comments come through as criticism rather than attempts to continue her contribution. In our meetings she complains of lack of feedback but shows resistance to taking this in when offered. I wonder about suggesting case consultation but do not recommend this, feeling she would not accept my suggestion. In retrospect, I can see how I allowed her defensive style to block my recognition of the way in which her needs are masked and expressed by criticism.

Student E is slowly and painfully confronting the limits of his performance and the problem areas which will need to be mastered as a candidate. He has submitted case material which reflects an alarming blurring of therapeutic boundaries and failure to recognize and understand transference and countertransference issues. I suggest a case consultant for help with his concerns about treatment skills. He responds positively to this but persists in using our conference time for personal rather than learning issues. My confrontation around this does not move the problem. I also attempt to help him feel good about what

he is learning rather than blaming himself for what he did not know in the past. Hopefully some of his attempts at mastery will relieve anxiety.

Student C: Her learning style is to struggle and find answers on her own. After this problem-solving she can bring solutions to the Mentor. She is aware of a regressive pull in the one-to-one relationship and is, therefore, more comfortable in the colloquium process. She handles her discomfort and her general anxiety about the burden of an independent learning process by warding off the Mentor as if Mentor is an intruder. She failed to schedule a conference this trimester.

Student D has accepted the need to make a learning plan and curriculum design and is giving in to the process of demonstrating competence, but her pain at being in the student role comes through clearly. I emphathize with the painful process, but am unable to relieve it, feel her anger. She makes me feel I am holding her back. I wonder if I do?

Commentary - Second Trimester

The Dean reports the Trustees' impressions that students need an "angel's advocate" to help them through the program. I question whether I am too tough, wondering what is our standard. At the same time the Dean reports

that our PDE research consultant is worried about quality. Some material submitted to her is on the master's level. I wish the faculty could come to some understanding about acceptable standards for the degree. In order to deal with my self-doubt that my perfectionistic internal standards are putting unreasonable pressure on my students, I develop a design with my Animateur colleague to jointly review students' curriculum plans and demonstrations of competence. In this way we can balance each other's criteria and the students can hopefully feel less persecuted.

I attend a faculty meeting in mid-trimester anticipating a longed-for discussion of policy issues and some considerations of the principles and standards by which we are operating. Instead I am asked to report on problem situations; since I have several such to offer, I respond in a way which focuses on negative aspects rather than the whole student, including good aspects of ego functioning. This results in critical and specific suggestions as to how I should proceed. I had not anticipated needing or asking for such recommendations, felt attacked, inadequate and poorly functioning. This response suggests vulnerability and boundary confusion regarding roles and tasks. My expectations of myself seemed to have merged with my students' performance and products.

After soul searching self-examination I conclude that I must take responsibility for my own functioning in a self-designed role. At the moment peers cannot provide either support or modeling. It is not clear what happens to unanimity of standards or quality control in such a system.

I introduce my own design for formalizing a learning plan for students to use as a model for a learning contract with the Institute. This is clear, works well for my students, is subsequently recommended by the Dean to other faculty members.

I examine my present feelings of dissatisfaction regarding my functioning. My wish is to be an enabler, a facilitator of students in pursuit of knowledge. My activity is apparently not perceived in these positive terms by some students. Rather than supportive and facilitating, I am experienced as controlling and authoritative. I am pushed into the role of persecutor and evaluator. My own lack of clarity about standards and distrust regarding what is acceptable to others versus to myself make it hard for me not to overreact to this. I have also had to recognize my own disapproval of students who are in a hurry to get through rather than learn. My disapproval must get communicated and feed into the negative interaction I am experiencing.

What is the institution's responsibility on this issue? I feel alone with no guidelines regarding quality control. I can call on my own standards, but can I trust these? This is not my shop and my students did not choose me; I was assigned to them. I am feeling in the middle again between the system and the students. I feel the system is not providing what faculty needs to do its job. Is this real or am I overly dependent, resisting freedom and in need of sheltering structure? What has happened to the spirit of play which was so delightfully enticing as we anticipated the creative experience we were to have this year?

Third Trimester

Introduction

By now I am drowning in paper. Students submit case material, carefully summarized, which reflects their learning experiences, changes in their understanding of patients, the application of new ideas and understanding. I spend hours reading and studying the material at length and find it fascinating. The question then arises: What do the students expect in response and what does the system require? Am I to read and discuss in detail? Some students want this. I enjoy it. Is this the best use of the time that is allotted to us to spend together? This time

is limited. Can it contain all the work? I spend time far beyond the allocation.

A letter from the Dean reports that a Trustee disparages the quality of a PDE draft, finding it trivial. I learn after a bit of research that the work belongs to one of my students. I react with puzzlement, alarm and resentment. The Dean talks about the need for "standards without standardization." This sounds very nice, but what does it mean to us on the firing line? Contradictions seem to be proliferating. Only last month faculty were told that students apparently needed an angel's advocate to help them through the system. I again feel squeezed between the students and the system. I have deep conviction in the dialectic process of evolution and growth, but find it uncomfortable to spin with the spiral as it evolves.

Log of Teaching Experiences

Conference with Student E

The student is having difficulty reading and retaining under the stress of personal crises. He is disappointed by his slow progress and feelings of inadequacy in the group. I attempt to counter his continuous discussion of personal problems by focusing on learning issues and the learning plan. He counters by complaining about what he is sacrificing versus what he is getting in the program.

Finally agrees on material to be reviewed and discussed at our next conference. Student arrives for the next conference announcing a new disturbing personal crisis. Despite a valiant attempt to concentrate, he is clearly unable to use me for purposes of reflection about learning. We agree on a time limit to determine whether some resolution of personal issues will take place so that energy will again be available for study. The student's depression, emotional appeal and style of throwing himself on the mercy of the court make it enormously hard to stay in the role of educator. Stating that I am not his therapist and cannot help with these matters, despite my empathy for his pain, does not prevent his persistently bringing them to conferences. I see this not only as resistance but as his being really flooded and unable to partialize. At the same time I have the impression that the student has not been effectively challenged to perform professionally. It seems clear to me that bending our rules and standards of competency in response to his appeals will accomplish nothing. I end up feeling that I have responded to his demands appropriately but with some lingering unrealistic guilt that I should have somehow alleviated his pain. His work, particularly his writing, is on a low master's level rather than a doctoral level; he and I both know it. It seems clear that he must face the reality of an extended

period of study in the Institute before he can possibly qualify for the degree.

Conference with Student H

Reports much pleasurable learning. Has submitted her case summary as per request and comes to conference prepared to discuss this. She clearly regards case consultation as part of my function. I enjoy such discussion and participate happily in this. This student's problems with boundaries and limits are also reflected in case material where professional boundaries seem somewhat muddy and ill-defined. I use this to illustrate problems in learning reflected in her boundless eagerness to study everything. We run out of time and student is disappointed that other items on the agenda have not been covered. To some extent this reflects the same issue in that she does not trust herself to provide her own containment. In our next conference we work on curriculum planning. Student appears realistic and appropriate, much less self-denigrating and reports considerable pleasure in beginning to apply newly learned theoretical material in her case practice. At the same time she has some question about how to use the Mentor, particularly if case consultation cannot always be provided in the hours. I feel that she

has told me that if I am not knowledgeable in everything in the curriculum, how can I be useful to her at all?

Telephone Contact with Student C

I call as there have been three months without contact. She had submitted written material reflecting much learning and thinking. I know she is overextended, working full-time and actively participating in her colloquium. I am wondering what all this means in terms of our relationship. Earlier student had acknowledged her style of problem-solving alone and then bringing solutions. Is she one of those who truly learns best alone and who needs very little from the Mentor or does her silence, in fact, reflect some internal struggle in which I am some symbolic authority figure? I recognize she has a fiercely independent need to master on her own and is able to do so. She is not timid about seeking out resources and reassures me that she can ask for help if necessary.

Conference with Student A

Student is working on mastery of the basic curriculum at the same time as she is evolving her PDE. While the student is not clinically sophisticated, she works hard and uses help. It was partly around this student's level of practice that I found meetings with her Animateur particularly helpful in the accreditation process. We both

acknowledged the need to develop realistic goals and standards for the student with a view to measuring her own independent development. If she learns and demonstrates increasing understanding within her own framework, this indicates to us that she has made good use of what we have had to offer. She is after all competing against herself rather than an abstract standard. We are a bit uneasy about this since some of her material is closer to a master's than a doctor's level. However, we do find a way of validating her products. Interestingly, in my final assessment with the student, I subsequently learned of her negative reaction to my conjoint discussions with her Animateur. She saw me as indecisive, not having the courage to give her my own feedback, needing to lean on the power of the Animateur. I am profoundly disturbed by her feedback since my manifest intent had been to protect her from my own perfectionism and possible supercritical idiosyncratic standards. Is it possible that I did not do as well by the student as I might have, even at the same time I thought she was not doing as well by herself and experienced disappointment in her?

Conference with Student B

Conference is regarding her next to final PDE draft. I have learned a lot from the student about PDE

committee functioning and responsibilities. Also I learned of the necessity to set some kind of timetable with the student providing time for faculty to read and reflect on material as well as for the student to revise drafts. The committee worked to meet this student's deadline at great cost to themselves. Recognizing that the Institute was in some way responsible for the press of time, we were able to respond to the student's apparently insatiable demands; she was equally unsparing of demands on herself. It was, however, difficult to accept her sense of entitlement without some resentment. She responded to our suggestions, made required corrections and came through with a creditable piece of work to the relief and pleasure of all of us.

Conference with Student F

This student is deciding to withdraw. Her decision is composed of many issues, including her difficulty in being satisfied with the independent study process and the isolation required. She feels she would benefit more from a conventional classroom teaching situation. Her awareness during this year of her many lacks and the length of time it would take her to complete curriculum expectations are an important element in her decisions. Since she is not enjoying the process, she sees no value for

herself either presently or in the future. She is finding other directions more satisfying and reports that in intervals between meetings her studies are not on her mind. She has responded well all trimester to efforts to help her understand the multiple meanings of her move and came to the end of the year with some sense of dignity and achievement. She is another whom we did not serve best by the momentum of pushing people quickly into the second year. She has made a choice for herself reflecting a realistic self-assessment and her best judgment of her needs. I feel good about helping her to achieve this resolution in positive terms.

Student H

This student submits her self-assessment for the end of the year. Her comments about her experience, speculations and criticisms of the role of Mentor are so pertinent that I am quoting it at length:

> I see the Mentor as one who can evaluate my learning needs and accomplishments--that is, help me identify both gaps and areas of competence. Fulfillment of this role assumes broad knowledge. Can a Mentor evaluate a student's knowledge in areas still unfamiliar to him or her? If not, who then can? And who has the responsibility and authority to find someone who can? Do I produce a knowledgeable person who can evaluate me or does the faculty have the responsibility in so doing?

> Related to the above question is the issue of the evaluative function of the Mentor and the power resident in the role. How centrally seated in this role is the evaluative function? Is there any system of checks and balances on the Mentor as evaluator? How can the Institute equalize differences between two Mentors? . . . the issue of common standards is raised.

Additionally the student proposes a roster of student/tutors who have already demonstrated competence in specific areas and might serve as teacher/mentor in the area of specialization. These would contribute not only making knowledge available, but possibly also participating in the evaluation process.

Commentary - Third Trimester

In a letter to the Dean at the end of the trimester I express my concern about how we are defining standards, both in terms of curriculum content and our dissertation expectations. What is master's versus doctoral level of practice? Regarding PDE, students are bewildered as to how our research and dissertation expectations differ from those of academia? I am finding myself stymied by the question. The press of students to have previous employment experiences, community activities, etc., accredited toward the curriculum completion is understandable, however, what are our own standards for monitoring this? I have found my own way thus far to be ready to discuss at length

the nature of these experiences and to ask for some sort of theoretical and conceptual framework in which they might fit. Some students respond well to this; others feel I am quibbling and demanding. It feels as if we need some general standards. Someone who has an excellent reputation in the community could have our blessing by virtue of personal knowledge. What about another whose reputation is also excellent but is not personally known to any of the faculty? What is reasonable, adequate demonstration? Are we accrediting references, reputation? Am I being stubborn, inflexible, uncreative? This is an uncomfortable area. Question: "Am I still struggling with a wish for structure and standards imposed from without? Is this my own discomfort? Am I asking for specific guidelines which are in fact impossible in an institution such as ours? I think not." The direction I feel I need is more along the lines of an approach to solving the problem rather than specific criteria. It is more a matter of how to conceptualize and to think about the issues. I wish the faculty had more time to discuss and share on this level.

Tension around these issues had emerged clearly in an April faculty meeting. The importance of people graduating to demonstrate that this was possible in our system was stressed. There was administrative pressure to get

some students through. Sparks flew between faculty who were targetted as "super-academics with old habits" versus others who were more ready to consider the "art of the possible." It seemed that not only were the students struggling around their needs for and resistance to structure but faculty were as well. In this meeting I experienced deeply and with clarity that I was not the system but rather in the middle between students and administrative structure. I have come a long way from being identified as the school with faculty and school being one. The Trustees have gradually emerged as a separate system and the struggle in this meeting around diverse needs has confronted me with my serving two masters, neither of whom is satisfied. In addition I must grapple with my own sense of confusion, satisfaction as well as pleasure and even occasional triumph.

I struggle to formulate my own thinking on the issue of the differences between master's level and doctoral students. What is the profile of the competent, excellent clinician? What are minimum requirements for graduation? It seems to me to be reflected in the integration of theory and practice skills; interventions with clients should be based upon understanding rather than mere intuition. It should be possible for our graduates to step back and look at the components, reflect on the

dynamics of a treatment process for the purpose of taking it apart, analyzing it and synthesizing it. There should be comfort with, or at least an ability to tolerate, ambiguity and a lack of answers while clarifying questions and refining them more clearly.

In this regard I have some concern about the case material submitted by students. They enjoy doing this. In many instances it demonstrates clearly how new theoretical insights are being tested with patients who had been seen and understood differently. However, is feedback from this material primarily the responsibility of the Mentor and in what depth should this take place? There are some presentations to colloquium and convocation but these are limited. What would be a satisfactory means to acknowledge the seriousness of the work which is being presented to us?

I was deeply affected by two students who withdrew from the program at the end of the year. (Actually three students left, but the one who left in the first trimester had never become involved, had entered ambivalently and resolved the ambivalence by taking flight.) The two others were modestly competent clinicians who had actively participated during the planning year. Both acknowledged that they had decided to go on with the program with considerable self-doubt and ambivalence but, hating to lose

the momentum, took a chance and were hopeful that they could finish in one more year. When they faced the reality of the curriculum requirements in relation to their own level of competence, and what would be required in time and effort, they decided that they were unwilling to commit to this. Their withdrawal appeared appropriate in view of the particular issues each faced. Their self-assessments were practical and realistic and, I think, reflected their own decision. My feeling was one of acceptance and relief. Since we had offered them the opportunity to partcipate, we were committed to provide whatever help they needed to get through. Nonetheless, it would have been a long and arduous process and I felt they had each found a more appropriate solution.

I ended the year with one student who had satisfactorily completed and graduated; three students who had withdrawn in constructive ways that were appropriate to their needs, and four students at various stages in the learning process, all actively and deeply involved in their candidacy. The process seems to be flowing. I feel that I am ending the year with more questions than answers about my role, but the complexities and mysteries are emerging and taking definition. I feel strongly identified with the role of Mentor, convinced of its value and importance but less convinced of my effectiveness during

this turbulent year. I am hoping that I can achieve sufficient perspective on the experience so that the second year, which I am eager to undertake, can be carried with more clarity, effectiveness and definition.

Chapter 5

RETROSPECTIVE CRITIQUE: ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF DATA

As I review the chronicle of my first year as a Mentor in the Institute for Clinical Social Work, from the perspective of a year later, patterns emerge and issues are highlighted which illustrate significant concerns that can be examined for their implications and relevance. Problems of function, role definition and the nature of the Mentor/student relationship can be evaluated both in the context of a specific emerging innovative program as well as from the general perspective of educational needs and consultation issues for advanced clinicians.

I had anticipated that the main thrust of this study would be my experience with students and the development of the process of our relationship; learning purposes for which a Mentor proved valuable; and the application of my own clinical teaching knowledge to this different experience. However, as I studied and analyzed my material, additional issues emerged which were related to the institution itself as an evolving organization and my relation to it. These areas emerged for consideration

as I described my attempts to locate my identity and mediate between what I experienced as conflictual internal and external forces. Faculty members were operating in a new structure, an emerging culture with ideals but without firm rituals. I often felt like Theseus--that I was holding on for dear life to a thread as I explored the maze of this experience, not sure whether at the end would be freedom, the ideal golden student for whom we had played with a fantasy profile, or a critical minotaur reflecting greed and doubt.

Thus, I intend to examine the data of the diary in relation to the following major theme: (1) the Mentor/student relationship and the role of the Mentor; (2) the students and their experience; (3) organizational issues. These aspects will be considered in relation to the educational philosophy of the Institute of Clinical Social Work and from the perspective of a clinical educator with my own understanding of the learning process for practitioners. A review of concerns and problems brought by students to the Mentor should make it possible to delineate some of the teaching tasks of that role as well as to consider the appropriate boundaries of the Mentor/Student relationship and the sources of stress experienced therein.

Since the overlapping and interacting dimensions are complex and confusing to trace, much less to understand,

for the purpose of this analysis it seems possible to address only one facet at a time. This has the unfortunate effect of appearing to produce an oversimplification of the issues. This is not my intent, nor do I anticipate that it will be possible in this study to attempt a synthesis of these many reciprocally interacting elements. Rather, it is hoped that perspectives developed and questions raised will be useful for further study and research as part of the ongoing growth and evolvement of the Institute for Clinical Social Work as well as their broader implications for clinical teaching generally.

The Mentor Function and Mentor/ Student Relationship

As one examines data from Chapter 4 with respect to issues of the Mentor's task and the nature of the Mentor relationship with students, a variety of complex themes are revealed. Ordering and reflecting on some of these appear to bring clarity to the experience; with others what emerges with clarity are questions without answers.

Simplest to recognize were the accumulation of administrative, procedural and housekeeping tasks which gradually accrued to the Mentor. Some of these were allocated by the Dean or in faculty meetings because it seemed logical for certain procedural instructions and requirements to flow to students via the Mentor, who would then

be responsible for some overseer function. Others were developed by the Mentor for the purpose of organizing the work as well as for defining and making concrete patterns and procedures by which students could submit material on behalf of accreditation and candidacy. In addition, because of the formlessness of the early phase, the Mentor found it useful to develop various systems for recording activity and concretizing study plans. These were begun as a way of bringing some order to the task and eventually proved productive so that the reading logs, the record of educational activities and the design for curriculum planning were eventually adopted for general use.

There was much experimentation by Mentor and student trying on different patterns and uses for the relationship. These variations could be seen both as responses to individual needs and reactions on the part of students, as well as parallel experimentation by the Mentor, toward finding a comfortable role definition. Student H focused on case discussion, utilizing consultation on her ongoing case submitted for practicum. This seemed appropriate; case practice reflects ongoing learning issues. Student E, less appropriately, brought personal problems and sought a therapy session, seeking to avoid a focus on a learning problem; he was disappointed at my holding to an educational purpose. Student F expressed disappointment of

needs and complained about her colloquium not providing enough teaching and attention to her interests. Student B protested against the tyranny of new forms and procedures but was interested in learning about research techniques. Student D requested approval for her learning program and timetable. Student A wanted a review and critique of previous experiences which might be accredited.

In the opening phases particularly, but with continuity throughout the year, these diverse approaches reflected the individual progressive learning status of students as well as adaptive responses to the stress of being in the learning situation. During the phase of initial anxiety, the Mentor occasionally appeared to be the receptacle for negative projections derived from earlier supervision experiences of some candidates. There was some effort to turn the relationship into an old familiar form, such as case supervision, shifting the burden or autonomy from the student to the outside. In a similar fashion, the push to turn the colloquium into a teaching seminar could also be seen as reflective of the wish to escape to comfortable, familiar patterns in the face of the unfamiliar, unstructured learning task. In the ebb and flow of the experience we tested, got to know and responded to each other. With such familiarity and as more and more individualized and differentiated needs of

students were recognized and understood by the Mentor, as well as by themselves, more satisfactory patterns and fits emerged which seemed to reflect individual needs. Documentations, forms and structural processes were designed that worked satisfactorily, and a collaborative process was developed between Animateur and Mentor. This removed them from an adversary position which students could manipulate so that splitting was no longer the seductive pathologic option it had initially appeared to be. Consequently, Student F, for example, found it necessary to take back on herself her conflict over her dependency needs and her difficulty at getting these gratified in a program where so much study was independent and there was little provision of formal didactic teaching.

The Mentor services provided the student seem crucially related to the philosophy of an individual study program offered by the Institute, in which the Mentor is related to the tasks of enabling the student to locate and become aware of his own special needs and tailoring his program to that end. The relationship could be seen as the locus for assessing, designing and implementing goals for learning. It serves to protect the self-exploration of the individual and to encourage the thrust toward individual creativity by clarifying shifts from these goals as they develop and by observing and commenting on the

learning process. The Mentor must relate with respect to the variable capabilities of goals and styles of the student and the ambivalent struggles around dependency, independency, and mastery. By observing how the various activities and demands of the curriculum enhance, contribute or detract from the student experience, the Mentor can provide a continuing thread of attention to the unfolding of the student's process, and to the ebb and flow of frustration and achievement. Jean Sanville, in a presentation in March 1979, conceptualized the Mentor as the ombudsman for the student whose goal is clarification and whose function is to protect the autonomy of the individual learner from the pressures, constraints and even contagion of group processes so that these issues can be recognized and separated from internal issues that arise from the student's own learning needs.

In some ways the Mentor role is not different from other clinical teaching functions. It is a one-to-one relationship built on rapport, neutrality and considered judgment in which time and continuity are available for an ongoing process of understanding the individual student's learning needs and learning experience. The personality of the Mentor requires the same combination of benevolent interest and empathic understanding expressed in liking and respect. It is important that the Mentor

have a high degree of pedagogic understanding and skill; experience with human factors that contribute to or detract from learning; and recognition and capacity to deal appropriately with students' stress reactions. The objective is to provide a learning experience in which handicaps and learning difficulties can be clarified and to enable the student to proceed toward his goals.

The following suggest the differences and unique aspects of the Mentor function as contrasted with other clinical teaching or supervisory functions:

1. There is no built-in expectation for the content as in a didactic process; the Mentor is not responsible for the patient as is a supervisor in clinical settings where the practicum and the patient are in the forefront. The major concern, therefore, is the student's process not the product; the learner and not the content.

2. The Mentor is not an expert in all subjects and may have less understanding in an area of particular knowledge than does the student.

3. Since these are advanced and accomplished learners personality factors may not loom as significantly; but it is still necessary to formulate an educational diagnosis in some form, reflecting the student's special style and individual needs.

4. The freedom to individually design the relationship can give full play to the creativity and individuality of both members of the learning partnership.

Freedom is encouraged in that the manner in which a particular curriculum item can be demonstrated is bounded only by the imagination and creativity of the student. Thus there is no restriction on form nor is there on time. A student can set his own pace and proceed as quickly or slowly as fits his own needs and capacities. Once the student has learned to enjoy this freedom and experience it as strengthening rather than deficient in support, the Mentor can enjoy and participate in the freedom with him. At the same time, the Mentor bears responsibility for observation and clarification if the student's direction seems ultimately to be at cross purposes with expressed wishes and goals.

Another major issue which needs to be considered for its profound implications relates to the authority vested in the role of Mentor. The fact that there are no examinations or tests in the Institute's assessment process and that recognition of curriculum competence and the power of assessment have been increasingly concentrated in the Mentor's function provide for a heavy measure of authority which may conceivably mitigate against the freedom just described. The dilemma produced by this contradiction is a major administrative area still to be examined and resolved. This will be discussed in greater detail later along with the importance of acknowledging and addressing

the impact of this issue on the relationship to the student. I would first, however, like to examine my experience with the Mentor/student relationship from the standpoint of psychodynamic clinical learning theory.

The nature of the learning alliance; the requirement that the Mentor appreciate the complex nature of the student/teacher relationship, including the factors that contribute toward it; and the need for understanding and skill for the purpose of recognizing and appropriately dealing with the student's reaction to the stress of the learning process has already been described in Chapter 3. My experience was that filled with excitement and the momentum of school really getting under way, I entered into my relationship with students in the spirit of beginning a collegial, consultative interaction. This stance contrasted markedly with the way my students perceived me and the way the interaction developed. Under the stress of beginning, some students tended to slip into an ego state that narrowed their spectrum of adaptive skills and to quickly pull me into a transference-like relationship in which certain key problems were reactivated and occasionally acted out. This experience was not unfamiliar and is quite similar to that reported on by Doerhman (1976), in her study of the parallel processes in supervision and psychotherapy. She stresses the importance of the

supervisor being continuously aware of intrusion into the teacher/learner relationship of these intense transference reactions. Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) prefer to consider and label resistances in the supervisory situation as "problems about learning." Although I also prefer to consider the binds and conflicts that develop between students and supervisors in terms other than transference-countertransference, I agree it is critically important that these forces, which impact on the relationship, be recognized and attended to so that they do not remain as blocks to the learning process. It is necessary for supervisors to be sensitive to unknown and unanticipated effects. A one-to-one relationship in a learning situation upon which so much hope, weight and stress is focused cannot be a simple didactic one. It cannot remain as a simple collegial image as it is subject to irrational needs and potent unconscious forces that get stirred reciprocally in the student and Mentor. The regressive pull symbolized by the role may create a threat to the established identity of the student, whose identity is already put on the line by acknowledging himself as a student despite many years of demonstrated competency as a practitioner. This may have been operating with Student H, who, although extremely competent, graded herself low at the initial assessment. Did this reflect her

usual self-concept, or was the impact of the new experience felt as a threat to self-esteem? Student G graded himself high, doubting he had much to learn, but experienced ambivalence and self-doubt, anticipating that his case presentation would be "boring."

In the face of the reactions experienced by some very advanced students, we must appreciate the impact of students' excessive vulnerability as they risk self-exposure on behalf of growth. The flexibility of the Institute makes possible a learning alliance individually tailored to the needs and learning styles of each student, but in each case it is a challenge to enable the student to use the Mentor to expose and explore needs without being unrealistically self-protective. The development of this process requires time and continuity, both for the relationship to grow and for the Mentor to understand individual needs sufficiently to respond helpfully. The contribution can become pertinent as the Mentor observes what students do with input. For example, Student H, an eager learner, needed boundaries and containment for her insatiable intellectual appetites from the Mentor. This could not be understood or recognized without time and a continuity of experience. Student C, a highly independent learner, preferred to study and problem solve alone and then bring achievements for demonstration. There were

long periods of no contact. Here again it took time to understand that this was not an avoidance in the service of an authority struggle, in which case there might have been question as to the necessity for intervention. As it developed the learning style was understood, and both student and I knew if need arose she would reach for consultation. Student G, who ultimately left the program, required a long process of empathic consultation before he could permit himself to acknowledge his need for a more structured academic learning situation so that he could withdraw, not with a sense of failure as compared to his colleagues, but with accepting recognition of his particular learning needs.

Clearly multiple influences impinge upon the learner. What role can the Mentor relationship play in this state of flux which is the medium in which we work? It appears to be a continuing dialectic spiral of change, disruption, resolution and temporary equilibrium, described so well by Riegel (1976).

Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) describe the tension evoked by the process of struggle to change one's level of understanding and functioning, to develop system and order. Change and learning are both desired and feared, and the arena in which this process is played out, the student's "problems about learning," are not obstacles to

learning but the very vehicle through which growth takes place. The Mentor must understand and relate to this complex process as well as guard against any pathological implications, being mindful that these issues are addressed within an educational, not a therapeutic, framework. Thus, the tension in the relationship is inevitable and instrumental for growth if the Mentor can contribute to the students' powers of self-observation and self-awareness. The Mentor, because of the one-to-one relationship, seems the most appropriate faculty person to attend to the process, contributing ultimately to the student's process of clarification and mastery.

It is relevant to comment on the role of identification as an essential aspect of learning and the sources for this in the Institute process. Our advanced students come to us with their professional identifications well developed. In the Institute they are provided with additional opportunities for identification--the ideals and values of the institution, the Dean, the Animateur, the Mentor as both individual teacher and learner as well as peers with diverse points of view and interests.

If we now rotate the kaleidoscope, the assessment function of the Mentor and the authority implicit in that role represent both a contradiction and complication in the learning process described above. The Mentor's stated

protective, supportive and enabling functions had been experienced by the students in addition to the evaluative function with its inherent, but less articulated, power. These contradictory elements resulted in a powerful source of stress for the Mentor as well as the student. Doubts regarding checks and balances were in fact expressed in such statements as that cited earlier by Student H. In designing the program we had idealistically envisioned a structure in which the student was independent, self-defining and self-accountable; yet the power residing in the Mentor's role had introduced dimensions of control and hierarchy.

My conflict about the assessment function was reflected throughout the diary in questions regarding standards, student capabilities and how rigid or flexible I permitted myself to be. Yet concerns about authority, unconsciously and consciously experienced, were not addressed directly by faculty and administration nor made manifest to students. I was aware of ambiguity with regard to criteria and standards. Student D represented the dilemma raised by advanced clinicians who have a reputation for superior work and yet must validate and demonstrate this process within the institution. Student B, another advanced clinician, was not responsive to efforts to challenge and stretch, wanting to settle for

what she already knew. Student A, competent but not superior, grew in relation to her own starting place, suggesting comparative standards were in order. These examples illustrate the possible tension-producing incongruence between the needs of a mature student, the value system of the institution and its unacknowledged bureaucratic structure. We have defined authority as based on knowledge and expertise, but the functional role of the Mentor in the assessment process shifts this authority into an arena of power which has not yet been examined and explored.

It seems reasonable that the student have two faculty persons to relate to, both the Animateur and the Mentor; in order to distribute stress and anxiety aroused by the process, to enable the student to check reality and to share the decision-making around assessment issues. This then raises further question as to the impact of this collaborative relationship on issues of confidentiality and authority. If, in the one-to-one relationship with a Mentor, the student exposes areas of concern, weakness or profound discomfort affecting his learning experience, is it not important that these be held confidential? What are the implications of sharing such information, what is the faculty member's responsibility to the institution and what would represent a breakdown of confidence?

These factors suggest that the Mentor is required, as is true in any teaching role but more forcefully here, to engage in stringent self-observation of participation and activity in the learning process with students. Because of the inherent power of the role in which the Mentor is currently functioning as part of and yet separate from hierarchy, the contribution of the Mentor's uncertainty, confusion and other elements that may contribute to negative transference responses from students must be carefully monitored and understood. I experienced expectation that I live with ambiguity and change as well as continue efforts to locate myself within the system. There was an ongoing free-floating attention in my attempts to monitor myself vis-à-vis my own standards, at the same time seeking to obtain outside support and validation from colleagues and students.

Certain additional variables, not yet touched on, seem to affect both the form and degree in a particular student's use of the Mentor. There can be personality issues--the particular fit or non-fit--which can be aggravated by the fact that Mentors have been assigned and not chosen. Langs (1979) has commented on the complications and possible interferences in such a system, urging the value of student choice of supervisor. Thus, there has been a risk in our system of temperamental mismatch which

could inhibit development of an optimum relationship. There are the occasional independent students who truly do not need much in the way of outside help. They prefer to work alone, the creative process flows and they may need merely to check in with the structure to make sure of their progress. Some students appear to need a great deal of sharing throughout their progress in the system, whereas others are aware of needs only at critical periods or at crossroads of their own evolutionary process. Thus, the Mentor is required to have the sensitive capacity to monitor styles and needs of individual students as they fluctuate over time and to provide for flexible availability as it is pertinent and useful.

Miller's (1977) comments are useful to remember in this regard: the supervisor or educator's function is as guardian of the self of the learner, flexibly creating conditions for a learning environment which facilitate achievement. He reminds us that even as client autonomy is the core of social work philosophy, as clinical educators we should equally appreciate the autonomy of the learner. The process of education ideally is not something done by one person to another but something that occurs within the learner, either as a part of his own independent process or possibly even independent of the educator's efforts. In this context Miller quotes Reynold's (1942)

view of learning as a natural process which occurs if teachers do not frustrate it.

Many authors discuss the role of the teacher in fostering autonomy, independence and self-accountability in the learner. King (1970), in reporting for the humanities curriculum project at Oxford, writes, " . . . that the withdrawal of teacher dominance increases the level of achievement. The essence of responsibility is autonomy exercised in the light of critical standards. This involves consciousness of self as an agent of choice and the acceptance of accountability for this." The report goes on to describe the central task of the teacher as helping the learner learn how to learn independently by presenting successively more difficult choices. The teacher's primary task in King's opinion is to help the student be independent of external authority and to provide guidance for independent choices and decisions.

In an actual use of the term Mentor in clinical literature, Burton (1977) conceptualizes a Mentor, not in a teaching, institutional setting, but as a special personal relationship which can provide complex, dynamic input for certain adults at a transitional point leading to adult fulfillment and individuation. He describes the Mentor as a peer between eight and fifteen years older than the mentee, who represents wisdom, authority and

paternal qualities but whose proximity in age and attitude resembles a peer or older brother rather than the image of a wise old man or distant father. He sees the absence of a Mentor at critical periods as associated with developmental impairments and the presence catalytic, contributing to a positive evolvement to mature adulthood. This notion of dynamic forces at work operating through peer and collegial relationships in adult learners and facilitating an almost alchemistic growth process has empathic overtones for our view of the Mentor's potential function. Our Mentor can offer peership and an opportunity for a joint creative performance on behalf of the student's learning goal, representing the usefulness of a continual learning process and the validity of study as an element of one's professional life work. These suggest additional components of the identification process with the Mentor referred to earlier.

The Students' Experience

The experience of finding one's self in the student role was extremely stressful and appeared to stir anxiety in all the students, even in those who were in transition from the identifications with the planning year, to a degree beyond what had been expected. The anxiety and discomfort seemed related to and derived

from many diverse issues including: (1) the new state of the self defined as learner; (2) the isolation of independent study, in which many students felt deprived although some smaller number enjoyed it; (3) the necessity for self-assessment, including the exposure of practice to one's peers, appeared in some to stir massive self-doubt and self-esteem issues, which were defended against in a variety of ways; (4) the specific curriculum expectations and necessity to prove competence, which again stirred self-doubt; (5) the formlessness of the innovative structure and its opportunity for independence, which appeared to create enormous conflict both for and against freedom with a pull to dependence consciously denied; and (6) the lack of clarity about the Mentor's function.

Students G and H have already been referred to as examples of those whose omnipotence was threatened and, consciously or unconsciously insecure about competence, tended to choose either extremely high or extremely low grid placements. The wish to be admired and mirrored was illustrated in Student B, who consciously needed nothing from faculty, and Student F, who became helpless and demanded not only external validation but more courses and more content. It was either the extreme of "I can do it myself," or "I can do nothing myself." The taking in of the reality of our structure as well as the meaning of

independent study and autonomy was frightening to some; others, in the full flowering of their omnipotence, resented any structural demands. The assignment to a Mentor, as a one-to-one relationship, reactivated for some elements of former supervisory relationships so that students tended either to cling dependently, to run or to fight. The threat of exposure was dealt with by avoidance or denigration because the Mentor was not a specialist/ expert and, therefore, nothing could be learned. Other symptomatic ways of dealing with the anxiety were blaming, projecting, turning the Mentor into a persecutor and splitting the Mentor and Animateur. It is useful to look at all these as crisis behaviors related to the experience of beginning a new enterprise with the stress creating psychological disequilibrium and confusion. We know that anxiety is a potent force in learning. Thus, rather than viewing these regressive behaviors as a flight to earlier patterns, they can be productively considered as adaptive in accordance with individual personality styles and structure as well as restorative in the service of future progress. Towle (1954) differentiates between two forms of regression in learning. Temporary regression serves to protect the learner against the unsettling effects of rapid internal change induced by learning, which will subside under the positive force of anticipatory gratification, optimism

regarding ultimate clinical ability and confidence derived from earlier mastery experiences. Regression used as defense and resistance against knowing will, if it persists unrelieved, become maladaptive and prognostically poor.

Of significant interest in the experience being reported is not that these manifestations of stress and adaptive mechanisms were demonstrated by our students but the unexpected degree and intensity of the regressions. Before assuming the role of Mentor I had expected that our students, as experienced and self-directed learners with a high degree of motivation, competence, self-awareness, openness to learning and capacity from experience for dealing with delay and frustration would be less vulnerable to these standardized, expectable reactions. I had also assumed that the identity of these students would not be as vulnerable as less experienced social workers because professional identity had been solidifed and integrated and they were well acculturated into the profession. In addition, they were a self-selected group who chose the Institute's structure because of the appeal of its freedom and opportunities for individuality and autonomy. What was revealed in this year's experience was that these seasoned learners were in some ways more vulnerable than beginners. Because of their high expectations of self, they appeared to be more vulnerable to exposure to peers

and, despite their familiarity with their own styles of growth and response, they were highly sensitive to the psychic costs of the learning situation and the pain generated in the process. Kolodziejski (1979) reports related findings in her study of social work students in which she comments on the special stress related to high motivation, expectations, demands on self to meet ideals and values as well as to develop skills of self-scrutiny. Her research is related to pre-master students, but the notions are relevant for our post-graduate population.

Surely it must be acknowledged that the fluid, unformed and evolving state of the Institute's structure itself, as well as the ambiguity about authority and the Mentor's lack of clarity and comfort with her own role, undoubtedly contributed to the stress experienced by these advanced students as demonstrated in their variety of adaptive responses.

The importance of the Mentor's capacity to use his clinical knowledge and teaching skills in both recognizing and appropriately dealing with a student's responses is critical. I know from experience that the state of crisis described does not necessarily impede growth but may enhance it if the teacher possesses the pedagogical skill to assist the student to strengthen his capacity to tolerate the ambivalence within himself and to make

conscious the nature of the struggle in which he is engaged. Since the advanced learner is surprised and often humiliated by the loss of professional detachment and by his excessive disturbing, often irrational responses, this is a particularly ticklish issue of technique. From this perspective a student comes with the desire for change and growth allied with progressive forces in his personality and shockingly experiences regressive, illogical and disquieting responses that reflect a threat to identity and the fear of change. Our structure with its stress on individual planning, encouragement for autonomy, independence and mastery should quickly facilitate the restorative level of adaptive response so that the crisis state is resolved and learning can proceed. The Mentor's observing teaching ego needs to operate at its fullest in order to deal appropriately with these various manifestations of expectable student anxiety.

The validity of looking at students' reactions to stress in this manner is reflected in the experience over time of the year. The very passage of time appeared to reduce the threat, and the experience of mastery, order and structure which slowly evolved also served to minimize the anxiety level. Certain structural requirements, forms and procedures by which work could be

demonstrated and shared, such as the log, self-assessment and the ongoing case, also served a helpful purpose in this regard. My capacity to individualize the students, their learning issues and needs also developed with time and made possible more appropriate responses.

Students developed their own educational designs and experienced the thrill of learning new concepts, which illuminated their understanding of clinical issues. They experimented with the application of these to their clinical practice. Integration and mastery of content enabled some students to begin to teach others, and particular knowledge, already held by some, was shared with colleagues. Thus, we can describe what we were offering as a maturational opportunity professionally; that is, a particular developmental phase in the professional life of our students which in the process evokes old struggles with authority, with teachers, with issues of dependency, independency, idealization and identification but provides an opportunity for achievement, mastery and autonomy on a new, higher professional level.

A self-screening process took place in that two students concluded that a learning situation in which they needed to assume such a degree of self-responsibility and independent study was not the most productive program for them and chose to leave. Another student whose personal

problems were of such a demanding nature that they interfered with his capacity to concentrate on learning at the same time as they reflected some lifelong struggles around competence and boundaries also withdrew from the program. These appear to reflect thoughtful and positive solutions which were in themselves adaptive rather than representing flight from a potentially positive learning situation.

Analysis of Organizational Phenomena and Its Impact on the Mentor's Task

Ideas put forward by authors on institutional and organizational processes from the theoretical base of psychoanalysis and developmental psychology provide a useful and different perspective from which to view my task as a faculty member in the Institute for Clinical Social Work. The natural anxiety stirred up by the new experience, both in the students and myself as participants, was compounded by the fluidity and looseness of the newly forming structure, which was proposed as an opportunity for an individual learning experience but also offered participation in culture and design building. The emotional forces which were unleashed in the participants and the dynamic play of both creative power and regressive conflict impacted powerfully on the performance of student and Mentor and on their relationship as it

developed. Riegel's (1976) dynamic view of individuals' growth in relation to the environment and the reciprocal play of interactive forces in a maturational process can be useful in understanding the experience. In his perspective the stress and disequilibrium, which occasionally appeared threatening to the program as well as to individual functioning, would be seen as positive and essential elements that allow for creativity and change. This is not significantly different from the concept described by clinical teachers regarding the internal adaptive responses to stress in the learning situation. Riegel and other writers have commented on the predilection for homeostasis and tranquility as a somewhat noncreative, regressive dynamic in mental health professionals. As reported, I was confronted with the contradiction between my intellectual conviction, regarding the dialectical process of growth and change, and my pleasure in participating in a creative process versus the regressive tendency in myself to long for balance and relinquish the excitement of innovation for the sake of a soothing equilibrium. Menzies (1975) graphically describes her theory that the conscious and unconscious needs of personnel in an organization tend to influence and determine its culture and structure. She also affirms that anxieties released by an innovative process need to be tolerated

while structure is being built. The building task cannot wait while attempts are made to facilitate anxiety resolution and mastery. On the contrary, the mastery will develop from the structure-building if the anxiety can be tolerated by the participants.

Newton and Levinson (1973) describe how a social system reflects and promotes the values of the participants. In a developing culture such as the ICSW, the structure starts by being congruent with the values of the organization. The task appears to be to develop a culture that maintains the fit between the consciously held ideals and values and the internal and unconscious needs and objectives of the participants which come together in a mutually influencing process.

These notions propose that one should be cautious in negatively evaluating the stress behaviors experienced and described. They can instead be considered as constructive confrontations which lead to new and creative developments. For the individual student, confrontations leading to growth should be seen as meaningful phases in one's life. The positive conclusion of the year's process for many students suggests that the system provided sufficient flexibility so that individual needs were not submerged or subordinated but that constructive, progressive learning occurred despite the many stresses and

ambiguities. My own commitment to the necessity for a continual process of change soothes many earlier doubts. The difficulty of attempting an objective analysis is hampered by the fact that a dialectical process is never frozen in time and that even as one tries to retrospectively examine it, attention must be given to both the balance and imbalance simultaneously.

In Riegel's (1976) notion of the four dimensions along which developmental progressions simultaneously take place, discussed in the literature review (p. 49), one might analyze the stress on the student and the student/Mentor relationship during the period described in the study as occurring along the second dimension--the individual-psychological, simultaneously with the third dimension--the cultural-sociological. In Riegel's formulation a crisis takes place when sequences are out of step and this was very much the sense of the experience.

Reiss, Costell and Almond's (1976) ideas regarding the impact of personnel's personal needs and value system on a work situation and staff preference for designing therapeutic techniques that will match and satisfy those personal needs and values are intriguing, relevant concepts for consideration in this study. If we attempt to relate these concepts, which were described in relation to a psychiatric hospital setting, to our institution we

need to observe how we continue to develop and modify our structure and design. To what extent are our procedures and patterns related to realistic organizational tasks and to what extent are they influenced by subjective concerns? The link between needs and technical preferences may be appropriate and desirable for the organization. If it provides for fulfillment of the personal needs of participants, it serves as a bond and produces a high level of participation. My intent, however, is not to try to correlate the organizational objectives of the Institute with externalization of the specific individual needs and values of its creators. We can accept the potential influence of personal objectives as they may help shape the character of the institution. In the same way, the appeal of the program to certain students and not to others may well relate to the fit of values and technical preferences. However, it seems important to consider this aspect as purely one element in organizational design and development rather than the total picture. Although the psychological perspectives enrich our understanding, they should not be taken as diminishing the importance of the initial purpose and challenge of the school: to create an innovative learning opportunity outside of academia for advanced clinicians capable of independent study and ready for an individually

designed learning program. This goal relates to the historical cultural needs of our profession as it attempts to adapt to needs of adult learners in a changing world. The experiments proposed by the radical theorists of education quoted in the literature review provide sound substantiation for this perspective for viewing this multifaceted experience. In my view, as we rotate the kaleidoscope, professional, sociological, cultural, organizational and psychological patterns fall into view.

Gardner (1964) describes the process of growth, decay and renewal in human institutions and sees the most desirable combination as the interweaving of continuity and change. He states that in stable, mature societies, which are stubbornly defended against change, a crisis or catastrophe is required to produce regeneration; to make for receptivity to innovation. In his words, "civilizations become prisoners of their own great achievements and artists prisoners of their style." The Institute for Clinical Social Work originated in the coming together of a group of pioneering clinicians with common professional concerns, educational goals, and a vested interest in changing outmoded learning structures on behalf of healing the split between education and clinical practice. In the planning stages, these innovators could be seen as providing the seedbed of change. The challenge, as the

school became operational, would be in discovering how to maintain the creative momentum in a dialectic flow rather than to drift to institutionalizing newly created structures. The dialectic struggle as it developed appeared to be between climate, culture and goals, which we were attempting to institutionalize, and issues of structure, authority, efficiency and economy. Additionally, the crises which were inevitable in the first operating year of the Institute made their own periodic contribution both to the necessity for and the receptivity to innovative designs and procedures.

I believe it is possible to comment about a parallel process organizationally in terms similar to Ekstein and Wallerstein's (1958) notion of the parallel process related to learning and supervision. Ekstein and Wallerstein point to the temptation to inappropriately view a student's difficulty in learning or problem with a patient in terms of his internal psychodynamics and countertransference rather than as a problem in learning. Similarly, it can be simplistic and inappropriate to view organizational problems such as resistance, complaints about authority and staff disagreements as problems which are purely the product of intrapsychic dynamics of the participants, rather than including the organizational problem dimension related to issues of structure,

authority and the overt and covert manifestations of power issues.

It is useful to look at the experience of the year from these perspectives. As we proceeded structure and forms were created both to fill the chaos, or the experienced chaos, of a formless vacuum and to provide for reality needs of students and faculty. Anxiety derived from ambiguity produced not only regressive flight from freedom but creative changes. Many questions can be posed for examination and possibly future study. Were the changes useful and in support of institutional aims and philosophy? Were deviations a betrayal of ideals or a reflection of flexibility? How much fluidity and autonomy can be nourished and supported, and how can the emerging value system be a unifying versus a polarizing force? Were the organizational structures that developed formed in response to realistic objective needs and goals? Can the other dimension be traced; that reflecting the externalization of the needs and values of the individuals participating?

For example, in preliminary response to these questions we have illustrated that a number of specific procedures were developed both to meet organizational objectives and to deal with needs of students for some boundaries for their anxiety and some order for their

work. The requirement that periodic logs, self-assessment, reading lists, logs of educational activity and case material would be submitted provided for an organized, consistent and continuous method for displaying learning progress and mastery of material, as well as reflecting the amount of time invested in independent study. This served the purpose of demonstrating a student's work through a summary of his own achievements; this was then submitted to the faculty to validate progress in candidacy.

The collaborative process between Mentor and Animateur was established as a means of reducing regressive splitting on the part of anxious students, who were feeling exposed, as well as to develop some faculty consistency of standards regarding assessment of student work.

The move to shift the weight of the evaluation process from the colloquium to the Mentor was not as clearly a positive move. It appears in retrospect to reflect the colloquium's inability to cope with the massive anxiety stirred up by self exposure and assessment by colleagues. Although this task remained within the colloquium to some degree, the placement of its major focus within the Mentor/student relationship seems to me

to reflect an inability to deal with the anxiety reflecting learning stresses.

The confusion and concern over criteria and standards, evaluation and authority represent a major problem which was pervasive and emerged around differences between Trustees, Dean and faculty as well as between individual faculty members and students. Students' concerns and complaints about assessment, shared with faculty and with other staff members, have continued to keep this issue in the forefront as an unresolved major task. The failure thus far to address it objectively on an administrative, conceptual level has left room for much distortion, projection and scapegoating, and an attempt to objectify and validate these significant concerns has not yet been confronted. These comments are not in the nature of criticism--there were many priorities in the early life of the institution, and clearly, an accumulation of experience was required before this issue could be addressed in any but the most preliminary fashion. It is discussed, however, to highlight not only how tensions and distortions are perpetuated in the absence of some agreed upon system of rules, but how the intricate power of this issue can affect structure, functioning and relationships between student and faculty as well as between faculty and administration. Undoubtedly, this dynamic struggle will continue

until there is sufficient discomfort so that the task is addressed and a preliminary process of exploration and resolution can begin. This is a particularly crucial issue in a system which stresses independent learning and individual goals, where there remains much ambivalence and ambiguity about power resident in faculty and authority roles have not been defined.

Further, how can we be sure that standards to be developed will continue to be in support of institutional aims? As the school becomes more and more operative, does disparity develop between institutional aims of the Trustees, faculty and students and what form does it take? If we develop a new procedure that seems to work, does it become cast in concrete? If it is subsequently resisted, is this because of the dynamic, healthy process of evolution and change or because some unhealthy, regressive process is being acted out? How do we utilize our appreciation of the dialectic evolutionary ebb and flow of forces in the further building of the Institute? Moreover, how do we apply our knowledge of factors making for growth in our students in this setting? We know that not only does the student's learning process and style relate to his own internal personality structure and dynamics, but additionally, we are inviting both students and faculty to contribute to forming the system. At the

same time, we are aware that there will be continuing unconscious pressure in an attempt to satisfy personal needs and values by way of contributing to and influencing the organizational design. What seems very clear is that as the organization grows and as rules evolve from working devices into structures, they must be made manifest for the clarity and assurance of everyone concerned.

In November 1976, as part of my work in the administrative colloquium developing a preliminary design for the Institute, I prepared a workpaper in which I attempted to define the complexity of our administrative task and challenge. Many of the issues appear relevant today, almost three years later. The memorandum in its entirety reads as follows:

COLLOQUIUM I

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN FOR A
UNIVERSITY WITHOUT WALLS

A Contradiction in Terms or A Functional Possibility

Following are some thoughts related to the task at hand; that is, the designing of an organizational pattern in which our particular goals and methods for learning-teaching can be actualized. Our ideals and purposes are, I believe, clear and shared. We are committed to provide for our student candidates a learning experience which is highly individualized, providing infinite opportunities for growth, exploration and freedom of choice. Our professional ideals are of excellence in professional identity, competence and skill.

When we begin to address ourselves to designing a concrete instrument which will achieve this purpose, tension inevitably develops. We are faced

> with the reality of humanity and human performance. We set up a conflict situation for ourselves in which we provide freedom for the student to move through a learning process of his own design rather than to fit into a predetermined mold of our design. We are saying we will not decide what form the product will take, nor will we decide what will be the results of this educational process. How then do we reconcile this flexible stance, this freedom, with our yet undefined ideals of excellence? Our realistic defensiveness about how the community will judge us and the awareness that fellow professionals will be looking at the caliber of our graduates adds further to our tension. At the same time, we resist moving to conformity with the past, familiar, easy and controlled structures. Is it possible to design a blueprint in consonance with our values, safeguarding ourselves to the human limits possible from personal passions, subjective prejudices and the intrusion of expediency as a value base?
>
> It occurred to me that Hartman's concept of the "normal expectable environment" needed for the healthy growth of the normal child versus the overidealized fantasy of the perfect environment symbolizes the struggle for us. Can we provide a growth enhancing structure, a learning environment for our candidates which will reflect, at least, "good enough mothering," to quote Winnicott, rather than the wished-for and fantasied but unrealizable and not genuinely growth promoting fantasy of the supermother.
>
> It appears to me that the support system we need to build must reflect a well nigh invisible yet firm network of structures and processes which will enable us to actualize our goals for facilitating learning of practitioners, responsibly protecting our patients and elevating the status of the Clinical Social Worker in the community at large. Even Gareth's beautiful chambered nautilus is encased in a shell for protection.

Perrow (1972) has written a brutally realistic as well as sophisticated review of the perquisites and use of power in bureaucratic structures. He considers a

bureaucracy as a superior form of organization capable of mobilizing social forces for desirable ends. If power is concentrated in the hands of a few who use power for their own purposes, the results may be unproductive, destructive or even politically dangerous, as we know. Perrow has doubts about the value of applying social and psychological principles to organizational life since, in his opinion, their impact on organizational goals is not clear and has not been proven. He considers that the human relations model has been used to hide authoritarian systems in institutions. His comments on the place of rules in an organization and the fundamental nature of hierarchical structures seem relevant for our Institute building process and can shed light on the stress experienced by the Mentor in relation to students, colleagues and Trustees. In designing our organization, we concentrated on the individual goals of autonomy and self-actualization. These values were the common purpose of all participants who had banded together in a structure in which little attention was paid to bureaucratic hierarchical issues. Rather we conceived ourselves as collegial and professional, giving the impression to ourselves as well as to others that we operated without rules and without a hierarchical structure. As the situation has progressed and as our structure has become more complex,

we have found ourselves in conflict between our professional and bureaucratic selves. Are we hierarchical or a collegial body? Perrow calls rules or regulations the tough, invisible skeins and threads which band together the technical and social aspects of an organization. Even a radical educator such as Illich (1970), who wants to eliminate educational structures because institutionalized forms tend to confuse instruction, learning and competence, talks of a "learning web," a network of educational resources.

In the Institute the stated goals of autonomy and self-actualization for the learners were agreed upon and supported by both the students and the Mentor. Thus, the stress for both could be related to a point in reality where authority within the institutional structure was not clear as well as to other individual and psychological aspects already discussed. We presented ourselves as a school that operated with few rules. The push for structure and rules and the subsequent conflict over the forms and rituals that were adopted could also be seen as related to the authority issues which had not been overtly acknowledged.

The power issues involved in assessment and accreditation inevitably must be addressed. The basic and unacknowledged contradiction between the Institute's

wish to demonstrate eligibility for accreditation, which involves complex criteria and standards, conflicts with the idealized goal of freedom, autonomy and self-evaluation. The students' stress, as it materialized in the student/Mentor relationship, can be seen as a response to these as yet undefined structural issues as well as to their efforts, as described by Menzies, to influence the organization in the direction of their own ideals and values. There are contradictory elements in the fact that the Mentor is both an agent for learning for the student and an agent for the school in setting and reaching standards for accreditation. The school's goals of establishing credibility confronts the students' self-concept as a dispassionate learner with the additional, often unacknowledged goal, of obtaining a degree. These external goals and the conflict around them reverberate with the internal conflict inherent in the learning process with the resulting stress on all participants which we have been analyzing at length. My own question is whether or not the goals we set forth in organizing and developing the Institute can be institutionalized without compromising them beyond recognition in the process. How do we allow for responsibility and power to be used in the service of those goals and make this sufficiently manifest so that clarity will foster trust in our student

body? What institutional support does the Mentor need to carry the varied overt and covert responsibilities assigned, participating in the ebb and flow of forces while maintaining the power and strength of convictions about the value of this educational function.

An example of this evolutionary dialectical process at work in the area of faculty roles and faculty functioning is reflected in my own shifts in identification during my first year. My earlier identification was with the school as a whole and that whole was, as we know, an ideal without formal structure. There were, therefore, no boundaries between myself and the system; it was as if I were, in Riegel's (1976) model, part of merged infant-mother dyad. As events flowed in the functioning of the school, with continuous contradictions, changes, pressures and pulls, I became first confused and later clearer about my questions, purposes and the parameters of my function. I moved through a process of ambiguity and non-definition through a feeling of isolation with no attachments and supports to a state of separate identity as a faculty member within the institution. The very process of this study has strengthened my objective capacity to examine and raise questions on behalf of my observing ego. Thus I end up not only with identification with the institutional aims but optimism engendered by experience and

hopefulness, reflecting my expectations of satisfaction and the contribution I may continue to make.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this study was to examine the role of Mentor, a newly designed clinical teaching function in an innovative educational setting, the Institute for Clinical Social Work. The Institute offers an individually tailored study program for advanced clinicians, providing an opportunity for demonstration of skill and competency in clinical practice as well as a broad ranging curriculum, ultimately leading to a Ph.D. in Clinical Social Work. When the school opened officially in September 1977, the Mentor was the only untested faculty function and represented the only one-to-one faculty/student relationship. Although the task designated for for the Mentor was to facilitate the learning process of the student, the parameters of the role had not been defined. Ideals and goals rather than specific components had been described. One might say that the image was on the film but had not yet been developed nor had the language defining an educational ideal been translated into a clinical teaching reality.

The specific objective of this research was to produce clarification regarding the components and dimensions of the role, the usefulness of a relationship with the Mentor for advanced clinical students and the degree to which this particular faculty function serves to support and enhance the educational goals of the Institute. It was further hoped it would be possible to draw some conclusions from this study regarding the usefulness of such a clinical teaching model for advanced clinicians outside the Institute for Clinical Social Work. Finally, in the process of assessing my functioning as Mentor, I hoped to illuminate order for myself and to integrate the experience.

To address the intent of the study, a literature review was undertaken which included the following areas: (1) psychodynamic concepts of clinical learning and teaching, including the concept of the learning alliance between student and supervisor; (2) organizational dynamics and the dilemma faced by emerging experimental structures, such as the Institute for Clinical Social Work, in attempting to deal with the innate contradiction between the idealism of their experimental goals and the realities of institutional life; and (3) contemporary issues in adult education and lifelong learning.

The method utilized in this study was the review and analysis of my actual experience as Mentor, recorded in a log and diary, in the first operational year of the institution. Since examination and evaluation of self is a core dimension of the philosophy of learning of the ICSW, it seemed appropriate that this should be the nature of my method as I attempted to tease out data from the wealth of subjective experience that might have relevance for my particular faculty position as well as for the continuing organic growth of the institution. Thus, examining the performance of my task from a myriad of perspectives, I have made myself the object of my own inquiry. My sources of data include retrospective reflections of my own experience both in relation to the students with whom I worked and to myself as a learner and creator of my own function. In that the role and experience of Mentor could not be appreciated in isolation from impacting processes and stresses, the interacting and conflicting forces which molded the role were also examined.

A study of even a static system presents limitations and difficulties because interpretation of facts is subjective, perceptions are fluid, and it is hard to come by unequivocal data regarding a continuing reality. The attempt to study an evolving innovative organizational

system is infinitely more complicated. Rules, boundaries, parameters and role definitions are in a process of flux. How does one fix a point in time in order to tease apart the elements for the purpose of understanding? The innovative procedures create mechanisms which change even as we try to identify them. Wallerstein (1978), in his description of the development of a new mental health profession, refers to "evolving conceptualizations and reconceptualizations over time," and this is the climate and atmosphere in which this study has proceeded. The effort has been to understand the Mentor's contribution to the learning process for seasoned students engaging in this particular experimental environment while concurrently developing the function.

The presentation and analysis of findings delineated in Chapters 4 and 5 affirm the crucial importance of the function of Mentor in facilitating students' achievement of their learning goals. A reminder of the nature of the Institute and the student body provides a basis for further elaboration of this statement. The Institute, a school without walls for experienced social work practitioners, serves highly individualized needs and interests, emphasizing self-directed study within a broadly conceived curriculum. Responsibility is vested in the student to maintain an active learning stance, to define

learning needs and goals and to monitor and evaluate progress. Faculty primarily serve as facilitators and evaluators of the learning process. Originally four faculty members were assigned as Mentors, and it is certain that each experienced the role differently, responding to the opportunity and expectation in relation to their own individual styles, personalities and experiences.

Students accepted for admission are clinical social workers whose experience and demonstrated capability qualifies them for autonomous and self-directed study. In the admissions process they have demonstrated their capacity for self-evaluation. They are, hopefully, sufficiently skilled observers of their own clinical practice so that they come with awareness of gaps in knowledge to be filled and blind spots to be contended with as well as some capacity for objective reflection on their own learning styles. As seasoned clinicians they have achieved a professional identity and a sense of their professional self. The goal of further self-development is well-integrated and secure. They have accepted the imperative demand of our profession to engage in lifelong self-scrutiny. As learners they have progressed from the state of "learning for love to that of learning for love of learning" (Ekstein and Motto, 1969). They come for a

creative reappraisal which may confirm, expand or change the quality of their practice.

Given the nature of the student body, a surprising finding in this study was the degree of anxiety evidenced even by learners of such accomplishment upon discovering themselves, once again, among a group of students. The extent of the distress had not been anticipated in that our educational design emphasized autonomy, the peer process of teaching as well as learning in reciprocal relation to each other and the minimization of competition with an abstract standard. Nevertheless, we found the very nature of the experience set regressive forces and anxieties into motion for many students. With variations related to individual personalities, levels of experience and life situations, we saw manifestations of dependency, helplessness, search for and struggle against controls, need for structure as well as anxiety about performance emerge as the students began their work. In most cases these initial indications of anxiety subsided; and the process of participation in convocations, colloquia, discussions and self-assessment restored self-confidence. Reality testing took hold, fueling the motivation and capacity for learning and exploring. Thus, this study revealed that even professionally seasoned students manifested intense regressive responses initially which,

while ubiquitous, were temporary and in the service of adaptation. More persistent maladaptive responses emerged in a few instances.

Because of this demonstrated impact of the learning situation on even the most sophisticated and advanced learners, the notion of the Mentor as the faculty member with the primary task of attending to the students' individual needs, learning style and process appears to be a significantly important component of our educational structure with marked benefits to our candidates.

The analysis of the data further suggested the Mentor served the purpose of protecting the individual learning styles and value systems of the student. This enhanced the potentiality of each student's adhering to unique individual goals and learning needs in the face of power, influence from colleagues and peers and stress from internal learning struggles. Through the learning alliance with the student, the Mentor was able to carry on a dialogue regarding the students' needs, goals and progress toward those goals with due respect for individual value systems and theoretical differences. Thus, the Mentor could be seen as one who assisted the student to locate and define learning needs, to recognize parts in relation to the whole during the process of making those parts become whole while simultaneously protecting

the student's autonomy and freedom to pursue his educational agenda. One might say the Mentor stood for the students' individuality and autonomy in a stance which symbolizes the essence of good clinical practice, which is neither to control nor direct but to permit and support evolving insight, awareness and self-knowledge. This suggested that if the Mentor adopted this posture in relation to the student, the Mentor could contribute to the student's self-evaluation in the face of the tension created both by the formlessness and the form of the structure as well as the freedom and control experienced by the candidate.

Further, it seemed that the Mentor provided the essential element of continuity in the learning process. Despite the importance of the products that the student produced in order to certify himself, it was imperative that the process of growth and learning remain in center stage. Only a faculty person with continuity in time and attention could provide this perspective for both student and institution. The fact that learning plans were tailored to individual needs and goals as well as to capacities and interests made it possible for the Mentor to protect the individual experience from the constraints of group process and variations in level of starting or pace of growth evidenced between student and student.

In summary, we see then that this faculty role can contribute to an individually expressive learning process by providing space, time, protection and help with integration of learning. The experience described in the diary confirms what we know of the stresses in a learning situation and the progress and flow of the learning process. It confirms the need for an experienced teacher to facilitate the process of self-awareness, not to limit spontaneity but to support the forward creative, self-reliant drive. We know from clinical teaching experience that what goes into affective learning involves an individual's unique integration of affective and cognitive components. Thus, the Mentor needs to call on substantial pedagogic and clinical knowledge to provide support in this particular learning endeavor.

To recapitulate, this study has contributed to the understanding of the significance of the Mentor's function with respect to advanced learners by identifying the following relevant dimensions of the role: (1) protecting the individual learning needs and goals of the student; (2) facilitating growth of self-awareness and evaluation of self; (3) assisting with learning how to learn; that is, to develop in the learner the flexible adaptability to examine and assess new ideas and adopt those which fit his value system; (4) applying the

principles of clinical teaching and learning on behalf of the learning alliance with the student; and (5) anticipating the universality of stress reactions and learning problems found even among experienced people and responding appropriately on behalf of the individual learning process.

In these respects the Mentor's functions demonstrably meshed with the goals and values of the institution. Clearly, the task was to keep the educational ideal in the foreground and to be aware of the gaps between ideal and practical. Tension developed in the seemingly inherent contradictions in the Mentor's role which appeared both to support a liberating educational process and to nurture autonomy within an evolving cultural pattern which also valued assessment of progress and held to the goal of accreditation. The dialectic struggle as it developed appeared to be between climate, culture and goals, which we were attempting to institutionalize; and issues of structure, authority and efficiency.

The data presented highlights some of the organizational dilemmas posed by the looseness of our evolving structure and the many unresolved structural ambiguities. These aspects, among others, not only proved to be sources of stress for both student and Mentor but also suggested

areas for further development and research within the Institute for Clinical Social Work.

Among the areas producing stress and warranting future consideration are the unacknowledged institutional hierarchy, which has not yet been manifestly addressed, and the authority increasingly vested in the Mentor role as the assessment function was assigned. Because of this Mentor's conscious identification with educational goals of autonomy and individuality combined with participation in the institutional avoidance of authority issues, a role conflict emerged with the evaluative self as an agent of the system. The institution's lack of clarity regarding guidelines and standards for evaluation produced additional discomfort for the Mentor as well as for the students who faced such ambiguity.

The inherent contradiction between supporting the students' autonomy and the Institute's responsibility for quality control requires further examination and understanding. The ideal of the learning situation as originally stated was to focus primarily on the process and not the product. Yet if we are a degree-granting institution, accreditation considerations must affect our criteria; we must attend to the student's product, work in progress and completed work, and by granting a degree we are providing the product. It is not surprising that

the task of designing criteria for acceptability of performance and assessment of competence has only slowly begun to be addressed. In a profession where performance is an art, competence is hard to judge; and it is easier to rely on familiarity, commonality and club membership.

Similarly, the Institute's slowness in the first year in making clear and manifest the dimensions of the hierarchical structure was in large part related to the newness of the undertaking and daily urgent priorities. The very looseness of the structure meant many vital issues were addressed only as they emerged. Issues of organizational form and their impact on faculty roles were too complex to attend to with any perspective or depth in this study. They may well provide interesting questions for further research. It is clearly time, however, for a more direct and open acknowledgment of institutional structural issues by the Institute and the implications of these somewhat contradictory elements.

In the next phase of development of the Institute for Clinical Social Work issues of ambiguity, the relevance of forms to goals and the power expressed in our institutional design, which inevitably influences the way our students learn and the way faculty perform their tasks, need to be addressed for consistency and effectiveness. This will be one of the many challenges in the next phase

of development of the institution and the urgent need for this has, it seems to me, been clearly demonstrated by the experience of this research.

Within the context of the social revolution in adult education, it is valid to suggest the applicability of this teaching/learning model for advanced students in any professional setting. Further, clinicians who are reading and studying independently, either because they are in private practice or work in settings which do not provide for adequate staff development, could find their learning process enhanced by collaboration with someone who functions as a Mentor. This would support the shift from passive to active learning, moving the burden of responsibility for pursuit of knowledge from the system to the individual. An advisory-collaborative process shared by the Mentor and learner would also minimize the polarization between teacher and student, affording an opportunity for an educational partnership. In such a mutual endeavor both Mentor and student would learn from each other as co-investigators in a dialogue; both would inevitably be changed.

Seeley (1967) calls education a search for self-discovery. Extrapolating from his concepts, the goal of mentoring would not be to guide, lead the way or to direct the student but to form a learning partnership

with students to engage in joint exploration. Thus, the Mentor would facilitate the student's capacity to experience the self, encouraging attitudes of self-inquiry. This ideal depicts the Mentor as a catalyst or facilitator of observation, an enzyme contributing to integration, in a relationship which is mutual rather than characterized by a pattern of master and apprentice. It is also this ideal which is complicated by the realistic tension produced by ideals and realities, autonomy and authority, advocacy and power and the relativity of knowledge and truth.

In such an educational relationship the Mentor could be seen by the learner as a resource with experience and knowledge to share; one whose understanding and sensitivity of the complexities of the clinical learning situation would facilitate mastery of stumbling blocks and blind spots. In a professional student in either a structured or unstructured setting, the Mentor, as delineated in this study both with respect to role and function, may well represent acknowledgment of the pleasure and satisfaction to be derived initially from developing the initiative and expanding the ability to shape one's needs and later from achieving learning goals as well as increasing self-reliance and competence. To get to know one's self in the process of disclosure to another takes

courage for the pursuer of knowledge and therefore must take place in an environment of dignity and respect as can be provided by a Mentor.

These concepts are discussed in broader social and cultural terms by Lasch (1978) in his examination of contemporary societal trends, which in his view tend to reinforce narcissistic impulses and traits. Whereas Lasch considers the capacity for critical thought to be an indispensable precondition to social and political progress, he sees our contemporary paternalistic culture preaching self-indulgence as well as encouraging grandiose omnipotent dreams and dependencies which can never be satisfied. This environment limits the satisfaction to be derived from the development of initiative and competence and denies the individual the pleasures of self-reliance and modest achievement afforded by the educational model which has been presented. Lasch's discussion further supports the desirability of adult learning and professional education propounded in this study which underscores the importance for the student of defining and locating his individual learning needs that set the stage for progress toward mastery and the satisfaction of achievement related to individual capability and goal.

In our delight in the creative experience and the occasional reinventing of the wheel, there is danger that

we may think that issues of lifelong adult learning are a discovery of our time. Descartes (1637), in his Discourse on Method, wrote as follows:

> From my childhood I have been familiar with letters; and as I was given to believe that by their help a clear and certain knowledge of all that is useful in life might be acquired, I was ardently desirous of instruction. But as soon as I had finished the entire course of study, at the close of which it is customary to be admitted into the order of the learned, I completely changed my opinion. For I found myself involved in so many doubts and errors, that I was convinced I had advanced no farther in all my attempts at learning than the discovery at every turn of my own ignorance. And yet I was studying in one of the most celebrated schools in Europe . . . .

Similarly, the notion in contemporary thought that education can no longer be restricted to a fixed content to be assimilated but must be conceived of as a process in which the human being learns in interaction with his environment was well expressed by Coleridge (1853), over one hundred years ago:

> . . . education of the intellect is achieved by awakening the method of self-development. This method does not reach after specific information that can be conveyed into it from without. The aim is not storing the passive Mind with various sorts of knowledge most in request, as if the Human Soul was a mere repository or banqueting room, but to place it in such relations of circumstances as should gradually excite its vegetating and germinating powers to produce new fruits of Thought, new Conceptions, Imaginations and Ideas.

Although philosophers and students of earlier times clearly struggled to address the nature of education, there is an urgency for the present world to continue to do so in view of technological developments, the vicissitudes of life in our time and the implications for professional tasks. An ongoing assessment of conventional methods of teaching as well as modification and experimentation with untraditional systems can broaden the scope of self-learning activities and enhance the value of active and conscious attitudes in the acquisition of knowledge. The achievements of science in outer space must be matched by an educational revolution affecting inner space. Education which can no longer only be defined in relation to a fixed content to be assimilated can instead be conceived of as a process in which human beings thereby learn to express themselves, to question and to communicate with the world through various experiences and thus to fulfill themselves.

In this pioneering experiment with new forms of clinical education, the Institute for Social Work has undertaken a fruitful and complex task of cultivating creativity and ingenuity while respecting the uniqueness and originality of each student. We are building and transmitting culture; letting go of ready-made models; attempting to use gifts, aptitudes and personal forms of

expression; and paying keen attention to each student's specific traits at the same time that we are holding to the collective activity involved in the creation of an educational institution.

I believe that in the context of contemporary values promoting lifelong learning and new conceptualizations of the pedagogic task in professional education, the Mentor can make a significant contribution to the scholar-practitioner who undertakes the risk and pleasure of testing perspectives and stretching boundaries in the quest for professional self-realization and fulfillment.

I should like to close with Gibran's (1926) definition of a teacher, which not only embodies the stance and perspective of the Mentor but also suggests the potential contribution of a Mentor to the professional journey of the student. Gibran describes a teacher and teaching as follows:

> Then said a teacher, Speak to us of Teaching.
> And he said:
> No man can reveal to you aught but that which already lies half asleep in the dawning of your knowledge.
> The teacher who walks in the shadow of the temple, among his followers, gives not of his wisdom but rather of his faith and his lovingness.
> If he is indeed wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind.
> The astronomer may speak to you of his understanding of space, but he cannot give you his understanding.

The musician may sing to you of the rhythm which is in all space, but he cannot give you the ear which arrests the rhythm nor the voice that echoes it.

And he who is versed in the science of numbers can tell of the regions of weight and measure, but he cannot conduct you thither.

For the vision of one man lends not its wings to another man.

And even as each one of you stands alone in God's knowledge, so must each one of you be alone in his knowledge of God and in his understanding of the earth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abroms, Gene. "Supervision as Metatherapy." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions. Edited by F. W. Kaslow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Adsett, C. A. "Undergraduate Programs: The McMaster Experience." In Mental Health Education in New Medical Schools. Edited by Langsley, McDermott, and Enelow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Allan, Eunice, and Clemence, Esther. "Toward a Philosophy of Teaching Casework." Smith College Studies in Social Work, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Northampton, Mass., February 1960).

Amacher, Kloh-Ann. "Exploration into the Dynamics of Learning in Field Work." Smith College Studies in Social Work, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Northampton, Mass., June 1976).

Bandler, Bernard. "Ego-Centered Teaching." In Ego-Centered Casework, Problems and Perspectives. Edited by H. Parad and R. Miller. New York: FSAA, 1963.

Bion, W. R. Experiences in Groups. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Breger, George, and Specht, Harry. Community Organization. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Bruch, Hilda. Learning Psychotherapy; Rationale and Ground Rules. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Bruner, Jerome S. Beyond the Information Given. New York: W. W. Norton, 1973.

_____. "Learning and Thinking." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Cambridge, Summer 1959).

_____. Report on Woods Hole Conference on Education in Science. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

_____. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Burton, Arthur. "The Mentoring Dynamic." American Journal of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 37, No. 1 (1977).

Caro, Francis G., ed. Readings in Evaluation Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.

Coleridge, Henry Nelson. Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit. 1853; reprint ed., London: Adam and Charles Black, 1956.

Descartes, Rene. A Discourse on Method. 1637; translated by J. Veitch, LLD, London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951; reprint ed., Great Britain: Penguin, 1968.

Doehrman, Margery J. G. "Parallel Processes in Supervision and Psychotherapy." Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Topeka, 1976).

Ekstein, R., and Motto, R. L., eds. From Learning for Love-to Love of Learning; Essays on Psychoanalysis and Education. New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1969.

Erikson, Erik H. Insight and Responsibility. New York: W. W. Norton, 1964.

Etzioni, Amitai, ed. A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Faure, Edgar et al. Learning to Be; the World of Education Today and Tomorrow. Report of the International Commission on the Development of Education. Paris: UNESCO, 1972.

Fleming, Joan, and Benedek, Therese. Psychoanalytic Supervision; A Method of Clinical Teaching. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966.

Fliess, Robert. "The Metapsychology of the Analyst." Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Vol. 11, No. 2 (1942).

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. London: Sheed and Ward, 1972.

Gagne, Robert M. "Some New Views of Learning and Instruction." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 51, No. 9 (May 1970).

_____. The Conditions of Learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Galbraith, Jay. Designing Complex Organizations. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Gardner, John W. Self Renewal--The Individual and The Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Garrett, Annette. "Learning Through Supervision." Smith College Studies in Social Work (Northampton, Mass., February 1954).

Gibran, Kahlil. The Prophet. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926.

Goldberg, J.; Roland, A.; and Spotnitz, H. "Exploring the Parameters of Psychoanalytic Training." Modern Psychoanalysis, Vol. 3, No. 1 (1978).

Greenson, Ralph. "The Struggle Against Identification." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Vol. 2, No. 2 (April 1954).

Hamachek, Don E., ed. Human Dynamics in Psychology and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Hamilton, John D. "The McMasters Curriculum; A Critique." British Medical Journal, Vol. 1 (1976).

Harris, A. J. "Contemporary Concepts of Learning." In 1954 Round Table, American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 24, No. 4 (October 1954).

Hartman, Heinz; Kris, Ernst; and Lowenstein, Rudolph. "Comments on the Formation of Psychic Strcuture." Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, Vol. 2. New York: International University Press, 1946.

_____. Ego Psychology and the Problem of Adaptation. New York: International University Press, 1958.

Hearn, Gordon. Theory Building in Social Work. Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Hilgard, Ernest, and Bower, Gordon H. Theories of Learning. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1966.

Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Kadushin, Alfred. Supervision in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Kaslow, F. W., and Associates. Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Kernberg, Otto. "Leadership and Organizational Functioning: Organizational Regression." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Vol. 28, No. 1 (January, 1978).

King, Edmund J., ed. The Teacher and The Needs of Society in Evolution. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press, 1970.

Klein, Henriette R. Psychoanalysts in Training; Selection and Evaluation. Report of the Psychoanalytic Clinic for Training and Research, Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University, New York (1965).

Knowles, Malcolm E. Self Directed Learning; A Guide for Learners and Teachers. New York: Association Press, 1975.

Kolodziejski, Katherine. "Stress and Social Work Education; An Exploration of One Component-Paranoid Like Thinking." DCSW Dissertation, Institute for Clinical Social Work, 1979.

Kubie, Lawrence S. "How Can the Educational Process Become A Behavioral Science?" From Learning for Love to Love of Learning. Edited by R. Ekstein and R. M. Motto. New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1969.

Kutzik, Alfred J. "The Social Work Field: History and Philosophy of Supervision and Consultation." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training. Edited by F. W. Kaslow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Langs, Robert. The Supervisory Experience. New York: Jason Aronson, 1979.

Lasch, Christopher. The Culture of Narcissism. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978.

Lazerson, Alan M. "The Learning Alliance and Its Relation to Psychiatric Teaching." Psychiatry in Medicine, Vol. 3 (1972).

Liss, Edward. "Contemporary Concepts of Learning." In 1954 Round Table. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 24, No. 4 (October 1954).

Menzies, Isabel. "A Case Study in the Functioning of a Social System as a Defense Against Anxiety." In Group Relations Reader. Edited by A. D. Coleman and W. H. Bexton. Sausalito, California: GREX, 1975.

Miller, E. J., and Rice, A. K. Systems of Organization. London: Tavistock Publications Limited, 1967.

Miller, Roger R. "Clues from the Past about Clinical Learning." Clinical Social Work Journal, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Winter 1977).

Neufeld, Victor, and Barrows, Howard. "The McMaster Philosophy; An Approach to Medical Education." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 49 (November, 1974).

Newton, P. M., and Levinson, D. J. "The Work Group within the Organization: A Socio-psychological Approach." Psychiatry, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1973).

Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1972.

Polansky, Norman A., ed. Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

_____. "Getting Down to Cases in Casework Research." In Ego Psychology and Dynamic Casework. Edited by Howard Parad. New York: FSAA, 1958.

Read, Herbert. The Redemption of the Robot. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966.

Reiss, D.; Costello, R.; and Almond, D. "Personal Needs, Values and Technical Preferences in the Psychiatric Hospital: A Replicated Study." Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 33 (July, 1976).

Reynolds, Bertha. Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work. New York: Rinehart & Company, 1942.

Rieff, Philip. Fellow Teachers. New York: Delta, 1975.

Riegel, Klaus E. "The Dialectics of Human Development." American Psychologist, Vol. 31, No. 10 (October, 1976).

Rioch, Margaret J. "All We Like Sheep: Followers and Leaders." In Group Relations Reader. Edited by A. D. Coleman and W. H. Bexton. Sausalito, California: GREX, 1975.

Roszak, Theodore, ed. The Dissenting Academy. New York: Pantheon Books-Random House, 1968.

Sanville, Jean. "The California Institute for Clinical Social Work: Conception, Birth and Early Development." Clinical Social Work Journal, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1977).

Seeley, John. The Americanization of the Unconscious. New York: Science House, 1967.

Selltiz; Jahoda; Deutsch; and Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Smith, Neilson. "Practitioners' Orientation to Knowledge and Conceptual Learning from Practice." Social Casework, Vol. 47, No. 8 (October-November, 1966).

Solnit, Albert J. "Who Owns the Schools in our Changing Society." In From Learning for Love to Love of Learning. Edited by R. Ekstein and R. M. Motto. New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1966.

Sommers, Beatrice A. "New Frontiers for the Clinical Educator." DCSW Dissertation, Institute for Clinical Social Work, 1979.

Spaulding, W. B. "Implications of the Core Content Concept in Medical Education." Annals of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, Vol. 9:119, Canada (1976).

Stanton, Alfred H., and Schwartz, Morris S. The Mental Hospital. New York: Basic Books, 1954.

Stolland, Ezra, and Kobler, Arthur. Life and Death of a Mental Hospital. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

Towle, Charlotte. The Learner in Education for the Professions. Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Trow, Martin. "Methodological Problems and the Evaluation of Innovation." In Readings in Evaluation Research. Edited by Francis Caro. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.

Wallerstein, Robert. "The Mental Health Profession: Conceptualization and Reconceptualization of a New Discipline." International Review of Psychoanalysis, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1978).

Wallerstein, Robert, and Ekstein, Rudolf. The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy. London: Imago Publishing Company, 1958.

Webster. Third New International Dictionary, unabridged. Massachusetts: G. C. Merriam, 1971.

Zaleznik, A., and Kets de Vries, M. Power and the Corporate Mind. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Zetzel, Elizabeth. "The Dynamic Basis of Supervision." Social Casework, Vol. 34, No. 4 (April 1953).