The Effectiveness of Case-Based Instruction vs. the Lecture-Discussion Method in
Multicultural Social Work

by

Abdullahi Barise

.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Educational Psychology

Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology

McGill University

Montreal

November, 1998

0-612-50109-4

Canadä

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to compare the effectiveness of case-based instruction and lecture-discussions in enhancing students' multicultural social work competence and their reflective self-regulation to learn multicultural social work. The sample consisted of undergraduate social work students enrolled in a multicultural social work practice course which was composed of two classes, the Special Bachelor of Social Work (SBSW) and the Regular Bachelor of Social Work (RBSW). The students in the SBSW had higher levels of education, mean age, and mean GPA than the students in the RBSW class. Each of these classes was divided into two sections. Participants were randomly assigned to these two sections in which case-based instruction in a section (n=20 for the SBSW class; n=19 for the RBSW class), and lecture-discussions in the other section (n=20 for the SBSW class; n=19 for the RBSW class) were used to teach the same course content. To control for instructor effects, the researcher and another instructor both taught the two sections of each class, one with case-based instruction and the other with lecture and discussions. The randomized pretest posttest control group design was used in this study. Case analyses scored through Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised and student self-reports using the Multicultural Counseling Inventory were used to measure multicultural social work competence. To measure levels of students' self-regulated learning in relation to the course, students were administered the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire. The same data were collected both at the beginning of the study and at the end of the study. The length of the study was 8 weeks. Two procedures were followed to ensure treatment fidelity: two observers recorded the extent to which class plans reflecting the content and methods of instruction

were implemented and students completed questionnaires evaluating the extent to which each method of instruction was implemented. Results indicated significantly higher overall multicultural competence, awareness, skill, and relationship for the case-based sections in both classes. There were significantly higher levels of multicultural knowledge and learning motivation for the case section in the SBSW, but not in the RBSW class. No significant interaction was found between self-regulated learning and method of instruction. There was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of increase in skills in self-regulation.

Résumé

Le but de cette étude était de comparer l'efficacité de la methode de cas et la methode de

la conférence-discussion dans l'augmentation de compétence des étudiants en travail

social multiculturel et leur niveaux d'autorèglement en apprenant le travail social

multiculturel. L'échantillon a consisté d'étudiants du travail social qui s'étaient s'inscris

dans un cours de l'entraînement du travail social multiculturel. Le cours a été composé de

deux classes, le Baccalauréat Spécial de Travail Social (SBSW) et le Bacalauréat

Régulier de Travail Social (RBSW). Chaque un de ces classes ont été divisées dans deux

sections. Les participants ont été assigné à ces deux sections par hasard. La methode de

cas a été utilisé dans l'une sections (n= 20 dans la classe SBSW; n= 19 dans la classe

RBSW), et la methode de la conférence-discussion a été utilisé dans l'autre section (n= 20

dans la classe SBSW; n= 19 dans la classe RBSW). Le même contenu du cours a été

enseigné dans les deux sections. La conception de cette étude etait le pretest posttest avec

une groupe de contrôle equivalente. Pour mésurer le niveaux de compétence en travail

social multiculturel, les étudiants avaient analysé des cas. Ces analyses ont été marqué au

moyen de Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. De plus, les étudiants ont

complété le questionnaire Multicultural Counseling Inventory. Les étudiants ont complété

le questionnaire Motivated Strategies for Learning (MLSQ) afins de mesurer leur niveau

de l'autoréglement de l'apprentissage par rapport au cours. Les mêmes genre des données

ont été rassemblées au commencement de l'étude et à la fin de l'étude. L'étude a duré 8

semaines. Pour assurer la fidélité du traitement, deux observateurs ont noté l'ampleur à

qui les plans de la classe qui représentaient le contenu du cours et les méthodes de

l'enseignements ont été rendues effectif. De plus, les étudiants ont complété deux

questionnaires représentant les deux méthodes d'enseignment à la fin de l'étude. Les résultats de l'étude ont indiqué que les groupes dans les sections de la methode de cas ont demontré des compétences multiculturelles totales, consciences, habiletés, et rapports multiculturels plus hauts comparativement aux groupes dans les sections de la conférence-discussion, dans les deux classes. Le groupe dans la section de la methode de cas de la classe SBSW a demontré considérablement plus haut niveau de connaissance multiculturelle et motivation de l'érudition par rapport au cours, mais ce n'a pas été le cas dans la classe RBSW. Il n'y a pas eu d'interaction considérable entre le niveau d'autoréglément d'apprentissage et la méthode d'enseignement. Il n'y a pas eu de différence considérable entre les deux groupes quant à augmentation dans habiletés dans d'autoréglement d'apprentissage.

Acknowledgments

The completion of this dissertation represents the culmination of three years of exciting but challenging years of doctoral studies, and my deep thanks are extended to the following people who helped me through this process:

First, I would like to extend my deepest thanks and gratitude to my Supervisor Dr. Cheryl Amundsen for her continuous guidance, mentoring, support, and encouragement. I thank her for being an inspiring teacher for me and getting me interested in teaching and learning in higher Education. I thank her for her thorough and timely feedback on my manuscripts.

I thank Dr. Alenoush Saroyan, my committee member, for her guidance, encouragement, high expectations, and confidence in my abilities. I thank her for being my inspiring teacher and getting me interested in teaching and learning in higher education.

I thank Dr. William Rowe, my committee member, for his support and encouragement. I thank him for giving me the permission to conduct my research in the context of the course I was teaching and supporting me throughout the study.

I thank Dr. Mark Aulls for his stimulating questions and advise on case studies during the early stages of my dissertation research.

I thank my colleague, Michael Baffoe, for committing time and effort to take part in my dissertation study. I also thank all of those who participated in my dissertation research.

I thank the Fonde des Chercheur et de lAide a la recherche (FCAR) for granting me a scholarship when I have been conducting this dissertation research. As well, I

extend my gratitude to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, McGill University,

for funding my dissertation research.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife, Faiza, and my

children Maryam, Ramla, Hafsa, and Aisha for their understanding and continuous

support. I owe them the most in relation to the completion of my doctoral studies.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

Introduction and Theoretical Rationale

The imperative that all social workers should be able to function in a multicultural society is well-established in Canada. This imperative is necessitated by social, legal, and professional realities. From a social perspective, the demographic composition of the Canadian society is becoming increasingly diverse (Boucher, 1990; Herberg, 1995). This demographic reality calls on all social workers to, at one time or another serve clients of diverse cultures. Legally, both the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act guarantee equal access of all citizens to services (Herberg, 1995; Li, 1990; Sanders, 1980). Additionally, multicultural sensitivity is a value held by the social work profession (Latting, 1990; Ronnau, 1994; Singleton, 1994). Based on these realities, there is an increasing exigency for finding the most effective ways of teaching this essential area of multicultural[1] social work. The primary purpose of the present study is to compare the effectiveness of case-based instruction and traditional lecture-discussions in enhancing students' multicultural social work competence . Multicultural competence is defined here as the appropriateness of a practitioner's use of attitudes, knowledge, relationship, and skills to effective social work practice with persons from cultural backgrounds different than his/her own. Case-based instruction in the present study refers to a method of teaching in which problematic, realistic case studies are analyzed and resolved by instructors and students. Traditional lecture-discussion is defined as a method of teaching in which the instructors lecture and students listen to the lecture and take notes; Students' questions are answered and instructors occasionally pose questions to students.

Although some cross-cultural social work educators (e.g., Chau, 1990; Latting, 1990; Ronnau, 1994) advocate the use of more student centered pedagogical strategies, the traditional teacher centered lecture approach is still the norm in this field. Ridley, Kanz, and Mandoza (1994) argued that "most published accounts of multicultural training indicate a heavy reliance on traditional teaching tools—didactic lectures and reading and writing assignments" (p. 262). Many educators in the field of multicultural professional services have called for more empirically validated, innovative ways of teaching this essential field (e.g., Chau, 1990; Garcia, 1996; Ridley et al., 1994; Ronnau, 1994).

Case-based instruction seems a promising method for supporting the development of cross-cultural social work competence. The use of case-based instruction is well-established in the applied fields of law and business and is increasingly being used in other professional fields such as medicine and teacher education (Kagan, 1993; Shulman, 1992). In contrast, the reported use of case-based instruction in social work education has been limited (Cossom, 1991).

It could be argued that in comparison to the fields of business and law, cross-cultural social work is a highly ill-structured field—"one that does not have a consistent underlying theory that can act as a structure for organizing knowledge" (Williams, 1992, p. 377). There are no proven prescriptive theories stipulating how a cross-culturally competent social worker should intervene in a given situation. However, it has been suggested that a multiculturally competent social worker should possess global cognitive and affective characteristics and skills such as cultural self-awareness, positive attitudes toward diversity, flexibility in thinking, critical thinking skills, cross-cultural problem

---

[1] The terms cross-cultural and multicultural are used interchangeably in the present study.

solving skills, cultural learning skills, etc. (e.g., Green, 1995; Herberg, 1995; Pinderhughes, 1989). In other words, these global cognitive and affective learning outcomes which are purportedly supported by case-based instruction may be important in training cross-culturally competent social workers. As well, case-based instruction is purportedly strong in fostering the development of self-awareness, gaining insight into the feelings of others, and developing sensitivity to diversity issues (Dana, & Floyd, 1993; Kleinfeld, 1991; Noordhof, & Kleinfeld, 1990; J. Shulman, 1992b; Sudzina, 1993; Wassermann, 1994). Like other applied fields, cross-cultural social work practice is a problem solving endeavor (e.g., Green, 1995; Herber, 1995; Pinderhughes, 1989). Specifically, cross-cultural social work comprises cross-cultural assessment and intervention. The assessment aspect includes identification of culturally relevant problems, gathering of culturally relevant data, and interpretation/analysis of psychosocial problems in a culturally sensitive manner (e.g., Pinderhughes, 1989). The intervention aspect entails planning, decision-making and acting on the basis of the cross-cultural assessment. The anecdotal literature on case-based instruction claims that it is effective for problem solving skills (e.g., Allen, 1995; Shulman, 1992; Wassermann, 1993) and has been used in different fields to develop skills in the application of concepts, principles, and theories (e.g., Dooley & Skinner, 1977; Wassermann, 1993). Finally, case-based instruction has the potential to increase students' motivation to learn more about the subject matter (e.g., McKeachie, 1999; Shulman, 1992).

However, it has been reported in the literature that not all students may have the necessary skills to learn from case-based instruction (e.g., Cossom, 1991; Ertmer, Newby, & McDougal, 1996). Self-regulated learning is suggested to be an important

learner characteristic that mediates learning from case-based instruction. Self-regulation is defined as "the ability and motivation to implement, monitor and evaluate various learning strategies for the purpose of facilitating knowledge growth." (Ertmer et al., 1996). Interestingly, the activities that reportedly foster self-regulated learning such as active learning, problem solving, collaborative learning are those inherent in case-based instruction. In other words, the skills fostered through case-based instruction are those possessed by high self-regulators (Ertmer et al., 1996). Therefore, there might be a reciprocal relationship between case-based instruction and self-regulation. To this researcher's knowledge, no controlled experiment has been conducted so far to examine the claims of positive interaction between case-based instruction and levels of learner self-regulation.

While many have written about the perceived merits of case-based instruction, there is little empirical evidence to validate its effectiveness in any content area. Shulman (1992) asserted "we do not really have evidence that case-based approaches work any better than lecture or discussion." (p. 22). Likewise, McKeachie (1994) notes "in view of the continuing popularity of the case method, it is surprising that so little research has been done on its effectiveness." (p. 161). Similarly, in a review of the literature on the evaluation of case-based instruction, Masoner (1988) has found mostly "anecdotal evidence, unpublished studies, and a small assortment of unrelated and non-cumulative published studies" (Keinfield, 1991, p. 3). The little research that has been conducted so far on case-based instruction has yielded conflicting results. These inconsistent findings might be due to: (a) flawed research designs, (b) inconsistent or unsound use of case-based instruction, and/or (c) lack of investigation of attribute-treatment interactions.

These issues were considered carefully in the present study. This study compared the effectiveness of case-based instruction and traditional lecture-discussions in enhancing students' multicultural social work competence and self-regulated learning. In addition, interactions between the method of instruction and various demographic variables including age, gender, social work experience, ethnicity, history of immigration, levels of self-regulated learning, and GPA were investigated.

Epistemological Foundations of Cross-Cultural Practice

Definition

Definitions of multicultural practice can be characterized as either inclusive or exclusive. Some authors adopt a definition of cross-cultural practice which includes characteristics such as racial/ethnic identity, religion, gender, physical ability, socioeconomic status, national identity, lifestyle, etc (e.g., Pedersen, 1988; Sue, Bernier, Burran, Feinberg, Pedersen, & Smith, 1982; Vontress, 1988). From this perspective, all cross-cultural practice is to some degree cross-cultural since all individuals are unique in their cultural characteristics. Therefore, this conceptualization of the construct involves virtually unlimited combinations of client/practitioner dyads. Although this conceptualization of cross-cultural practice is based on a legitimate definition of culture, there are those who are concerned that it might dilute the concerns of ethnic minority groups. Other theorists restrict the scope of multicultural practice to a situation where the client and the practitioner are from different racial/ethnic backgrounds (e.g., Hobbs, 1982; Locke, 1990; Yutrzenka, 1995). Those who adopt this point of view do not downplay the importance of the other cultural elements. They rather hold that the meanings given to such factors as gender and lifestyle are shaped by ethnic and racial

factors. In the present study, multicultural/cross-cultural practice is defined as "any counselling relationship in which two or more of the participants differ with respect to cultural background, values, and lifestyle" (Sue, Bernier, Burran, Feinberg, Pedersen, & Smith, 1982) and culture is defined as "all of the values and belief systems, ways of thinking, acting, and responding." (Kendall, 1983, p.13).

Knowledge-Base of Cross-Cultural Practice

Formal knowledge about cross-cultural competence is in its embryonic stage. Formal knowledge refers to knowledge produced through scientific research (Fenstermacher, 1993). As Yutrzenka (1995) reported, "the cross-cultural research domain is being defined, methodological and conceptual limitations abound, and the volume of research being conducted and ultimately being published remains relatively small" (p.198). Also, the effect of culture and ethnicity on practice outcomes remains unclear (Christensen, 1980; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991; Sue, 1991; Zane & Sue, 1991; Yutrzenka, 1995). What is known is that more sophisticated research is needed in this area (e.g., Ridley et al., 1994; YutrZenka, 1995). Therefore, the knowledge base for cross-cultural practice is drawn from theoretical and practical knowledge, and not from formal knowledge.

Perceptual Psychology Theory is one of the theories used to explain the importance of cross-cultural competence. Kurt Lewin (1951) first conceptualized the importance of a person's "perceptual field" in the psychological treatment of the client; he subsequently developed the perceptual psychology theory. Comps, Richards, and Richards (1976) defined the perceptual field as "The entire universe, including himself, as it is experienced by the individual at the instance of action." (p. 22). The authors

asserted that, for any given individual, his/her perceptual field defines his/her reality. Therefore, Comps (1971) argued, helper's success would depend on the degree to which they understand the perceptual worlds of their clients, and the extent to which they are skillful in helping their clients change their perceptions of themselves and their surroundings. Christensen (1981) argued that cross-culturally incompetent counselors risk perceiving culturally dissimilar groups in accordance with their limited perceptual fields (see also Pinderhughes, 1989; Ponteroto & Casas, 1991).

Components of Cross-Cultural Competence

During the past two decades, cross-cultural theorists mainly in social work practice (e.g. Chau, 1989, 1990, 1991, De Anda, 1984; Gelfand & Fandetti, 1986; Green, 1995; Hayes & Singh, 1992; Healy, 1988; Ho, 1991; Hoyos, Hoyos, & Anderson, 1986; Latting, 1990; Latting & Zundel, 1986; Montiel & Wong, 1983; Ronnau, 1994; Van Soest, 1994) and counsellor education (eg. Lefley, 1986; Locke, 1990; Ponteroto & Casas, 1991) have offered an array of descriptions of the competent cross-cultural practitioner. However, most of these conceptual models of cross-cultural competence are not comprehensive because they place more emphasis on one cultural element than on another (Garcia, 1994). Due to the fragmented nature and the lack of operational definitions of these competencies, measurement of cross-cultural social work has, until recently, been difficult.

Lately, progress has been made in delineating a conceptually sound and operationally defined model of cross-cultural practice. The Professional Standards Committee of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development has proposed 31 competencies as a standard for curriculum reform and training for the

helping professions (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). The committee has drawn

heavily upon and expanded the work of Sue et al. (1982). The competencies provided by

the committee are classified into the three dimensions of an overall multicultural

competence: (1) cultural awareness, (2) cultural knowledge, and (3) cultural skills. This

conceptualization of cross-cultural competence is the most inclusive and the most widely

accepted by the helping professions, including social work (Garcia, 1996). Presented

below is a brief overview of each of the dimensions of cross-cultural competence. All of

the existing measurement instruments with known psychometric properties are based on

the work of Sue et al. (1982; 1992).

Cultural Awareness. The culturally competent practitioner is culturally aware.

That is, the culturally competent clinician is aware of his/her own world view, biases,

how he/she is the product of his/her cultural socialization, and how this may affect the

helping process. He/she is cognizant of the client's culture, beliefs, and values. She/he

holds accurate assumptions and attitudes about persons from different cultural

backgrounds than his/her own. She/he respects and appreciates the world views of

culturally different clients as another legitimate perspective (Sue et al., 1982).

The necessity for mental health professionals to develop self-awareness has been

emphasized throughout the literature (e.g., Manoleas, 1994; Pinderhughes, 1989; Ridley

et al., 1994; Yutrzenka, 1995). Since clinicians are not value neutral, they bring their

cultural beliefs, values, expectation, and biases to the client/practitioner interface; this

influences their assessment and intervention approaches. Therefore, clinicians who have

not achieved cultural self-awareness are prone to unwittingly imposing their values on

their clients.

Cultural Knowledge. The culturally competent practitioner is culturally knowledgeable. This includes knowledge of both the micro and the macro aspects of cross-cultural practice. In other words, the culturally competent practitioner knows the personal and social aspects of the theoretical underpinnings of cross-cultural practice. For example, she/he understands the cultural interpretations of client problems and the factors contributing to the underutilizations of services by disadvantaged groups (e.g., Manoleas, 1994; Pinderhughes, 1989; Ridley et al., 1994; Yutrzenka, 1995). As well, the cross-culturally competent clinician must be aware of the fact that multiple definitions exist for important concepts in multicultural human services such as culture, multiculturalism, and cross-cultural competence (Ridley et al., 1994).

Cross-Cultural Skills. The culturally competent practitioner possesses certain cross-cultural skills. Johnson (1987) contended that cross-cultural training needed to go beyond "knowing that" and move toward "knowing how" to provide competent mental health services with culturally diverse clients. It is necessary to employ strategies to form appropriate helping relationships with culturally different clients and to appropriately and accurately communicate with them. The ability to use culturally appropriate interventions, including the use of traditional helpers and indigenous support networks is important. Finally, the culturally competent practitioner has a repertoire of culturally informed advocacy skills, including networking with the local community advocates. One of the objectives of multicultural counseling training in the APA's Committee on Multicultural Counseling Competencies report (Sue et al., 1992) is the development of culturally appropriate assessment, research, and intervention skills in trainees.

Fenstermacher (1993) has referred to this kind of knowledge as "performance knowledge

" What epistemologists have generally called "know-how" skill knowledge, or competent performance is referred to here as "performance knowledge" (p. 25).

The Methods of Instruction Compared in the Present Study

Case-Based Instruction

What is case-based instruction? Dooley and Skinner (1977) asserted that there are as many ways of teaching with cases as there are case instructors. They believed that the only shared characteristic of case-based instruction is the use of case studies. Shulman (1992) argued "the case method of teaching does not exist." (p. 2). Instead, Shulman (1992) believed that there are case methods of teaching.

Ways of teaching with cases differ in the kind of cases used, the role of the instructor, the level of student involvement, and the ensuing discussion approaches. Teaching cases can vary in format (for instance, length) and in content (for instance, the inclusion or not of expert opinion). Levels of student participation in case-based instruction vary along the active-passive continuum, while the instructor's discussion leading style varies along the facilitative-directive continuum (Erskine, 1981). Purposes for using case-based instruction vary depending on the knowledge base of that field and the kinds of learning outcomes sought. As Merseth (1991) puts it, "to a remarkable extent, the purposes and use of the case method turn on the nature of the body of knowledge that exists in the professional field." (p. 9). Cases may be analyzed individually or in small groups, in class or outside of class. Cases may be discussed inductively (widely adopted in business education) or deductively (traditionally used in legal education) (Prion, 1994). Ways of teaching with cases vary from field to field and even within fields. However, the applied fields with a well established history of case-

based instruction (notably business, law and medicine), have developed a traditional way of teaching with cases. In the next section, case-based instruction in these fields will be reviewed. This will include the history, the purposes for using case-based instruction, the epistemological rationale for using case-based instruction, and the ways of teaching with cases in each of these professions.

Case-based instruction in legal education. Case-based instruction[2] in legal education was first established by Christopher Langdell who became the dean of Harvard Law School in 1870 (Williams, 1992). Dean Langdell viewed case-based teaching as the best way of mastering the legal doctrine. However, proponents of traditional instruction opposed the case method calling it an "abomination" (Teich, 1986, p. 170). To this day it remains a controversial approach in legal education. Nonetheless, by 1915, most prestigious schools of law adopted case-based instruction (McNair, 1954) and currently, case-based instruction is the predominant method of legal education in the United States (Teich, 1986). One of the expressed purposes of case-based instruction in legal education is to prepare law students to "think like a lawyer." (Stevens, 1983). In addition, students' reasoning abilities are expected to be enhanced through this method of instruction. Students use deductive logic to learn legal precedents from cases. Williams (1992) argued that case-based instruction is particularly suited for a common law legal system. She stated "when a large number of judges had made the same decision in similar cases, the decision became common law, an unwritten rule that existed only in the record of cases." (p. 378). Williams concluded "from an epistemological perspective, law is much like history; it lacks a comprehensive theory that allows a professor to present information easily in an abstract form." (p. 378).

Socratic dialogue prevails in law schools that use case-based instruction (e.g., Christensen, 1987; Merseth, 1991). Law students in a typical case-based instruction course discuss court decision of appellate cases. Students are expected to analyze cases on their own and identify the type of case, relevant facts and issues, the decision, and the reason for that decision. In the larger class, the professor calls upon a student to summarize the case. Using socratic methods of discussion, the professor then asks questions to test students' ability to abstract rules from the case. To define boundaries between situations in which rules abstracted from the case apply and situations in which they do not apply, the professor often asks about hypothetical variations of the assigned case (Williams, 1992). Case-based instruction in legal education has often been criticized for adopting the "sink or swim" approach by treating students as experts, when they are only novices (Carter, 1995).

Case-based instruction in business education. In business education, case-based instruction was started by Dean Wallace Donham of Harvard Business School who took office in 1919. The case method is currently the primary method of instruction in Harvard Business School and other business education institutions in North American including the School of Business Administration at the University of Western Ontario (Erskine, Leenders, & Mauffette-Leenders, 1981).

The often stated purpose of case-based instruction in business education is to educate students in the skills of analysis, decision-making and problem-solving (Dooley & Skinner, 1977; Erskine, 1981; Merseth, 1991). Case-based instruction is also used in business education to help students evaluate the consequences of their decisions (Erskine, 1981).

---

[2]   Termed the case method in legal education.

The instructor role in a case-based course in business varies along the facilitative-directive continuum. In business education, "case instructors ask questions to guide the discussion--to engage students as vicarious participants and analysts--without a predetermined conclusion in view." (Merseth, 1991, p. 8). Merseth (1991) contrasted this inductive approach to case-based instruction to the deductive strategy used in legal education. He concluded that the inductive approach is appropriate in professions such as business and teaching where the knowledge-base is less structured. Unlike law, contexts in business and teaching may vary so widely that previous solutions or precedents are inappropriate. In these relatively less-structured domains, professionals must generate solutions to problems.

Case-based instruction in medical education. In 1984, the American Association of Medical Colleges published a report calling for a reform of medical education. Among other concerns, the report contained accusations of overemphasis on recall of factual information and poor problem-solving and diagnostic skills among graduates of medical schools. As a result, the report called for the consideration of case-based instruction[3] as an alternative to traditional medical education.

Also known as problem-based learning, this method is characterized by small cooperative learning groups. Students often meet in small tutorial groups to analyze and diagnose the medical problems of a hypothetical patient (Williams, 1992). Case-based instruction in medical education is highly student directed. Students typically work on problems constructed from the actual records of patients. These problems are often presented to students as the patient presented them to the doctor (Williams, 1992). The

---

[3]   Termed problem-based learning in medical education

tutorial groups are lead by instructors who provide students with guidance as the students are engaged in inquiry.

The purpose for using case-based instruction in medical education is most often said to be the enhancement of medical problem solving skills. Students learn how to look for the missing information and make decisions on the basis of data. Generally, patient problems are presented to students as symptoms without additional explanation. They then generate hypotheses and obtain the information they are missing in order to make a diagnosis.

Case-based instruction in teacher education. More than a decade ago, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1985) recommended shifting away from emphasis on acquisition of factual information toward the encouragement of critical thinking and problem-solving (Sikula, 1990). In 1986, both the Carnegie Commission and the Holmes Group published a report criticizing the traditional didactic approach to teacher education. The two reports called for more active role of students in their learning. Since then, there has been a growing interest among educational theorists and teacher educators in case-based instruction (Carter, 1991; Doyle, 1990; Kleinfield, 1991, 1992; Merseth, 1991; Shulman, 1992; Wassermann, 1993, 1994). These scholars view case-based instruction as a vehicle for fostering active student involvement, self-reflection, problem-solving, analysis, decision-making, and critical thinking.

Collier (1995) discussed case-based instructional approaches in teacher education in terms of the five conceptual orientations described by Feiman-Nemser (1990). These are the academic, the technical, the social-critical, the practical, and the personal orientation. The academic orientation to teacher education mainly focuses on the

development of subject matter knowledge. The purpose of case-based instruction falling

within this category is "developing subject matter specific thinking and reasoning skills

that allowed teachers to quickly generate alternative strategies and evaluate those

strategies, based on continually shifting conjectures about student thinking, motivations,

and beliefs." (Barnett, 1991, p. 1). The technical orientation to teaching emphasizes the

development of skills and knowledge drawn from the research on teacher effectiveness

(Feiman-Nemser, 1990). Case-based instruction has been used within this framework to

foster the mastery of specific knowledge and skills. Collier believes that the uses of case-

based instruction by Broudy (1990), Easterly (1992), and some of the work of Kleinfeld

(1992) fall into this category. For example, Easterly (1992) presented various classroom

management approaches to her students and asked them to write case reports synthesizing

data from their teaching sites, and materials from textbooks, lectures, etc. The practical

orientation to teaching focuses on fostering problem solving and the analyses of teaching

and learning. In case-based instruction used within the practical orientation to teaching,

problem-solving and decision-making are emphasized and professional judgment and

multiple solutions are encouraged. The proponents of this orientation to teaching see

knowledge essential for teachers as "contexual, interactive, and speculative." (Clark &

Lampert, 1986). Collier believes that the bulk of case-based instruction in teacher

education befits this orientation. Most of the leading advocates of case-based instruction

in teacher education (e.g., Merseth, 1991; 1992; J. Shulman, 1992; L. Shulman, 1992;

Wassermann, 1993, 1994) promote this orientation. However, it should be noted that J.

Shulman and L. Shulman advocate for multiple uses of cases (see, J. Shulman, 1992; L.

Shulman, 1986, 1987, 1992). Another view of teaching is offered by the social critical

orientation. In this orientation, educators are viewed as political actors and teachers

(Merseth, 1991). The purpose of case-based instruction used within this framework is to

develop critical thinking. Teachers are encouraged to recognize, analyze, and reflect upon

critical moral and ethical issues and propose changes (Merseth, 1991). Collier classified

the work of Grant (1992) and some of the cases developed by Kleinfeld (1992) into this

orientation. Finally, the personal/developmental orientation to teaching views teacher

education as a process of understanding, developing, and using oneself effectively

(Feiman-Nemser, 1990). Collier reported that cases fully befitting this conceptual

orientation are yet to be published. However, several scholars placed emphasis on the

importance of taking learners' prior knowledge, developmental levels, approaches to

learning, and beliefs into consideration in case-based instruction (Greenwood & Parkay,

1989; Harrington, 1991; Kleinfeld, 1992; Levin, 1995).

    Case-based instruction in social work education. There is evidence of a long

history of case use in social work for variety of purposes, which are different from the

purposes for using case-based instruction in the fields of business education, legal

education, medical education, and teacher education. For instance, case study as a

research methodology, originated in social work (Stake, 1995). The pedagogical use of

cases has also been documented in the social work literature. A variety of social work

case studies have been published that could be used for pedagogical purposes (e.g.,

Perlman, 1957; Pincus & Minahan, 1973). However, these cases are usually used only as

examples to depict specific models of social work practice rather than to engage students

in problem-solving (Perlman, 1957; Pincus & Minahan, 1973).

A search of the social work literature shows only one occasion of the systematic use of case-based instruction (Cossom,1991). In that account, Cossom handed out cases one week in advance for individual student preparation. Students then discussed the cases in small groups, followed by large class discussions. A questionnaire and discussions about case-based instruction were used to evaluate this method of instruction. The majority of the students (76%) were satisfied with case-based instruction. The advantages of case-based instruction reported by the students were similar to those found in the literature in business and teacher education. First, students reported that the cases broadened their perspectives because they encountered a variety of views about the cases being analyzed. Second, they felt they gained awareness of their own ideological system as they dealt with "a wide range of values, beliefs and assessments which often diverged sharply from their own." (p. 149). Another advantage recognized by many students was that case-based instruction put them in the role of the practitioner and forced them to make professional decisions. Because cases are not real life, students felt safe to make decisions "without having to live with them." (p. 150). In contrast, a minority of the students (24%) were not satisfied with their learning experience in case-based instruction. These students reported being "frustrated with the absence of the correct answers, and the lack of a clear decision or a consensus about what *should be* done in a particular case." (p. 150).

Summary of the advantages of case-based instruction. Cases are used to teach principles or theories and to provide practice with their application . Many teacher education scholars believe that the goal of case-based instruction is to link theory and practice into a contexualized knowledge (Boyce, 1993; Carter, 1992; Cowalski, 1990;

Grossman, 1992; Kleinfeld, 1992; Shulman, 1992; White & McNergy, 1991). For example, Shulman (1992) argued that case analysis "drives students to explore ever deeper reasons for applying principles in a particular way." (p. 3). Boyce (1993) reported that case-based instruction is used in preservice training of physical education teachers to bridge the gap between theory and practice. Kleinfeld (1992) viewed the strength of case-based instruction as the creation of a context for prospective teachers "to spot the important issues in a complex, muddy situation and learn how to apply general principles." (p. 34). In legal education, The main purpose of case-based instruction is to teach legal principles (e.g., Shulman, 1992). In the business context, Christensen (1987) noted, "When successful, the case method of instruction produces a manager grounded in theory and abstract knowledge, and, more important, able to apply those elements." (p.32). Graham and Cline (1980) argued that one of the purposes of case-based instruction is to study similar situations that share a common, more abstract concept or principle.

Numerous scholars and practitioners in professional education believe that one of the main advantages of case-based instruction is teaching problem-solving and higher level thinking skills. Several authors (e.g., Boyce, 1993; Grossman, 1992; Merseth, 1992; Silverman, Welty, & Lyon, 1994b; White & McNergy, 1991) report that case-based instruction enables students to analyze and develop solutions for situations which will be encountered in the real world. Similarly, in business education, Leenders and Erskine (1978) explained that case-based instruction gives students the opportunity to put themselves in the problem-solver's shoes. Merseth (1992) viewed case-based instruction as an opportunity to link diagnosis of classroom problems with possible teacher actions.

Merseth (1992) argued that decision-making cases support the development of analytic and decision-making skills and asserted that such cases are "designed specifically to develop the power to analyze a situation, to formulate action plans, and then evaluate those actions with respect to specific context variables." (p. 53). Boyce (1993) reported that case-based instruction is used to show students that problems have more than one solution. Graham and Cline (1980) argued that case-based instruction can help students learn to examine multiple perspectives before reaching a solution. Another purpose for employing case-based instruction is the development of critical thinking skills (Boehrer & Linsky, 1990). Case-based instruction requires and thus supports higher order thinking (Christensen & Hansen, 1987; Wassermann, 1993). Case-based instruction helps students achieve the cognitive flexibility necessary for professionals to function competently in ill-structured domains. Both Graham and Cline (1980) and Shulman (1992) explained that one of the strengths of case-based instruction is its ability to model modes of thinking in many fields. Thus, case-based instruction helps students learn to think professionally (Kleinfeld, 1992).

Another often cited rationale for the use of case-based instruction is the encouragement of reflection. Numerous scholars, notably in teacher education, argued that case-based instruction helps students develop reflectivity (Grossman, 1992; Richert, 1992; White & McNergy, 1991). Richert (1992) believes that "case methods provide fertile ground for facilitating reflection in teaching." (p. 158). Case-based instruction helps students develop self-awareness and awareness of the ethical and moral dilemmas confronting human services professionals. As Wassermann (1993) put it "you are continually challenged to choose for yourself. In that process, you learn about the values

you hold that guide your choices. As values become clearer, choice inevitably becomes more informed." (p. 23). This helps students integrate self into the developing teacher role (Merseth, 1991) and to enhance their interpersonal skills. Finally, case-based instruction helps students become familiar with analysis and decision-making in complex "lifelike" situations.

Retention of knowledge is another reported objective of using case-based instruction. Leenders and Erskine (1978) argued that using cases which are high in imagery enhances the retention of knowledge. Neufield (1974) reported that one of the advantages of clinical cases in a medical curriculum is the greater retention of information.

It is also argued throughout the literature that case-based instruction is a good student motivator (e.g., Neufield, 1974; Shulman, 1992; Wassermann, 1994). For example, Wassermann (1994) argued that cases are natural motivators because students are challenged to get more information to solve problems.

Limitations of case-based instruction. Fewer limitations of case-based instruction are reported in the literature, as compared to advantages (Armistead, 1984; Beckman, 1972; Christensen & Hansen, 1987; Graham & Cline, 1980; McAninch, 1993; Pigor & Pigor, 1961; Shulman, 1992). Some of the suggested shortcomings of case-based instruction seem to be inherent in the type of instruction itself, while others are due to misconceptions about it (Prion, 1994). Shulman (1992) suggested that case writing is time consuming and the creation of cases is costly. On the basis of the amount of content covered in a given time period, case-based instruction is less efficient than traditional lecture (Graham & Cline, 1980; Shulman, 1992). However, many educators convincingly

argue that the process and depth of coverage are more important than the amount of

content covered (e.g., Allen, 1995; Lohman, 1993). As Lohman (1993) puts it "the motto

might be "less is more" (p. 21). Another alleged limitation is that case-based instruction is

difficult to teach (Graham & Cline, 1980; Shulman, 1992) since: (a) case-based

instruction is less orderly and discussions are more prone to be diverted to trivial issues

as compared to more teacher-centered approaches (Beckman, 1972); (b) case-based

instruction may demand more preparation from the instructor than a straight lecture

(Graham & Cline, 1980); and (c) some teachers may feel threatened by their perceived

lack of control over the content and the classroom processes. Clearly, all of these issues

can be resolved as they originate in the perception, effort, and skills of the case-based

instruction facilitator. Finally, it is suggested in the literature (e.g., Cossom, 1991; Ertmer

et al., 1996) that some students are not prepared cognitively and affectively to learn

successfully from case-based instruction. Of particular importance is the suggestion that

students with low levels of self-regulation are ill-prepared to learn from case-based

instruction (Ertmer et al., 1996).

Case-based instruction and self-regulated learning. As stated above, one of the

alleged limitations of case-based instruction is that learners with low self-regulation skills

might not simply be ready to learn from it. Ertmer et al. (1996)) argued that there might

be a reciprocal relationship between case-based instruction and self-regulated learning.

Specifically, students with low self-regulation skills might not have the skills needed to

learn well from case-based instruction; however, the processes inherent in case-based

instruction might enhance their self-regulation skills (Ertmer et al., 1996). These

processes include active learning in a meaningful context, collaborative learning, problem solving, and reflection (Ertmer et al., 1996; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989).

Cross-cultural social work and case-based instruction. It is reported throughout the literature that a safe, open, and trusting environment which is conducive to free expression of feelings and attitudes is essential to the success of cross-cultural competence instruction (e.g., Kagwa; 1976; Latting, 1990; Ronnau, 1994). Kagwa asserted that "it is the responsibility of the instructor to set the tone, to create the kind of climate in which students will feel free to discuss feelings, values, and attitudes honestly." (p. 31). Kagwa further explained that students should be made to feel that they will not be condemned if they harbor negative feelings.

Obviously, as in teacher education, the knowledge-base in cross-cultural social work is evolving and cross-cultural social work is a highly ill-structured domain. As a result, arguments put forward by many scholars for the use of case-based instruction in the ill-structured domains of law, business, and teacher education (e.g., Merseth, 1991) also apply in cross-cultural social work. Case-based instruction seems to hold promise for supporting all three components of cross-cultural competence. As discussed in the following literature review, there is some empirical evidence pointing toward the suitability of case-based instruction to address teacher biases, prejudices, and to foster the development of positive attitude toward multiculturalism (Kleinfeld, 1991; Shulman, 1992b; Sudzina, 1993). It is therefore logical that the same might be true for case-based instruction in cross-cultural social work. Furthermore, case-based instruction might be the most suitable method for fostering cross-cultural knowledge. The knowledge dimension of cross-cultural competence consists of factual, propositional knowledge. As mentioned

earlier, Shulman (1992) argued that case-based instruction is likely to work well in

teaching theoretical principles. He asserted that "cases are occasions for offering theories

to explain why certain actions are appropriate." (p. 3). The bulk of case-based instruction

is used for this purpose in legal education. Finally, it is argued throughout the literature

that cases are strongest in fostering the development of analysis, problem-solving, and

critical thinking skills. These skills are important for the cross-cultural competence

dimension of cross-cultural skills. As stated earlier, social work is a problem solving

process (e.g., Compton & Galaway, 1994; Green, 1995). It therefore seems that case-

based instruction might work well in enhancing cross-cultural skills.

In summary, case-based instruction holds great promise for cross-cultural social

work instruction. Case-based instruction addresses the practical issues faced in

professional education. Case-based instruction seems to provide a safe environment for

students to practice realistic cross-cultural problem resolution, rather than being

immersed in the field without adequate preparation. In other words, it offers vicarious

experiences for students rather than direct experiences. It thus seems to bridge the gap

between the "academic" environment of the classroom and the "actual" professional

practice in the field. Hence, it apparently protects both the novice student and the clients,

while at the same time fostering quality learning. In addition, case-based instruction

seems to befit the theories proposed by cross-cultural social work educators to guide

instruction in this field. For example, Gladstein and Mailick (1986) stressed the relevance

of andragogy to cross-cultural social work instruction, "An andragogic approach credits

the utility of life experience and suggests the necessity of starting where the student is"

(p. 46). Similarly, using Paulo Freire's (1970) theory to teach multicultural social work

has often been proposed. Like case-based instruction, this theory emphasizes the importance of presentation of material as a problem to wrestle with, not as a piece of knowledge to be stored. Case-based instruction is also congruent with the instructional frameworks and models supported by many leaders in the field of instructional psychology. For example, Scardamalia & Bereiter (1989) support the conception of teaching as producing conceptual change. In this conception of teaching, like case-based instruction, "learning is seen as transformative rather than a merely cumulative process" (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1989, p.39). Likewise, Leinhardt (1993) defended the framework of viewing teachers as facilitators. Leinhardt explained the facilitator approach to teaching: "In these collaborative models, the student constructs knowledge systematically under guided social conditions" (p.3). Finally, Brown et al. (1989) proposed the cognitive apprentice model which, like case-based instruction, emphasizes the development of cognitive skills in authentic, contexualized activities. Williams (1992) suggested that cognitive apprenticeship is a form of case-based instruction that might help us overcome the limitations reportedly associated with previous implementations of case-based instruction. Therefore, empirical examination of merits of case-based instruction for cross-cultural social work is highly warranted.

The Lecture Method

Variations in Lecturing Styles. The lecture method continues to be the prevailing method of instruction in higher education (McKeachie, 1999). Lectures can be flexible in that various pedagogical principles can be incorporated in them (Frederick, 1986; Saroyan & Snell, 1997). For example, Saroyan and Snell (1997) characterized three types of lecturing styles: content-driven, context-driven, and pedagogy-driven. They defined

content-driven lectures as conveying relatively large amounts of information without

incorporating activities to help students learn the content and they concluded that this was

a good example of Ramsdens'(1992) "teaching as telling" theory. According to them, the

context-driven lecture went beyond merely transmitting information as it included such

activities as interaction with patients. According to Saroyan and Snell, the context-driven

lecture seemed closer to Ramsden's (1992) theory in which teaching is viewed as making

learning possible. Finally, Saroyan and Snell reported that the pedagogy-driven lecture

incorporated clearly articulated learning objectives, limited content, summary, a short

evaluation, and handouts. The authors have also placed this lecture in the "making

learning possible" theory within Ramsden's (1992) framework.

A number of pedagogical principles of good lecturing have been reported in the

literature (Frederick, 1986; McKeachie, 1999; Saroyan & Snell, 1997). The elements of

good lecturing synthesized from this literature include: (a) at the beginning of each class,

summarizing the concepts covered in the previous class and linking it to the present topic;

(b) presenting an outline showing the structure of each lecture at the out set (using either

the blackboard or an overhead projector); (c) asking students questions about the main

points of the present lecture topic before starting the lecture; (d) limiting the content of

each lecture to avoid student cognitive overload; (e) using examples and metaphors

frequently to illustrate concepts; (f) encouraging students to stop the lecturer and ask

questions or disagree during the lecture; (g) posing questions to students during lectures

to check student understanding; (h) providing a summary of what has been covered from

time to time; (i) informing students when the lecturer moves from one topic to another;

(j) at the end of each topic, telling students what topic would be covered next; (k) after finishing the lecture, giving students a chance to ask questions or raise a point; (l) at the end of each lecture, giving students a few minutes to write the summary of the main concepts in the lecture; and (m) at the end of the class, linking the concepts covered that day to those which would be covered the following week.

Advantages of Lectures. Several advantages of lecturing have been cited in the literature. First, lecturing is an efficient method of consolidating and communicating information dispersed over a variety of sources (McKeachie, 1999). Second, lecturing can be relatively inexpensive since it can accommodate large numbers of students (Saroyan and Snell, 1997). Third, lectures can be interactive since students' involvement in their own learning can be fostered in planning and delivering lectures (Frederick, 1986). In addition, lectures can provide an opportunity for modelling expert thinking. Finally, lectures may be used to promote student motivation to learn about the subject matter (McKeachie, 1999).

Limitations of lectures. A variety of shortcomings of lectures have been mentioned in the literature. It is argued throughout the literature that lecturing does not promote higher order thinking, application of knowledge (Gibbs et al., 1987), attitude change, problem solving skills, and independent learning (e.g., McKeachie et al., 1986; McKeachie, 1999.). Poor student attention during lectures is cited as another limitation of this method of instruction (Gibbs et al., 1987).

Lecturing and cross-cultural competence. Although references to the use of other pedagogical strategies exist in the literature, the lecture is widely used to teach cross-cultural competence. Ridley et al. (1994) argued that "most published accounts of

multicultural training indicate a heavy reliance on traditional teaching tools—didactic

lectures and reading and writing assignments" (p. 262). Crompton (1974) explained that

the teacher-centered orientation of teaching cross-cultural social work consists of

lectures, guest lecturers, slides, papers, and examinations. However, Ridley et al. (1994)

suggested, while the traditional didactic teaching methods are important, they are

insufficient. As Leinhardt (1993) explained "The fundamental problem with the didactic

approach is that it has no room for, and therefore does not deal with, the way in which

either the teacher or the student might develop the meaning and the structure of the

material being learned." (p. 5). Chau (1990) argued "Culture-sensitive practice is value-

laden and evokes emotions, and didactic formats are useful only to impart factual and

descriptive content."(p. 27). As a result, lecturing might be suitable for conveying the

knowledge dimension of cross-cultural competence, but it does not seem to fit the

cultural awareness and skills components.

<div align="center">Theoretical Framework</div>

Theoretical Support for Case-Based Instruction.

Various theories of learning have been suggested to explain the effectiveness of

case-based instruction. Some of these theories like situated cognition theory and

cognitive flexibility in ill-structured domains originate in cognitive psychology. Other

theories such as Piaget's theory of cognitive development and Vygotsky's theory of

sociocultural development are developmental theories. A description of each theory and

its perceived relevance to case-based instruction follows.

Situated learning theory. Shulman (1992) argued that situated learning is one of

the theories that might explain why case-based instruction is likely to work. The *situated*

learning theory (also referred to as situated cognition) is based on the notion that the environment is an integral part of what is learned; an activity in which knowledge is developed and used is inseparable from learning or cognition (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989). In other words, learning is *situated* in the context in which it is constructed and employed (Collins et al., 1989; Griffin, 1995; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Resnick. 1996). In situated learning, activities are conceptualized as interactions in which individuals and situations are co-participants (Greeno, 1991). Concepts are therefore situated and progressively developed through the activity.

There is an apparent congruence between some of the claimed strengths of case-based instruction and the main propositions of situated learning theory. First, situated learning theory holds that problem-solving should be taught in an authentic, contexualized activity (Brown et al., 1989). Case-based instruction gives students the opportunity to situate mental activities in meaningful and relevant contexts. The specificity and localism of cases support contexualized problem solving. In other words, by analyzing and making decisions about realistic cases faced by professionals in the field, students are better prepared for real-world problems. The proponents of situated cognition (e.g., Brown et al., 1989) argue that knowledge constructed through relevant contexts is more likely to be transferred to similar contexts than decontexualized knowledge acquired in a propositional, expository form. As Feltovich, Spiro, and Coulson (1993) explained "knowledge is more readily available for later use if the settings, cognitive processes, and goals active at the time knowledge needs to be used resemble those that were active when knowledge was acquired." (p. 200).

Nonetheless, it should also be recognized that the problems dealt with in case-based instruction are not the equivalent of reality. First, as Pigor and Pigor (1961) argued, cases are filtered by the biases and perceptions of their authors. From the perspective of situated learning theory, the problem-solving involved in case-based instruction is not entirely authentic in the sense that it does not depict the full cycle of the problem-solving process by practitioners. For example, as stated earlier, in legal education students get cases describing legal problems already solved and their task is to analyze the cases and these solutions. This analysis is by itself an authentic activity, but does not provide practice of the entire problem-solving process. For example, as Williams (1992) argued, students in case-based classrooms in legal education do not have the opportunity to engage in other authentic aspects of the legal problem-solving process such as interviewing clients and negotiating. Therefore, Williams (1992) argued "neither the case method nor problem-based learning uses materials for the entire problem-solving cycle of planning, executing, evaluating, and revising problem-solutions." (p. 416). In summary, although case-based instruction is a simulated activity and cases depict only a slice of reality, it is argued that this instructional approach approximates authentic professional activities in that it helps students become familiar with analysis and decision-making in complex "lifelike" situations.

Cognitive flexibility. Another theory which may support the claims about the pedagogical strength of cases is the theory of cognitive flexibility in ill-structured domains (Spiro, Vispoel, Schmitz, Samarapungavan, Boerger, 1987). Cognitive flexibility refers to the skill of suspended judgement, the ability to see the many sides of a question, and the ability to think clearly about key issues in complex situations.

Feltovitch et al. (1993) define an ill-structured domain as "one in which many concepts, in interaction, are pertinent to an instance or case of knowledge application, and different patterns of concepts might be relevant across cases that appear to be alike or that are categorized as being alike" (pp. 200-201). Examples of ill-structured domains are history, medicine, law, teaching, and social work. Case-based instruction helps students develop the cognitive flexibility necessary for professionals to function competently in ill-structured domains. Spiro et al. (1987) argued:

> The best way to learn and instruct in order to attain the goal of cognitive
> flexibility in knowledge representation for future application is by a method of
> case-based presentations which treats a content domain as a landscape that is
> explored by criss-crossing it in many directions, by reexamining each site in the
> varying contexts of different neighbouring cases, and by using a variety of
> abstract dimensions for comparing cases. (p. 178).

Piaget's theory of cognitive development. Levin (1995) asserted that Piaget's theory of cognitive development provides a rationale for why discussion is essential for fostering learning in case-based instruction. Piaget holds that peer interactions create cognitive conflicts. In turn, these conflicts trigger change since children reflect on the conflicting ideas arising from peer interactions. Piaget claims that children resolve the disequilibrium resulting from the conflicts by constructing a new cognitive structure, (schema), which links to an existing system of schemas. Levin (1995) argued "the social interactions that result from the discussion of a case about teaching and learning among a group of teachers has the potential for triggering cognitive conflict, hence for change to occur." (p. 15).

Similarly, Donmoyer (1990) uses Piaget's (1971) schema theory to explain Stake's naturalistic generalizations from case studies. Stake (1995) defined naturalistic generalizations as "conclusions arrived at, as through personal engagement in life's affairs or by vicarious experience so well constructed that the person feels as if it happened to themselves." (p. 85). Donmoyer asserted that people learn from case studies by *assimilating* the vicarious experiences they get from their exposure to a case study into their cognitive structures of the topic. They also restructure their cognitive structures to *accommodate* the novel aspects of what they experience by their exposure to the case. Consequently, their cognitive structures become both more *integrated* (in that the subject of the case mean more things to them) and more *differentiated* (in that they can distinguish more kinds of issues and aspects of issues pertinent to the case). As a result, Donmoyer argued that "from the schema theory view of generalizability, the purpose of [case study] research is simply to expand the range of interpretations available to the research consumer." (p. 194). Although Donmoyer and Stake discuss case studies as a research methodology, there is clearly an overlap between the use of case studies as a research tool and as a pedagogical tool. Learners in case-based instruction can be conceived of as research consumers provided that the case studies used are based on research (Grossman, 1992). Note also that Levin (1995) focuses on case discussion as a medium for social interaction, while Donmoyer and Stake talk about learning from case study research in general.

Vygotsky's theory of sociocultural development. According to Levin (1995), Vygotsky's theory of sociocultural development is another developmental theory that may explain why case-based discussions are likely to foster cognitive development.

Vygotsky holds that higher mental functions such as categorical perception, logical memory, voluntary attention, and abstract thought develop through children's interactions with others. According to Vygotsky "every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first on the social level, and later on the individual level; first *between* people (interpsychological), and then *inside* the child (*intrapsychological*)" (Vygotsky, 1934/1978. p.37, as quoted in Gredler, 1997, p.246). Levin explained that, from Vygotsky's perspective, it is the case-based dialogue, and not the case *per se*, that fosters and shapes the ensuing cognitive development.

The zone of proximal development (ZPD) is another important construct in Vygotsky's theory of psychological development, which might be important for understanding the effective use of case-based instruction. The ZPD is defined as "the distance between the actual developmental level that is reflected in the child's independent problem-solving and the problem solving level that is accomplished with guidance" (Vygotsky, 1930-35/1978, p. 86, as cited by Gredler, 1997, p. 256). In case-based instruction, facilitators need to identify learners' ZPD and guide them through case discussions to higher levels of cognitive skills and knowledge. In other words, facilitators need to determine the level of support (modelling, coaching. and scaffolding) that students need and what they can do on their own in order to achieve certain learning outcomes in a class.

In summary, although there is little empirical evidence to support why case-based instruction is effective, several authors have used various theories to explain the potential value of case-based instruction. Shulman (1992) argued that situated learning is one of the theories that might explain why case-based instruction is likely to work. Situated

cognition may explain why knowledge and skills developed through case-based instruction are more transferable than, say, knowledge and skills acquired via the lecture method. Another theory which may support the claims about the pedagogical power of cases is the theory of cognitive flexibility in ill-structured domains (Spiro et al.,1987). This theory proposes that it is the nature of the knowledge-base in certain domains (ill-structured domains) that makes case-based instruction the best instructional approach for these domains. The assumption is that in order to function well in such ill-structured domains, one must possess certain cognitive characteristics including cognitive flexibility. Levin (1995) has suggested that Piaget's theory of cognitive development and Vygotsky's theory of sociocultural development are two developmental theories that provide a rationale for why discussion is essential in fostering learning in case-based instruction. Piaget's theory of cognitive development emphasizes that social interactions lead to changes in thinking, whereas, Vygotsky's theory of sociocultural development holds that social interactions not only lead to a change in thinking, but they shape the nature of that thinking. What has not been considered so far is a theoretical framework for the use of case-based instruction in the context of multicultural social work learning.

Theoretical Framework for This Study

The theoretical framework for this study is based on the cognitive apprenticeship model (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989, 1989) and the theory of perspective transformation (Mezirow, 1978, 1981, 1989, 1990, 1991). As Merseth (1991) put it, "to a remarkable extent, the purposes and use of the case method turn on the nature of the body of knowledge that exists in the professional field." (p. 9). Since the social work profession in general and multicultural social work in particular have their own

distinctive characteristics, this researcher hypothesized that an innovative model of case-based instruction combining cognitive apprenticeship and transformative learning is bound to yield better results than lecturing in terms of promoting multicultural social work competence. Williams (1992) proposed the use of the cognitive apprenticeship model as a form of case-based instruction. Williams argued "Because they [cognitive apprenticeship and anchored instruction] both emphasize teaching in the context of realistic problems or cases, they can be viewed as forms of case-based instruction." (p. 369). In addition to principles derived from traditional apprenticeships, cognitive apprenticeship draws upon the theory of situated cognition as well as John Dewey's vision of learning-by-doing (Farnham-Diggory, 1990).

The theory of perspective transformation, on the other hand, is based on constructivist assumptions which is "a conviction that meaning exists within ourselves rather than in external forms such as books and that personal meanings that we attribute to our experience are acquired and validated through human interaction and communication." (Mezirow, 1991, p.xiv). Transformative learning is defined as "the development of revised assumptions, premises, or perspectives on the world by means of critical self-reflection." (Cranton, 1994, p. xii).

The cognitive apprenticeship model seems to hold a greater potential in promoting the cross-cultural skills and knowledge dimensions of cross-cultural competence. Whereas, the transformative learning theory has the potential to foster best the cultural awareness aspect of cross-cultural social work competence. Although important differences exist between the perspectives of cognitive apprenticeship and transformative learning, their main components can be combined to explain why case-

based instruction conceptualized, designed, and implemented within this integrated framework would best foster cross-cultural competence. This integrated model includes the four components of content, teaching methods, sequence, and group interactions. Each of these dimensions is discussed below.

Content of Learning. Both the cognitive apprenticeship model and transformative theory go beyond transmitting the subject matter content. The cognitive apprenticeship model entails three additional types of content. Specifically, Collins et al. (1989) asserted that students need to learn *problem-solving* strategies (heuristics or "trick of the trade") that experts pick-up through experience. Second, such *control strategies* as goal-setting, strategic planning, monitoring, and revision should be included in the content to be taught in cognitive apprenticeship. Third, *learning strategies* such as exploring new fields and getting more knowledge in a familiar subject are important content issues in cognitive apprenticeship. It seems that the content components stressed in the cognitive apprenticeship model are also an integral part of the skills dimension of cross-cultural competence. The transformative learning theory emphasizes helping learners reshape their *meaning perspectives* in order to construct a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative understanding of one's experience. *Meaning perspectives* are the structure of assumptions that constitute a frame of reference for interpreting the meaning of experience (Mezirow, 1991). This definition of meaning perspectives is similar to the definition of culture in the present study, which is "all of the values and belief systems, ways of thinking, acting, and responding." (Kendall, 1983, p.13). Taylor (1994) explained that the transformative learning stages of *catalyst* for change, *process* of change, and the *outcome* of change befit the process of becoming cross-culturally

competent. In perspective transformation, the catalyst for change is a disorienting

personal dilemma (Mezirow, 1985) or some kind of trigger event (Cranton, 1994). In the

case-based instruction context, the researcher hypothesized that multicultural cases would

provide students with trigger events that may stimulate their critical self-reflection, as

they are confronted with worldviews different from their own as well as alternative ways

of conceptualizing and intervening with these cases. As suggested by J. Shulman (1991)

and Dana and Floyd (1993), case-based instruction gives students the opportunity to

identify their underlying assumptions and to reflect on them. However, this assertion is

not supported by a theoretical framework. Thus, the theory of perspective transformation

can be used to conceptualize the development of the awareness component of cross-

cultural competence through case-based instruction. Discussed below are the instructional

strategies used to foster the development of the different content components emphasized

by the cognitive apprenticeship model and the transformative learning theory.

Methods of Teaching. Both the cognitive apprenticeship model and

transformative learning emphasize modeling as an important teaching technique. In

transformative learning theory, educators should model critical self-reflection. Cranton

(1994) asserted that "providing a model or models of critical reflection is a powerful

climate-setting device because that is a way of fostering continued reflection." (p.160).

According to the cognitive apprenticeship model, the instructor should think aloud and

describe reasoning processes in an attempt to make visible the invisible mental processes

such as problem solving, reasoning, and decision making (See Brown et al., 1989;

Farnham-Diggory, 1990).

According to the cognitive apprenticeship model, when a student performs a task, the instructor should give guidance and feedback (coaching). As Farnham-Diggory (1990) explained "It [coaching] helps guide and supervise practice to the point of automaticity." (p. 68). To stimulate critical self-reflection and thus transformative learning, educators need to create a learning atmosphere which adopts both challenge and support as the norm. Cranton (1994) asserted that "Challenging learners can create a climate conducive to critical reflection if learners are self-confident " (p. 159). Mezirow (1991) characterizes the role of the transformative learning educator as "empathic provocateur and role model, a collaborative learner who is critically self-reflective and encourages others to consider alternative perspectives " (p. 206). This description entails both the supporting and challenging role of the educator. An important form of challenge is critical questioning which aims at stimulating reflection instead of eliciting information (Brookfield, 1987). However, it is important to note that at times, because of the personal nature of the course content, learners may perceive critical questions as personal, intimidating or threatening. Therefore, challenge should be balanced with support in order to create the safe environment necessary for successful cross-cultural learning. One way to foster a supportive learning climate is the development of group cohesion (see Section d. Group Interaction, below). It seems that there is more room for peer challenge and support in the case-based instruction sections, than in the lecture sections. The educator modeling critical self-reflection as a co-learner also contributes to the development of open and supportive environment (Cranton, 1994). Since the students in the case-based instruction sections were expected to benefit from this guided practice in the form of coaching, scaffolding, challenging, and supporting, it was hypothesized that

they would develop higher cross-cultural competence, as compared to the students in the lecture-based sections.

In summary, learner empowerment is an integral part of both cognitive apprenticeship and transformative learning. Cranton (1994) explained that "learner empowerment simply means giving them power or making them able." (p.146). The literature on transformative learning indicates that learner empowerment can be achieved by (1) giving all participants equal opportunity to participate in the classroom discourse; (2) ensuring that a situation of coercion does not exist; and (3) encouraging learners to make decisions on their own whenever possible (e.g., Cranton, 1994, 1996; Mezirow, 1985, 1991). Similarly, Browne and Richie (1991) suggested that the cognitive apprenticeship teaching methods of *fading, articulation, reflection, and exploration* empower learners because they enable them to become autonomous. Specifically, as students become gradually self-sufficient, instructors must withdraw their coaching (*fading*). In this way, students are progressively handed over control of the learning process. The *articulation* process occurs through explicit descriptions such as summaries, critiques, or dialogue about situations or principles that the instructor asks the students to produce (Brown et al., 1989; Collins et al.,1989; Farnham-diggory, 1990). As Collins et al. (1989) put it "Reflection enables students to compare their own problem-solving processes with those of an expert, another student, and ultimately, an internal cognitive model of expertise." (p.463). As noted earlier, of particular interest in transformative learning theory is critical self-reflection which involves a critique of presupposition on which beliefs are built (Mezirow, 1991). In *exploration*, students are encouraged to try new tasks on their own (Collins et al., 1989).

Sequence. The cognitive apprenticeship model holds that learning should be arranged in such a way that the learners build the multiple skills required in expert performance and discover the conditions under which they apply. This requires engaging in increasingly complex tasks, and diverse problem-solving situations (Collins et al., 1989).

Group Interaction. Both the cognitive apprenticeship model and perspective transformation theory place emphasis on the promotion of group interactions. In the cognitive apprenticeship component of *sociology*, students are encouraged to work together to solve problems. Brown et al. (1989) view the notion of sociology essential, because in the real world, people have to work with others. As Berryman (1991) explained "The learning environment should reproduce the technological, social, time, and motivational characteristics of real world situations where what is being learned will be used" (p. 4). This researcher assumed that group interaction is even more necessary in contexts like the course in this study where the main purpose is to develop the skill of working with others who are different. Two salient purposes of cohesive group interaction in transformative learning contexts are fostering transformative learning through learner support and promoting transformative learning through critical questioning (challenge). It is also suggested in the literature that students' self-regulated learning is enhanced through group interaction in cooperative learning (McKeachie, 1999; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989). As explained earlier, the collaborative learning processes inherent in case-based instruction were expected to enhance students' self-regulation skills (Ertmer et al., 1996).

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the present study was to compare the effectiveness of case-based instruction and traditional lecture-discussions in enhancing students' multicultural social work competence. Competence was defined as a practitioner's appropriate use of attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to engage in an effective social work practice with persons from different cultural backgrounds than his/her own. A secondary purpose of this study was to compare the two methods of teaching in terms of increasing students' levels of self-regulation to learn multicultural social work as well as to determine whether there is an interaction between levels of student self-regulation and method of instruction.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Empirical Literature

Case-based instruction has a long history of use and its application is increasing in several professional fields. Theoretical support for the utilization and the value of case-based instruction is abundant. Nonetheless, empirical evidence of the effectiveness of case-based instruction is limited but growing. In this review, research on case-based instruction is organized according to its use in the professions: business, teacher education, medicine. In the following review, the studies from each professional field are organized according to their primary foci or main themes. The reviewed studies examine several themes which reflect the purposes for the use of case-based instruction discussed in the previous chapter. These themes are: (1) application of theories and/or principles; (2) problem solving; (3) decision making; (4) higher order thinking; (5) attitudes toward the subject matter/ course content; (6) attitudes toward case-based instruction; (7) self-regulation; and (8) sensitivity toward issues of diversity. It is important to note that there is not a definition of these constructs in many of the studies reviewed below. These terms will be used in this review as employed in the respective studies, with definitions when they have been provided. Obviously, these themes are not mutually exclusive. A brief evaluative comment is made about each study, pointing out its salient strengths and deficiencies. A summary of the findings of the reviewed studies under each field is then presented. Finally, an overall synthesis of results yielded by the reviewed studies is discussed.

Research on Case-Based Instruction in Business Education

Research on case-based instruction in business education has been almost entirely quantitative. The seven studies reviewed here examined decision-making, application of concepts, attitudes toward course content, and attitudes toward case-based instruction.

Decision-Making

To investigate the relative effectiveness of case-based instruction in teaching business decision-making, McDonald (1976) compared it with experiential learning. The two methods of instruction were compared on: (1) change in attitude toward course concepts, and (2) satisfaction/perceived learning. McDonald used a pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design. There were 40 subjects in the study. He found no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

In another quasi-experimental study in a business decision-making course, McKenney (1962) compared the use of business games to case-based instruction. Subjects were ninety students enrolled in a business decision-making course. One section of the course was taught via case-based instruction, while the other was taught by a business game. The dependent variable was knowledge of three business decision-making concepts measured with written examinations before and after treatment sessions. McKenney found that the business game was significantly better than case-based instruction in supporting the learning of (1) the planning aspect of business decision-making, and (2) interrelationships of different business functions within a firm.

Both of these studies have numerous methodological flaws. Most notably, in both studies, no information has been provided about the reliability and validity issues regarding whether: (a) the instruments used to measure the dependent variables were

valid and reliable; (b) instructor effects were controlled; and (c) Hawthorne effects were unlikely.

In a causal-comparative study, Painchaud (1985) attempted to determine whether case-based instruction influenced the decision-making processes of top-level executives. Painchaud divided the 77 subjects according to whether they had undergone case-based instruction. In interviewing the participants, Painchaud investigated 22 modifiers of the managerial decision-making process. Painchaud found no difference between those executives exposed to the case method and those who had not been exposed to it.

In conclusion, the three studies investigating the effects of case-based instruction on fostering decision-making abilities produced negative results. Specifically, in the McDonald study, no significant difference was found between case-based instruction and experiential learning in this regard, while business games were found to be superior to case-based instruction in McKenney's study. In Painchaud's study, no significant difference was found between those who underwent case-based instruction and those who did not.

Application of Concepts

In one of two studies concerned with application of concepts, Watson (1975) compared the relative effectiveness of lecture and case-based instruction in supporting two types of learning: knowledge and understanding, and the ability to apply various management topics. The study also compared the effect of the two methods on students' perception of the learning climate, the course content, and the instructor. Study participants were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory management course which had three sections. Two of these sections were taught through case-based

instruction. There were 35 and 38 students in these two sections. There were 44 students

in the third section which was taught through lecture. The same instructor taught all

sections. Learning was measured through two examinations, one conducted halfway

through the semester and the other, at the end of the course. Student reactions to the

course and to the instructor were elicited through a questionnaire. Study results suggested

that. as compared with the lecture group, learners in both groups taught through case-

based instruction showed more knowledge and understanding of communication, one of

the course topics. Students in both case-based instruction groups demonstrated

significantly more ability to apply management principles and concepts in goal-setting,

leadership, motivation, leadership, communication, and change than those in the lecture

group. However, the two methods were equally effective in teaching knowledge and

understanding of goals, decision-making, organization, leadership, motivation and

change. Watson found no significant difference between the two methods of instruction,

in terms of the students' reactions to the course or the professor.

Although Watson's (1975) study is one of the most rigorous studies conducted to

compare case-based instruction to other methods of instruction, it has significant

deficiencies. One main liability of this study which might have influenced its results is

the lack of known validity and reliability of the examinations and the questionnaires used

to measure the dependent variables. Also, instructor effects were not controlled since the

same instructor taught all groups.

This study also illustrates one of the controversies surrounding what constitutes

case-based instruction. In business education, there is no case-based instruction without

discussion. This explains why Watson (1975) considered students in the lecture section

who read and listened to the instructor's lecture on cases, as the control group. (The cases used in both the lecture and cased based instruction groups were the same). However, other authors hold that discussion is important but not a condition for case-based instruction. For example, Argyris (1985) considers any teaching method in which cases are used as case-based instruction. Shulman (1992) argued that the instructional power of some cases is inherent in their content rather than how they are used. From this perspective, Watson compared two forms of case-based instruction, one with discussion and the other without discussion (See also Levin, 1995).

In another study, Fox (1963) examined the effects of case-based instruction on the learning of students in applying human relations concepts. Students (n=312) were asked to analyze the same case both at the beginning and at the end of a personnel administration course. The written case analyses were graded on content and development of ideas. Although no statistical analyses were conducted, Fox concluded that one-third of the subjects showed substantial improvement, one-third showed moderate improvement, and one-third little or no improvement.

Although this study has apparent strengths, causal relationship cannot conclusively be claimed between the case-based instruction and the results of student case analyses. This study used case analysis as a measure of the dependent variable of interest. This approach is more valid for measuring what is learned from case-based instruction, as compared to multiple choice examination (which was often used in this line of research). Fox also employed a very large sample, which is another asset. However, what really affected student performance on the case analyses is unknown since this was not a controlled study.

In summary, these two studies on the application of business concepts produced

inconsistent results. Watson's study points toward positive effects of case-based

instruction on the enhancement of student abilities of applying business concepts. On the

other hand, in the Fox study, there were as many students who showed no improvement

on their application skills after taking a case-based course as those who demonstrated

substantial improvement.

Attitudes

To examine the relative effectiveness of case-based instruction in influencing

attitude change, Fisher (1972) compared case-based instruction with a reading/discussion

method. The study participants were 36 college and university deans and vice presidents.

Eighteen participants were in the case-based group and another 18 in the

reading/discussion group. The two groups were compared on attitudes toward policy in

higher education. Participants' pre-experiment and post-experiment attitudes were

recorded. Fisher concluded that case-based instruction changed the attitudes and beliefs

of the participants significantly more than the reading/discussion method did.

Two studies surveyed reactions to case-based instruction. Orlansky (1987)

investigated the attitudes of the graduates (from 1960-1980) of a business school toward

the case-based instruction curriculum. He used a Likert-type scale questionnaire to elicit

information. He reported that the graduates were generally satisfied with their education

through case-based instruction and thought that the time and effort spent in learning with

case-based instruction were worthwhile. In the other study, Carroll, Paine, and

Ivancevich (1972) probed the opinions of training directors in major corporations on the

effectiveness of case-based instruction and eight other methods of teaching. The

respondents were asked to rank the teaching methods in the following areas: knowledge acquisition, attitude change, problem-solving skill development, interpersonal skill development, participant acceptance, and knowledge retention. Case-based instruction was the only method which ranked in the top four for all of the above learning outcomes. However it should be noted that these studies were surveys of opinions with the limitations of that type of design.

In the reviewed literature so far, positive attitudes toward case-based instruction and the content taught is the most consistent advantage to case-based instruction. Both Orlansky and Carroll et al. (1972) reported positive reactions to case-based instruction. Fisher reported that the advantage to case-based instruction was it positively influenced attitudes toward policy in higher education, as compared to lecture and discussions. However, McDonald (1976) did not find case-based instruction significantly better than experiential learning in influencing attitudes toward course concepts.

Research on Case-Based Instruction in Teacher Education

Research on case-based instruction has been conducted in teacher education within the frameworks of both the confirmatory and interpretive modes of inquiry. The nine studies reviewed below examined problem solving, higher order thinking, attitudes toward the taught content, attitude toward case-based instruction, and sensitivity to issues of diversity.

Problem-Solving

Tillman (1993) compared case-based instruction to lecture/discussion in enhancing preservice teachers' problem-solving abilities. The two methods of instruction were also compared on (1) achievement on a measure of course content (measured

through multiple choice questions, matching, and open-ended questions); (2) opinions

about mainstreaming (measured through a questionnaire); and (3) perceptions of learning

in the course (measured through a questionnaire). Tillman employed the pretest-posttest

non-equivalent control group design. In one section of the course, students (n=21)

worked in small groups to solve problem cases. Study participants in the other section

(n=30) were taught with a traditional lecture/discussion method. The same instructor

taught both sections. Tillman found that the group taught by the case method exhibited

more mature problem-solving abilities. The study results also revealed that there was no

statistically significant difference between the groups in course content achievement. The

treatment group supported full-time mainstreaming to a greater extent, as compared to the

control group. Course evaluation results demonstrated no statistically significant

difference between the two groups in course satisfaction.

In the second study, Kleinfield (1991) compared case-based instruction to

discussion of readings in terms of students' abilities to analyze professional problems.

Kleinfield also compared the impact of case-based instruction with young and older

students. Fifty-four students enrolled in an undergraduate foundations course formed the

study sample. All study participants attended a weekly lecture until they were assigned to

either a case-based section or a section of the course taught via discussion of readings.

Kleinfield concluded that case-based instruction increased students' abilities to identify

issues in problematic situations, analyze educational dilemmas in sophisticated ways, and

identify alternatives for action. There was no difference in the usefulness of the case

method for the young and older students. As well, there was no statistically significant

difference between the methods of instruction in terms of student attitude.

Kleinfield's (1991) and Tillman's (1993) studies suffer from similar methodological weaknesses. One of the main factors that might have jeopardized the internal validity of the studies is the possibility of the Hawthorne effect. Another uncontrolled threat was that subjects in the treatment and control groups might have differed in attributes that could have influenced the results. This is a possibility since the subjects were not randomly assigned to the two conditions. Further, since the same instructor taught the two groups, instructor practice effects were not controlled for.

In a more rigorous study, James (1991) compared case-based instruction to a traditional lecture/discussion method in terms of students' ability to analyze problems in behaviour management. Other dependent variables of interest were: (1) knowledge of behaviour management principles; (2) attitude toward behaviour management; and (3) reaction to the pedagogical methods. In addition, James investigated interactions between the two methods of instruction and the student characteristic of complexity of thinking. The study was a pretest-posttest control group design. Thirty-one students were assigned randomly to either of the two conditions. Two instructors who both had experience in teaching with case-based instruction and the traditional lecture/discussion method alternated teaching each group over the six week study period. The case-based instruction group demonstrated significantly more positive attitude toward using systematic approach to behaviour management as compared to the lecture/discussion group. This was the only statistically significant difference between the two groups.

The James study is one of the most rigorously designed and thorough studies in this line of research. However, there are still uncontrolled and possibly confounding variables. Although this study seems to be the only one in this line of research in which

an attempt was made to control for instructor effects, there is no evidence that the two alternating instructors did implement the two methods equally and according to the plan. Another strength which is rarely found in this line of research is the random assignment of participants to the treatment and control conditions. However, James reported that assignment to the conditions was not fully random since she made sure that the three experienced subjects were divided equally between the case-based and the traditional lecture/discussion sections.

These research findings on the impact of case-based instruction on learner problem solving are not consistent. Tillman (1993) found that the group taught via case-based instruction demonstrated more problem solving abilities, as compared to the lecture/discussion group. Similarly, Kleinfeld (1991) concluded that students in the case-based instruction group exhibited higher problem analysis abilities, as compared to the discussion group. In contrast, James (1991) did not find a significant difference in student problem analysis skills between students who underwent case-based instruction and those who experienced lecture/discussions. Although one might intuitively tend to give more weight to the two studies with the consistent results, it should be reiterated that the James study is much more rigorously conducted than the Tillman and Kleinfeld studies.

Higher Order Thinking

Levin (1995) compared two versions of case-based instruction: reading and writing about a case, versus reading, writing, and discussing it. The two approaches were compared on the development of teachers' thinking. Levin also compared the two versions of case-based instruction on what teachers with different amounts of experience in teaching learn. The study used non-randomized pretest-posttest control group design.

Study participants were 24 elementary school teachers with different teaching experience (eight student teachers, eight beginning teachers, and eight experienced teachers). Both groups read and wrote about the same case. Two days later, the experimental group discussed the same case, but the control group did not discuss it. A few days later, both groups wrote another analysis of the same case. One month later, both groups wrote an analysis of a different but comparable case. To measure change in the teachers' thinking, both quantitative and qualitative analyses were used. All written case analyses of all participants were quantified using a holistic scoring system. Higher scores represented "discrimination, differentiation, integration, interpersonal maturity, independence of ideas, creativity, flexibility, consideration of more alternatives, and tolerance for ambiguity." (p. 67). These case analyses were also qualitatively analyzed, using the constant comparative method. The case discussions were video and audio-taped and discourse analysis was used in the analysis of this data. Analysis of the quantitative data demonstrated that the group of teachers who discussed the case scored significantly higher on the holistic scoring rubric as compared to the group who did not. There was no significant difference between the teachers with different levels of experience in their levels of thinking about the second analysis of the first case. However, there was a main effect for level of experience in the second case, but not for group. There was not a significant interaction. The qualitative results revealed that the thinking of teachers with different levels of experience was enhanced in different ways through case discussions. For the experienced teachers discussion seemed to have promoted metacognition. For the beginning and student teachers, case discussion seems to have helped them clarify and/or elaborate specific issues in the case. In contrast, the thinking of teachers with various

levels of experience did not benefit much from just reading and writing about the case. Teachers who did not discuss the case reiterated their previous thinking, instead of enhancing their perspective on the issues in the case.

One of the shortcomings of this study lies in the instrument used to measure the dependent variable. Since the holistic scoring rubric was specifically developed for this study, the procedures involved in its development and validation should have been described. No validity and reliability information was provided. Other possible threats to the internal validity of the study include: experimental diffusion (i.e., the possibility that the control group members also discussed the cases) and the Hawthorne effect. The role of the researcher is also unclear. For example, did the researcher facilitate the discussions? The triangulation of the quantitative results with the qualitative data, however, makes up for some of these inadequacies.

In an interpretive study, Harrington (1995) investigated whether dilemma-based cases could be used to understand student teachers' reasoning. Twenty-six students in an undergraduate course on teaching in elementary schools took part in the study. The course covered the four aspects of education: schools and society, teaching, curriculum, and ethics. Students were required to analyze four cases which match these themes. Students were asked to identify and discuss (a) the issues in the case, (b) how they would prioritize these issues, (c) what was the case, a case of, (d) how different perspectives might inform the interpretation of the case, (e) what the educator's solution should be, (f) what the possible consequences of that solution might be, and (g) how they would critique their solutions and analysis. Students were particularly required to substantiate their recommendations, demonstrate consideration of other perspectives, discuss

consequences, and critique their analysis. The first student case analysis (due at the end of the first month) and the last case analysis (due during the fifteenth week) were used as the primary source of data in this study. Through multiple passes of students' written case analyses, an analytic framework was developed. Harrington found that the majority of students were able to do what was asked of them over the course of the semester. She concluded that case-based instruction cannot only enable us to gain insight into students' professional reasoning, but it might also be used to foster that reasoning.

Harrington's study is interesting in that it describes the developmental nature of students' professional reasoning. However, due to its design limitations, the study cannot establish conclusively whether there is a causal relationship between case pedagogy and the development of student reasoning. Also, the format of the course other than the four cases analyses is unclear. Therefore, what enhanced the reasoning of the majority of students is not apparent.

In summary, the studies of Harrington (1995) and Levin (1995) present descriptions of how students' cognitive abilities might develop through case-based instruction. Despite the apparent design limitations and delimitations of these studies, their idiographic approach does begin to give a partial picture of the phenomenon of the development of higher order thinking through case-based instruction.

Attitudes

Butler (1966) compared case-based instruction to lecture/discussion in teaching a social foundations course. Students enrolled in the course (n=47) were assigned to one of two sections. One section was taught by the case method throughout the semester and the other was taught with lecture/discussion. The two methods of instruction were compared

on beliefs about certain social and educational issues covered in the course. Butler also investigated whether the two methods of instruction differed in their interaction with the subjects' attributes of scholastic aptitude and gender. Butler used a pretest post non-equivalent control group design. The case-based instruction was found to be superior to lecture/discussions.

In teacher education, research examining the effect of case-based instruction on student attitudes has produced mixed results. Tillman (1993), James (1991), and Butler (1966) found advantages for case-based instruction in fostering the development of positive learner attitudes toward the content taught. In contrast, Kleinfeld (1991) did not find any significant difference between case-based instruction and discussions in terms of student attitudes toward course content. Similarly, James (1991) found that there was no significant difference between case-based instruction and the lecture/discussion method in terms of impact on student reactions to these methods of instruction.

Sensitivity to Diversity Issues

Three studies examined the use of case-based instruction in multicultural education. The studies focused on the use of case-based instruction to help students address issues of diversity in the classrooms.

In a teacher education course, Dana and Floyd (1993) examined how preservice teachers make sense of diversity. A case narrative on cultural diversity was read aloud to four classes of 20 to 30 student teachers. The case described a child diagnosed as learning disabled and contained contexual information about the child's cultural background. Individual student reactions to the case were tape recorded. Students were then arranged in small groups to role play and discuss the case. Dana and Floyd concluded that case

discussions may give students an opportunity to understand their own beliefs and biases and how these subjectivities may affect instruction in multicultural contexts. Dana and Floyd claimed that they used the constant comparative method but they did not provide themes that had emerged from the analysis.

J. Shulman's (1992b) study investigated ways in which a case-based seminar about cultural diversity could offer special opportunities for cross-cultural learning and what difficulties accompanied this approach. Shulman focused on changes in attitudes, changes in behaviour, and responses to the case-based approach. Sources of data were questionnaires, interviews and tape recorded discussions. Shulman concluded that teachers exhibited enhanced sensitivity toward multicultural issues as well as an increased awareness of their personal biases. Changes in behaviour were not as clear since only two teachers reported that they changed their teaching approaches on the basis of what they had learned from the seminar. Shulman provided two cautionary conclusions. First was the necessity for a safe environment. In Shulman's study, two teachers actually left the seminar because they could not deal with the emotionally tense case discussions. Secondly, if facilitators need to confront attitudes or ideas, it needs to be done in a constructive manner.

Sudzina (1993) compared case-based instruction and cooperative learning in helping preservice teachers address multicultural issues. Preservice teachers (n=17) enrolled in an educational psychology course each orally presented and discussed a case in class. In another educational psychology course, preservice teachers (n=39) were organized into cooperative learning groups. The two groups were given the same final exam. Sudzina concluded that the case-based instruction increased understanding of

multicultural issues and provided them an opportunity to express their personal experiences, concerns, and commitment to successfully teach all students.

Research examining the use of case-based instruction in sensitization of teachers to issues of diversity is consistent in its results. Both Shulman (1992b) and Dana and Floyd (1993) concluded that case-based instruction might offer opportunities for preservice teachers to learn about their own assumptions and biases and how these subjectivities might affect instruction in multicultural contexts. Similarly, Sudzina (1993) found that case-based instruction gave students a chance to express their experiences and concerns. However, Sudzina's conclusion that case-based instruction increased student understanding of multicultural issues is unsupported by the data. There is no evidence that the two compared classes were not different before undergoing instruction.

Summary of Case-Based Instruction Research in Teacher Education

Interpretive research on case-based instruction in teacher education has produced fairly consistent findings. The studies of Harrington (1995) and Levin (1995) demonstrated how students' cognitive abilities might develop through case-based instruction. Whereas, Shulman (1992b) and Dana and Floyd (1993), and Sudzina (1993)) found that case-based instruction might offer opportunities for preservice teachers to learn about their own assumptions and biases and how these subjectivities might affect instruction in multicultural contexts.

However, as in business education, confirmatory studies on case-based instruction in teacher education have produced mixed results. Tillman (1993) and Kleinfeld (1991) found advantage for case-based instruction in promoting problem solving abilities, as compared to the lecture/discussion group. In contrast, James (1991) did not find a

significant difference between students who followed case-based instruction and those

who experienced lecture/discussions in terms of their problem analyses skills. As

concerns student attitudes, Tillman (1993), James (1991), and Butler (1966) found

advantage for case-based instruction in fostering the development of positive learner

attitudes toward the content taught. In contrast, Kleinfeld (1991) did not find a significant

difference between case-based and discussion instruction in terms of student attitudes

toward course content. Similarly, James (1991) found that there was no significant

difference between case-based instruction and the lecture/discussion method in terms of

impact on student reactions to these methods of instruction.

Research on Case-Based Instruction in Medical Education

In one of the most recent studies on case-based instruction, Ertmer, Newby, and

McDougal (1996) examined how students with high and low levels of self-regulation

responded to and approached learning from case-based instruction. Nine study

participants were selected from 58 veterinary students enrolled in a biochemistry

laboratory. The nine subjects were selected on the basis of their scores on the Motivated

Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (Pintrich, Smith, and Garcia, & McKeachie, 1991;

1993) and the Self-regulated learning inventory (Linder & Harris, 1992). These nine

students were interviewed three times during the semester to investigate their original and

changing responses and approaches to case-based instruction. The interview data were

analyzed through the constant comparative approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Ertmer et

al. described changes in student responses to case-based instruction in terms of the

motivational components: interest in case-based instruction, value perceived in case-

based instruction, and confidence in learning from this method. Changes in approaches to

case-based instruction were described in terms of student goal orientations, evaluation

lenses, levels of self-awareness, openness to challenges, and perceived levels of relevant

knowledge. Ertmer et al. found that all of the study participants with high levels of self-

regulation started with and sustained positive attitudes toward case-based instruction. It

seemed that their confidence was shaken only when cases involved unfamiliar diseases or

animals. The four students with low levels of self-regulation started with a limited

perception of the value of case-based instruction and were less confident in their case

analyses. By midway through the course, these students had gained in confidence and had

started to see greater relevance in case-based instruction. However, by the end of the

semester, their confidence and motivation for learning from cases declined once more. By

the end of the semester, students with high levels of self-regulation had broadened their

evaluative lenses (enhanced perspectives), and adopted process goals. In contrast, the

approaches of students with low self-regulation fluctuated. However, the majority made

gains. As admitted by Ertmer et al., the results of this study must be considered tentative

due to design limitations.

Summary of Research Comparing Case-Based Instruction and Lecture

Five studies in professional education compared the effectiveness of lecture or

lecture-discussion to case-based instruction in promoting problem solving, application of

principles, problem analysis, and positive attitudes toward the subject matter.

Specifically, one study in business education (Watson, 1975) found that case-based

instruction was superior to the lecture method in fostering the enhancement of students'

ability to apply business principles. In a study in the field of teacher education, Tillman

(1993) found advantages for case-based instruction, as compared to lecture/discussion

instruction, in the enhancement of preservice teachers' problem solving abilities as well as their positive attitudes toward the subject matter. In another study in teacher education, James (1991) found that the case-based instruction group demonstrated significantly more positive attitude toward the subject matter, as compared to the lecture/discussion group. No significant difference was found between the two instructional methods in promoting problem analysis. Finally, Butler (1966) found that case-based instruction was superior to lecture/discussions in promoting positive attitudes toward the content of a course on social foundations in education.

In summary, all of the studies comparing the effectiveness of case-based instruction to lecture-discussion in promoting positive attitudes toward the subject matter (Butler; 1966; James, 1991; Tillman, 1993) found case-based instruction to be superior. Two of the three studies which examined enhancing student cognitive skills (Tillman, 1993; Watson, 1975) found advantage for case-based instruction.

Overall Summary of Research on Case-Based Instruction

Only the common factors of the reviewed research across the professions will be summarized here. Methodological shortcomings common to most of the reviewed studies will be briefly discussed in this section. Interestingly, all the themes of interest in this study (except learner attitudes) including decision making, application of concepts, problem solving abilities, higher order thinking, self-regulation, and sensitivity toward issues of diversity, were exclusively studied in one profession or in another. Therefore, results about these themes will not be reiterated here since they were summarized under each profession.

Attitudes toward methods of instruction and course content were the only themes of interest to the present study which were examined in more than one profession. In total, four studies in business education (Fisher, 1972) and in teacher education (Butler, 1966; James, 1991; Tillman, 1993) reported an advantage for case-based instruction in positively influencing the content taught, as compared to other forms of instruction. Only one study in business education (McDonald, 1976) and another study in teacher education (Kleinfeld, 1991) did not find superiority of case-based instruction in this regard. Two studies in business education (Carroll et al., 1972; Orlansky, 1987) reported more positive reactions to case-based instruction, as compared to other forms of instruction, while one study in teacher education (James, 1991) did not find any advantage for case-based instruction in this regard.

In conclusion, there are several possible explanations for the mixed results produced by research conducted in different professions to compare case-based instruction to other methods of instruction. First, most of the quasi-experimental studies have serious design flaws which jeopardize any causal relationship between the methods of instruction and the dependent variables. The most striking design weaknesses were instructor effects not controlled for, the use of instruments with unknown validity and reliability properties, and the often non-equivalent samples in the experimental and control groups. Second, attribute-treatment interaction was not examined in most of the studies. Finally, in most of the studies, no description was given about how case-based instruction was implemented and what kinds of cases were used. It is a possibility that different forms of case-based instruction and different kinds of cases are simply not the same in their effectiveness.

Research Questions

The following research questions were considered in the present study:

1. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' overall multicultural social work competence?

2. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' levels of multicultural social work awareness?

3. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' levels of multicultural social work knowledge?

4. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' levels of multicultural skills?

5. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' levels of multicultural relationship?

6. Is there any significant interaction between the method of instruction (case-based instruction vs. traditional lecture-discussion) and students' levels of self-regulation in relation to multicultural competence?

7. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' self-regulated learning in relation to the course?

8. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' motivation to learn the course content?

9. Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than the lecture-discussion in terms of enhancing students' course-related learning strategies?

Significance of the Study

The present study contributes to the much needed empirical evidence on case-based instruction. Burger (1992), McKeachie (1994), and Shulman (1992) highlight the long history of application of case-based instruction, its potential in professional education and the striking lack of empirical evidence to support this assertion. In particular, the study results can inform the use of case-based instruction in cross-cultural social work. In addition, the study makes theoretical contributions because an innovative model of teaching cross-cultural competence through a case-based instruction framework which integrates the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of transformative learning is used for the first time.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Participants

Study participants were undergraduate social work students enrolled in the course entitled *Cross-Cultural Perspectives in Social Work Practice* in a Canadian research university. The course is required for all students in the Bachelor of Social Work program (BSW). The course is taught to students in two different classes. In one class, students are enrolled in the Special Bachelor of Social Work program (SBSW). Sixty-seven students who already had another Bachelor's degree were enrolled in this class. Forty-two students in this class agreed to participate in the present study. Two participants did not complete the posttest and their records were thus dropped from the analyses. In the other class, forty five students who do not have a Bachelor's degree were enrolled in the regular Bachelor's of Social Work program (RBSW). Thirty-nine students from this class volunteered to participate in this study, but one student in the experimental section dropped out. Due to this random attrition, 20 participants each in the case-based instruction and the lecture-discussion sections in the SBSW class and 19 participants each in the experimental and the comparison conditions in the RBSW class were included.

Table 1 depicts the demographic characteristics of the study participants from the SBSW and RBSW classes. The main difference between the students in the two classes is in their level of education. All of the students in the SBSW class had already obtained their bachelor's degree in the social sciences, but none of their counterparts in the RBSW had a bachelor's degree. In addition, 15% of the SBSW students had Masters degrees. The two classes also differed in their mean age (M=25.55, SD=7.34 in the RBSW class;

M=29.45, SD=6.74 in the SBSW class). Note also that the SBSW class had higher mean

GPA than the RSBSW class (M=3.35, SD=.33 in the RBSW class; M=3.65, SD=.25 in

the SBSW class).

Table 1

Demographic features of the experimental and the control groups in the 2 classes

| Demographic Feature | RBSW (N=38) | | | | SBSW (N=40) | | | |
| | Case (n=19) | | Lecture (n=19) | | Case (n=20) | | Lecture (n=20) | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender								
Female	16	47	18	53	18	56	14	44
Male	3	75	1	25	2	25	6	75
Age								
30 years or less	18	58	13	42	13	52	12	48
more than 30 years	1	14	6	86	7	47	8	53
Minority/Majority								
Charter Groups	8	42	11	58	9	60	6	40
Visible Minority	9	64	5	36	7	41	10	49
Non-Visible Minority	2	40	3	60	4	50	4	4
Who immigrated to Canada?	7	54	6	46	11	52	10	48
Participant or parents	12	48	13	52	9	48	10	52
Grand parents or before								
Social Work Experience								
3 years or less	14	45	14	45	5	33	10	67
more than 3 years	5	71	5	71	15	60	10	40
GPA								
3.3 or less	11	65	11	65	0	0	2	100
more than 3.3	8	38	8	38	20	53	18	47

Instrumentation

The Cross-Cultural Counselling Inventory Revised (CCCI-R; Lafromboise,

Colemena, & Hernandez, 1991) and the Multicultural Counselling Inventory (MCI;

Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) were used to measure participants' levels of cross-cultural social work competence. The instruments are conceptually drawn from a position paper by the Education and Training Committee of the Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association (Sue et al., 1982). Below is a description of the psychometric properties of each instrument and results of pilot research conducted to assess their validity for this study.

The Cross-Cultural Counselling Inventory Revised (CCCI-R)[4]

Lafromboise et al. (1991) developed the CCCI-R "to meet the need for explicit assessment of counselling effectiveness with culturally diverse clients." (p. 381). Using a 6-point Likert-type format (1 = strongly agree, 6 = strongly disagree) evaluators rate the extent to which the CCCI-R items describe the practitioner being evaluated. The 20 items of the instrument were developed to reflect the three dimensions of cross-cultural competence proposed by Sue et al. (1982): cross-cultural awareness, cross-cultural knowledge, and cross-cultural skills. The following are examples of items from each of these components: (a) awareness—"counsellor is aware of how own values might affect the client"; (b) knowledge—"counsellor demonstrates knowledge about client's culture"; and (c) skills—"counselor is willing to suggest referral when cultural differences are extensive." The instrument developers recommend that only its total score be used.

The CCCI-R has sound validity and reliability. Lafromboise et al. (1991) reported a coefficient alpha of .95 and inter-rater reliability of .78. It should be noted however, that the CCCI-R was previously validated on counselors' video taped performances. Although the wording of the CCCI-R is clearly appropriate for rating a clinician's written performance, there may be some difference between a video taped and a written cross-

cultural competence performance. Therefore, this researcher investigated the appropriateness of using the CCCI-R for this study as explained below.

There is evidence that CCCI-R is also appropriate for scoring case analyses. An initial validation pilot research was conducted during the Winter Semester, 1997, to assess the suitability of CCCI-R for rating written case analyses. To assess the interrater reliability of the CCCI-R when used for rating written case analyses, 21 students were asked to analyze a case reflecting multicultural social work content. Following the case, four questions eliciting responses reflecting the content of the CCCI-R were asked in writing. Using the CCCI-R, the case analyses were then rated by the researcher and the instructor in this study. The interrater reliability was .79. In addition, this researcher rated all 21 case analyses again after 15 days and an intrarater reliability of .91 was obtained. In the present study, a random sample of 10 case analyses were selected from each class and were rated by the researcher and another content expert, who was not the other instructor of the course. The expert read a conceptual article pertaining to the CCCI-R and was trained in rating case analyses using the CCCI-R. An interrater reliability of .82 was found for the SBSW class and .85 for the RBSW class.

The Multicultural Counselling Inventory (MCI)

In addition to the CCCI-R, the Multicultural Counselling Inventory (MCI)(Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) was used to measure cross-cultural social work competence. The MCI is a self-report questionnaire which measures cross-cultural competence. In addition to the three dimensions of multicultural competence proposed by Sue et al. (1982), the MCI contains a fourth dimension: cross-cultural relationship. The MCI is composed of 40 statements and uses 4-point Likert-type scale to show the extent

---

[4] The CCCI-R and the MCI are not appended here because they are copyrighted materials.

to which respondents believe that these statements characterize their work as clinicians.

There is evidence that the MCI has good reliability and validity. Specifically, Sodowsky

et al. (1994) reported an internal consistent coefficient alpha of .90 for the total scale. A

complete review of the validation studies is provided by the authors. Nonetheless, like all

other instruments recently proposed to measure cross-cultural competence, the MCI has

not been validated on undergraduate social work students.

To establish the validity of the MCI for the participants in the present study, the

MCI was administered to students in the BSW and SBSW classes during the winter 1997

semester. Students were asked to comment on the clarity and relevance of the items. On

the basis of student comments only minor editorial changes were made to adapt the MCI

to the Canadian context. Item 25 was changed to "I have a working understanding of

certain cultures including *Native*[5], *West Indian, Chinese and some of the* new Third

World Immigrants." Item 27 was changed to "When working with immigrants, I

understand the importance of the legalities *of landing, passport, work permit, and*

citizenship." These changes made the wording of these two items more relevant to the

sample in the present study and did not affect the essence of the instrument (Sodowsky,

January 1998, personal communication). The researcher believes that the use of both

CCCI-R and the MCI enhanced the overall validity of cross-cultural competence

measurement in this study.

The Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)[6]

Levels of students' self-regulation were measured using the Motivated Strategies

for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, & McKeachie, 1991). The

---

[5] Italics reflect additions for this study.
[6] See Appendix I.

MSLQ is a self-administered instrument designed to measure post-secondary students' motivational orientations and use of learning strategies in a particular course. The 7-point Likert-type scale (1= not at all true of me to 7=very true of me) instrument consists of 81 items, with 15 subscales measuring the two sections of motivation and learning strategies. In turn, the learning strategies section consists of two sections, cognitive and metacognitive strategies and resource management. The motivation component of MSLQ is composed of six subscales measuring students' goals and beliefs about the value of a course, test anxiety, and beliefs about their abilities to succeed in the course. The cognitive and metacognitive section consists of five subscales assessing students' use of such strategies as elaboration, rehearsal, and organization. Finally, resource management comprises four subscales regarding management of external resources. Printrich et al. (1991) reported coefficient alphas ranging between .52 and .93 for the MSLQ scales.

Design

Pretest-posttest control group design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) was used in this study. Each of the BSW and the SBWS classes was divided into two sections (case-based and lecture), creating four sections in all. Students in each class were randomly assigned to one of these two sections of case-based instruction (the experimental group), and lecture-discussions (the comparison group). The same course content was taught in both sections (see Table 2 below). This random assignment did not pose a problem of inconvenience for students since the two sections of each class was taught at the same time and as specified in the undergraduate course schedule. Randomization was achieved by giving a number taken from the a table of random numbers to each participant and then assigning them to the treatment or the comparison group randomly.

In order to control for instructor effects, the researcher and another instructor each taught the two sections (case-based instruction and lecture-discussion) of each class (RBSW and SBSW). From the first week through to the third week of the experiment, instructor A taught the SBSW lecture-discussion section and the RBSW case-based instruction section, while instructor B was teaching the case-based SBSW section and the lecture-discussion RBSW section (see Table 2 below). The two instructors then switched sections of each class from the fourth week to the eighth week. To foster continuity and reduce the possible negative effects of this alternations of instructors, this rotation was done at points where there was a natural break in the flow of the content. The two instructors followed mutually constructed class plans therefore each instructor knew what was covered by the other.

Table 2

Instructor alternations in teaching the experimental and comparison sections

	1st to 3rd Week				4th to 8th Week			
Instructor	SBSW		RBSW		SBSW		RBSW	
	CB[7]	LD[8]	CB	LD	CB	LD	CB	LD
A		X	X		X			X
B	X			X		X	X	

---

[7] CB represents the Case-Based Instruction Method

[8] LD represents the Lecture-Discussion Method

Procedure

In the present study, students' confidentiality and anonymity were ensured. Using the table of random numbers, code numbers equal to the number of students in the course were written on the instruments. At the beginning of the first class session, the instruments, the consent forms, and wallet-sized cards were distributed to all students in the class. Students were informed that participation was voluntary and that their decisions would not have any effect on their academic evaluation. They were asked to copy the code numbers on their cards and store them in their wallets as they would need their code number in the second phase of the study (if they decided to continue participating in the study). Students were asked to sign consent forms which were collected and kept separately from the response forms. They were then asked to complete the MCI and a background questionnaire as well as to analyze a multicultural case. The MSLQ was administered during the second week of the semester, to allow the students to get familiar with the course format (the MSLQ items are course-specific). Towards the end of the study, students were reminded to bring their code numbers for the posttest. The MCI and the MSLQ were administered this time. Students were asked to analyze the same multicultural case as in the pretest. To reduce the possibility of Hawthorne effect and experimental diffusion, it was explained to the students that the whole class would be taught through both methods of instruction after the end of the experiment.

These arrangements were made to ensure student anonymity for several reasons. For one thing, cross-cultural social work is a sensitive topic for some; therefore, such guarantee of anonymity might affect how some students respond. For another, the

researcher recognizes the student-instructor power relationship and its potential impact on student responses.

The treatment and the comparison sections of each class in the course shared several aspects. First, in both the case-based and the lecture-discussion sections, an effort was made to provide a safe environment for students. Students were encouraged to express their ideas freely, as long as they respected the ground rules which were established in the first day of class. These rules were: (a) mutual respect, (b) listening without interruption, and (b) appreciation of different opinions (see J. Shulman, 1991). Second, readings in the course package and assignment one were the same in the two sections. In addition to the overall planing of the course which started a few months before the study, the instructors met each week to plan each class. The class plans entailed the identification of the intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and allotting time for each block of activity.

The Case-Based Instruction Model

This model integrates the cognitive apprenticeship model (Collins et al., 1989) with some of the principles of transformative learning theory. The model of case-based instruction in the cross-cultural social work course is described below in terms of cases, role of the facilitator and the students, and class format.

Teaching cases. The multicultural social work cases used in this study have the following characteristics. They are narratives with a beginning, middle, and end (Shulman, 1992). They include a character of a client or client (s) facing problems to be addressed by a social worker. The client(s) described in the case belongs to a minority culture in Canada. They are not too long or too complex that they create cognitive

overload for the student problem solvers (Shulman, 1992). They are authentic. In other

words, the cases are either real cases in which the characters are disguised to provide

anonymity or fictional cases which are typical of the kind of cases that social service

practitioners might encounter in the field (see Grossman, 1992). Six of the cases used in

this study were developed by the teaching team of the course Cross-Cultural Perspectives

in Social Work Practice which has been the context of the study (See Appendices B and

E for copies of these cases). The three remaining cases were the Smith case, the

Colombian case, and case 9 published in Sowers-Hoag and Sandau-Beckler (1996),

Herberg (1990), and Altamirano (1997), respectively.

The cases were sequenced in such a way as to meet learners' needs in their

different stages of learning, and according to the learning outcomes pursued in the

course. In other words, the cases were sequenced: (1) to increase complexity; (2) in a

logical manner to help learners see the interrelationships among concepts.

Class Format. Each section in the RBSW and SBSW classes started at 8:30 in the

morning and ended at 11:30. Students in each section were organized into small groups

of four to five. A case was distributed to all students one week in advance (except during

the first week of class). In each class, students were also given a 10 minutes to read the

case in class. After jotting down their individual reactions, students analyzed the case in

their small groups (group interaction). Instructors went around to help students while

they were discussing cases in small groups (coaching and scaffolding). This was followed

by a discussion of the whole class.

Roles of the students and the instructors. Roles of the instructors and the students

were based on the principles of the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of

transformative learning. Examples from the first class of the case sections (the Black Youth case, Appendix B) are provided below to illustrate how these theoretical principles were used to foster the development of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. However, it should be noted that the learning tasks and subsequently, the specific instructional activities slightly varied from one class to another, to respond to the changing student learning needs, as the study progressed. For example, students were given more modelling, coaching, and scaffolding in the first few classes to meet their learning needs because they were not clear about the strategies and kinds of declarative knowledge needed to assess and intervene with multicultural cases. However, as more cases were introduced throughout the study, the learning tasks also became more complex because several cases were compared and contrasted.

The main learning outcomes expected in this class were that students would be able to: (a) demonstrate beginning awareness about their assumptions in relation to the dynamics of power and racism; (b) discuss the concepts of power and racism as they relate to multicultural social work assessment and intervention planning; and (c) demonstrate a beginning ability to conceptualize and devise a multiculturally appropriate intervention plan for a simple case. To achieve these learning outcomes, instructional activities based on the theory of transformative learning and the cognitive apprenticeship model were employed as discussed below. The type of questions asked following the case reflected both the two theories and the intended learning outcomes. The thinking and articulation encouraged through each discussion question as well as instructor/student support and feedback were expected to lead to the intended learning outcomes.

For example, the purpose of one set of discussion questions asked about the Black Youth case was to facilitate the development multicultural self-awareness. The questions asked about the case for this purpose were: What assumptions and values guide your understanding of these problems? What are the origins of these assumptions and values (how did you come to espouse them)? How do you know that these assumptions are valid (how can you defend/support them)? These questions were derived from the perspective transformation theory. Such questions are termed *critical questions* in this theory because they encourage *self-reflection* (see the Theoretical Framework section). While circulating in the small groups as well as when debriefing the whole class, the instructors asked further critical questions (*challenge*) when they observed unquestioned biases. For example, one student asserted that the police lured the students in this case because they were poor. The instructor asked her what evidence she had to come to this conclusion (in a calm, non-threatening tone). *Modelling* and *coaching* were also used extensively in analyzing this case because it was the first case in the course and some students did not seem to understand what some of the questions meant exactly. The instructors often provided examples of self-reflection.

The second set of questions targeted the knowledge dimension of multicultural competence. In other words, these types of questions asked about conceptual understanding of issues in the case and how they might apply in the problem solving process. Such questions were often case-specific because the intention was to introduce and foster the understanding of a different set concepts in each case. In the Black Youth case, the following questions fall into this category: What power relationships can you see at play in this case and how this might influence your social work assessment and

intervention processes? What is the significance of racism in this case and how would you address it in your assessment and intervention? Here too, students were given coaching and scaffolding. For example, one of the groups asked for the definition of the term power and the instructor told them. Since this was the first class and there had not been readings done for that class, the case concepts were limited to two (power and racism).

The purpose of the third set of questions was to foster the development of multicultural assessment and intervention planning skills. Specifically, the questions reflecting the problem identification or assessment aspect of the multicultural problem solving process were: What are the central problems in this case? How would you prioritize these problems? How would you characterize the behaviours exhibited by the different players in this case? Whereas the questions representing the intervention planing aspect of the multicultural problem solving process were: What are the main components of an intervention plan designed to help the clients involved in the case? What are some of the possible consequences of your suggested intervention? What makes you believe that your suggested solution will work? The instructors modelled expert cross cultural problem resolution. In other words, examples of assessment and intervention planning were provided as deemed necessary (*modelling*). The instructors modelled that there is no one "right" way to conceptualize and intervene with multicultural cases and that competing perspectives need to be allowed but evaluated. For example, the instructors helped the students to interpret the problem in this case from the perspectives of all of the players (i.e., the students, the school authority, the community leaders, and the police). The instructors were on the lookout for situations in which students reached deadlock and

helped them resolve the issues. For example, one group was arguing about the right

intervention plan to address the issues identified in the case. The instructor encouraged

them to move on and brainstorm several potential plans, then choose the best one.

The Lecture-Discussion Model

The same content as the case-based instruction section was covered in the lecture

section. The topics in the lecture-discussion section were sequenced in such a way as to

meet student needs at different stages of learning.

Class Format. Each section in the RBSW and SBSW classes started 8:30 in the

morning and ended 11:30. In every class, the lecture involved the whole section and there

were no small groups as in the case-based section. Students were instructed to read the

materials in their course package for the following week.

Role of the Students and the Instructors. The instructors attempted to implement

the ingredients of good lecturing synthesized from the literature (see the section on

lecturing, page 13, in the first chapter of this document. At the outset of each lecture,

instructors linked the present topic to the topic(s) covered during last class and indicated

how the present topic fits into the course structure. Instructors then provided an outline

showing the structure of each lecture (using either the blackboard or an overhead

projector). Next, they asked students questions about the main points of the present topic

to stimulate thinking and interest before starting the lecture. Instructors used examples

and metaphors frequently to illustrate concepts. They encouraged students to ask them

questions or disagree with them and gave them a chance to ask questions or raise points.

Instructors occasionally posed questions to students during lectures to check their

understanding. At the end of each topic, instructors provided a summary of what had

been covered so far and gave students a few minutes to write a summary of the main

concepts in the lecture. At the end of each topic, they told students what topic would be

covered next and linked the concepts covered that day to that which would be covered

the following week.

Treatment Fidelity

Treatment fidelity refers to the extent to which plans in an experiment are

implemented. Treatment fidelity was assessed in two ways. First, as explained earlier, the

instructors followed weekly class plans (See Appendix F for an example). They

developed these class plans by reflecting on the method of teaching and the topics that

they were implementing each week. Second, two observers each recorded the extent to

which each instructor implemented these plans during the last four of the eight weeks of

the present study. The observers used checklists representing the class plans to record

whether the two methods of instruction were implemented as prescribed. To further

check the extent to which instructors were true to the different methods of instruction,

students were asked to rate the instructors on questionnaires reflecting their method of

instruction (see Appendices C and D).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics including student demographic characteristics were

calculated. Table 1 compares the characteristics of the students in the different classes

and sections.

Stevens (1996) suggested that MANOVA should be used when several variables

are correlated and share a conceptual meaning. The variables, cross-cultural awareness,

cross-cultural knowledge, cross-cultural skills, and cross-cultural relationship, share the

conceptual meaning of cross-cultural competence. Similarly the variables, motivation and learning strategies, share the conceptual meaning of self-regulation. Therefore:

1. Using the pretests of the four subscales of Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI) as the covariates and the posttest of these subscales as the dependent variables, MANCOVA was performed to investigate whether there was a significant difference between the group of students who had been exposed to case-based instruction and those in the traditional lecture-discussion groups in their cross-cultural competence (Research Question 1).

2. Using the pretests of the two subscales of Motivated Learning Strategies Questionnaire (MSLQ) as the covariates and the posttest of these subscales as the dependent variables another MANCOVA was done to test whether there were differences between the two methods in terms of enhancing self-regulated learning (Research Question 7).

3. Seven ANCOVAs were conducted to determine whether there was any significant difference between the two methods of instruction in terms of increasing multicultural awareness(Research Question 2), multicultural knowledge (Research Question 3), multicultural skill (Research Question 4), multicultural relationship (Research Question 5), learning motivation (Research Question 8), and learning strategies (Research Question 9) as well as to investigate any significant interaction between the methods of instruction and self-regulated learning (Research Question 6). The covariates were the pretest on the respective instruments.

4. In each class, two paired t-tests were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences between each method of instruction and its ideal,

theoretical mean. Two independent sample t-tests were done to determine whether

the two methods of instruction were implemented equally in each class.

CHAPTER IV

Results

This study compared the effectiveness of case-based instruction and lecture with discussions in terms of enhancing undergraduate social work students' multicultural social work competence and their levels of self-regulation. To achieve the purpose of this study, data were collected from all students in the RBSW and the SBSW classes who were present in the first day of class and agreed to participate in the study (n=42 in the SBSW class; n=39 in the RBSW class). Students were then randomly assigned to one of the two treatment conditions. As a result of random attrition, 20 participants each in the case-based instruction and the lecture-discussion sections in the SBSW class and 19 participants each in the experimental and the comparison conditions in the RBSW class were included The assumptions underlying the statistical analyses used in this study will first be discussed in this chapter. Results of the statistical analyses related to the nine specific research questions investigated in this study will then be presented. Finally, results of the experimental fidelity data analyses will be provided.

Statistical Assumptions

ANCOVA assumes univariate normal distribution in each cell, while MANCOVA assumes multivariate normality. To assess normality, Shapiro-Wilks tests were conducted and the dependent variables were tested for skewness and kurtosis, using the EXPLORE procedure in SPSS. In addition, scatterplots were done to check for outliers. No serious departure from normality was detected.

Homogeneity of population variance assumption underlies ANCOVA, while homogeneity of population covariance underlies MANCOVA in the dependent variables.

Bartlett-Box tests were conducted to check homogeneity of population variance and Box's M tests were used to assess homogeneity of population covariance. Violations of the homogeneity of population variance assumption were detected in the dependent variable of *multicultural skills* in both the SBSW and RBSW classes as well as the dependent variable of *multicultural awareness* in the RBSW class. No other violations of this assumption were found. Due to the heterogeneity of variance in the dependent variables of *multicultural awareness* and *multicultural skills* in the RBSW class, violation of the homogeneity of population covariance assumption was also encountered in the MANCOVA analyses of the dependent variables of *awareness, knowledge, relationship* and *skill* in the RBSW class. While this is important information, Stevens argued that "it is very unlikely that the equal covariance matrices assumption would ever literally be satisfied in practice." (1996, p. 251). Fortunately, ANCOVA and MANCOVA analyses are robust to the violation of the variance-covariance assumption when group sizes are equal (Glass, Peckham, & Sanders, 1972; Stevens, 1996), as is the case in this study.

The standard checks were made to determine whether covariance was appropriate for the data analyses. The existence of a significant relationship between the covariate(s) and the dependent variable(s) was first verified. A second check was made to determine whether there was a covariate by treatment interaction. For one covariate the ANCOVA assumption is homogeneity of regression slopes, for two covariates, the assumption is parallelism of the regression planes, while for three covariates the assumption is the homogeneity of regression hyperplanes. Violation of this assumption means that there is covariate by treatment interaction and thus ANCOVA or MANCOVA is not appropriate. To determine whether there was covariate by treatment interaction when there was more

than one covariate, the interaction effects of all covariates were summed up. Violation of

these assumptions was not detected.

Normality of distribution and equality of population variance are the two main

assumptions underlying t-tests which are relevant to this study. No violations of these

assumptions were detected in the case of the independent t-tests conducted to determine

whether there were significant differences between the extent to which the two methods

of instruction were implemented in each class. However, both assumptions were violated

in the case of the paired t-tests conducted to figure out whether there was a significant

difference between the obtained mean of each method of instruction and its perfect mean.

The detected violations were rooted in the fact that the value of the ideal mean was six

with zero standard deviations. In any case, there is strong evidence that t-tests are highly

robust to these violations when the number of subjects in each group is equal (e.g., Glass,

Peckham, & Sanders, 1972; Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Glass and Hopkins asserted

"indeed, for practical purposes, one need not even test the assumption of homogeneity of

variance when the n's are equal." (p. 293). An alpha level of .05 was used for all

statistical tests.

<div align="center">Examination of the Research Questions</div>

Research Question One

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in

enhancing student multicultural social work competence?

In the SBSW and the RBSW classes, the MANCOVA results using the pretests of

the four subscales of Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI) as the covariates and the

posttest of these subscales as the dependent variables revealed a statistically significant

difference. Specifically, $F(4, 29) = 22$, $p = .001$ in the RBSW class and $F(4, 31) = 14.52$, $p = .001$ in the SBSW class. The multivariate effect size estimates for these dependent variables were .56 and .65 for the RBSW and SBSW classes respectively. Similarly, the ANCOVA results using the pretest case analysis scores as the covariate and posttest case analysis as the dependent variable revealed a significant difference in both classes. In the RBSW class, $F(1, 35) = 17.27$, $p=0.001$, while $F(1, 37) = 8.35$, $p = .001$ in the SBSW class (See Table 3). As Table 4 shows, the average adjusted mean for the case group is higher than the average adjusted mean for the lecture group in both classes. Effect size estimates for the case analyses were .33 and .18 for the RBSW and the SBSW classes respectively.

Table 3

ANCOVA Summary Table for the 2 Classes on Case Analyses

Class	Univariate F tests			
	SS	df	MS	F
SBSW				
Treatment	.14	1	.14	8.35**
Within Error	.64	37	.02	
RBSW				
Treatment	.59	1	.59	17.27**
Within Error	1.20	35	.03	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 4

Pretest and Adjusted Posttest Means and Standard Deviations of the Case Analyses for

the 2 Classes

	SBSW				RBSW			
	pretest		Posttest		pretest		posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Lecture	2.07	.2	2.63	.21	1.91	.25	2.33	.29
Case	2.16	.25	2.75	.13	1.93	.38	2.56	.22
	2.12	.23	2.69	.19	1.92	.32	2.45	.29

Research Question Two

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in

enhancing student multicultural awareness?

In both classes, the ANCOVA results indicated a statistically significant

difference between the experimental and the comparison groups in multicultural social

work awareness. As shown in Table 5 below, $F (1, 32) = 7.94$, $p = .001$ in the RBSW

class and $F (1, 34) = 54.12.52$, $p = .001$ in the SBSW class. As Table 6 shows, the

average mean for the case group is higher than the average mean for the lecture group in

both classes. Effect size estimates were .20 and .61 for the RBSW and the SBSW classes,

respectively.

Table5

Analysis of Covariance Summary Table for the 2 classes on Multicultural Awareness

Measure	Univariate F tests			
	SS	df	MS	F
RBSW				
Treatment	.28	1	.28	7.94**
Within Error	1.15	32	.04	
SBSW				
Treatment	.75	1	.75	54.12**
Within Error	47	34	.01	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 6

Adjusted Means and Standard Deviations for the 2 classes on MCI

Subscale	Special BSW				Regular BSW			
	Case		Lecture		Case		Lecture	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Awareness	3.66	.17	3.37	.32	3.42	.27	3.22	.4
Knowledge	3.82	.13	3.69	.24	3.80	.13	3.76	.14
Relationship	3.63	.27	3.46	.30	2.74	.31	2.41	.2
Skill	3.82	.10	3.75	.22	3.89	.07	3.51	.41

Research Question Three

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in enhancing student multicultural knowledge?

In the SBSW classes, the ANCOVA results showed a significant difference between the case and the lecture-discussion groups on multicultural social work

knowledge, F (1, 34) = 5.94, p = .02. However, the same ANCOVA analysis revealed no

statistically significant difference in the RBSW class where F (1, 32) = 1.10, p = .30 (See

Table 7). As shown in Table 6, the average mean for the case group is higher than the

average mean for the lecture group in both classes. Effect size estimates were .06 and .15

for the RBSW and the SBSW classes, respectively.

Table 7

Analysis of Covariance Summary Table for the 2 classes on Multicultural Knowledge

Measure	Univariate F tests			
	SS	df	MS	F
RBSW				
Treatment	.01	1	.01	1.10
Within Error	.43	32	.01	
SBSW				
Treatment	.14	1	.14	5.94*
Within Error	.80	34	.02	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Research Question Four

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in

enhancing student multicultural skills?

The ANCOVA results in both classes indicated a statistically significant

difference between the experimental and the comparison groups in multicultural social

work skill. As presented in Table 8, F (1, 32) = 21.34, p = .001 in the RBSW class and F

(1, 32) = 4.65, p = .04 in the SBSW class. As noted previously, the average mean for the

case group is higher than the average mean for the lecture group in both classes (see

Table 6). Effect size estimates were .40 and .12 for the RBSW and the SBSW classes,

respectively.

Table 8

Analysis of Covariance Summary Table for the 2 classes on Multicultural Skill

Measure	Univariate F tests			
	SS	df	MS	F
RBSW				
Treatment	1.18	1	1.18	21.34**
Within Error	1.77	32	.06	
SBSW				
Treatment	.04	1	.04	4.65*
Within Error	.28	34	.01	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Research Question Five

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in

enhancing student multicultural relationship?

In both classes, the ANCOVA results indicated a statistically significant

difference between the case-based method and the lecture-discussion method in

multicultural social work relationship. As presented in Table 9 below, $F (1, 32) = 73.8$, p

= .001 in the RBSW class, while $F (1, 32) = 7.51$, p =.01 in the SBSW class. Effect size

estimates were .28 and .18 for the RBSW and the SBSW classes, respectively.

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance Summary Table for the 2 classes on Multicultural Relationship

Measure	Univariate F tests			
	SS	df	MS	F
RBSW				
Treatment	2.36	1	2.36	73.80**
Within Error	1.02	32	.03	
SBSW				
Treatment	.25	1	.25	7.51*
Within Error	1.13	34	.03	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Research Question Six

Is there interaction between the method of instruction and levels of student self-regulated learning?

In both classes, the ANCOVA results using the pretest on the MSLQ as the covariate and case analysis scores as the dependent variable indicated no statistically significant interaction between the covariate and the method of instruction. In the RBSW class, $F (1, 34) = 0.34$, $p = .57$, while $F (1, 36) = 1.13$, $p = .29$ in the SBSW class (See Table 10). As well, no significant difference was found on the full-scale of the MCI where $F (1, 34) = 0.53$, $p = .47$ in the RBSW class and $F (1, 36) = .13$, $p = .72$ in the SBSW class (See Table 11).

Table 10

ANCOVA Summary Table for the 2 Classes on Case Analyses

Class	Univariate F tests				
	SS	df	MS	F	p
SBSW					
Treatment	.03	1	.03	1.13	.29
Within Error	1.1	36	.03		
RBSW					
Treatment	.02	1	.02	.34	.57
Within Error	2.3	34	.07		

Table 11

ANCOVA Summary Table for the 2 classes on MCI

Class	Univariate F tests				
	SS	df	MS	F	p
SBSW					
Treatment	0	1	0	.13	.72
Within Error	.71	36	.02		
RBSW					
Treatment	.01	1	.01	.53	.47
Within Error	.85	34	.03		

Research Question Seven

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in enhancing students' levels of self-regulation in relation to the course?

In both the SBSW and the RBSW classes, the MANCOVA results using the

pretests of the two subscales of Motivated Learning Strategies Questionnaire (MSLQ) as

the covariates and the posttest of these subscales as the dependent variables showed no

overall significant difference between the two teaching methods, $F(2, 33) = .66$, $p = .52$

in the RBSW class and $F(2, 35) = 2.50$, $p = .10$ in the SBSW class.

Table 12

Adjusted Means and Standard Deviations for the 2 classes on MLSQ

	SBSW				RBSW			
Subscale	Case		Lecture		Case		Lecture	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Motivation	5.52	.39	5.36	.41	5.45	.22	5.23	.43
Learning Str.	4.68	.65	4.63	.53	4.75	.66	4.56	.71

Research Question Eight

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in

enhancing students' motivation to learn in relation to the course?

The ANCOVA results indicated a statistically significant difference between the

experimental and the control groups on the motivation subscale of MLSQ only in the

SBSW class where $F(1, 36) = 4.35$, $p = .04$. As shown in Table 13 there was no

significant difference in the RBSW class where $F(1, 34) = .99$, $p = .33$. (Refer to Table

12 for the adjusted means of both classes).

Table 13

ANCOVA Summary Table for the 2 Classes on Motivation

Class	Univariate F tests				
	SS	df	MS	F	p
SBSW					
Treatment	.28	1	.28	4.35*	.04
Within Error	2.30	36	.064		
RBSW					
Treatment	.032	1	.032	.99	.33
Within Error	1.09	34	.032		

*p<.05

Research Question Nine

Is the case-based method of instruction more effective than lecture-discussion in enhancing students' course-related learning strategies?

In both classes, the ANCOVA results indicated no statistically significant difference between the two methods of teaching on the learning strategies subscale of MLSQ. As depicted in Table 14 below, $F (1, 34) = .64$, $p = .43$ in the RBSW class, whereas $F (1, 36) = 1.73$, $p = .20$ in the SBSW class. (Refer to Table 12 for the adjusted means of both classes).

Table 14

ANCOVA Summary Table for the 2 Classes on Learning Strategies

Class	Univariate F tests				
	SS	Df	MS	F	P
SBSW					
Treatment	.01	1	.01	1.73	.20
Within Error	.1	36	.003		
RBSW					
Treatment	.029	1	.029	.64	.43
Within Error	1.54	34	.045		

Table 15

Summary of the Results for the 9 Research Questions

	Univariate F	
Dependent Variable	RBSW	SBSW
Competence	17.27**	8.35**
Awareness	7.94**	54.12**
Knowledge	1.10	5.94*
Skill	21.34**	4.65*
Relationship	73.8**	7.51*
Self-regulated learning by Method of instruction	1.13	.34
Self-regulated learning	.66	2.5
Motivation	.99	4.35*
Learning strategies	.64	1.73

*p<.05

**p<.01

Demographic Variables by Treatment Interactions

Using MANCOVA and ANCOVA in both classes, no significant interaction was found between the demographic variables of age, gender, social work experience, ethnicity, history of immigration, and GPA on the one hand, and method of instruction on the other hand. This result is in terms of both case analyses and self-report measures of multicultural social work competence.

Treatment fidelity

Student Instructor Rating

Was each of the two methods of instruction implemented perfectly (as prescribed) in each class? (In other words, was there any significant difference between the obtained mean instructor rating for each method of instruction and the highest possible mean rating for that method of instruction in each class?).

In both classes, the t-test results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between obtained mean instructor rating for both the lecture-discussion and the case method of teaching and the perfect score for each method (See Table 16).

Table 16

t-test on Mean Instructor Rating for Each method of Instruction and the Ideal Mean for that Method

Class	Ms		t value	Ms		t value
	Case	Ideal		lect.	Ideal	
SBSW	5.62	6	-6.99**	5.70	6	-6.4**
RBSW	5.56	6	-8.04**	5.61	6	-8.24**

**p<.01

Were the two methods of instruction implemented equally in each class? (Specifically, was there any significant difference between the average mean instructor rating scores—combined for the two instructors—for the two methods of instruction in each class?).

The t-test results showed no significant difference between the average mean instructor rating scores for the two methods of instruction in both classes. As Table 16 shows, t(18) = .65, P>.05 in the RBSW class, whereas t (19) = .71, P>.05 in the SBSW class.

Table 17

t-test results for the 2 Classes on Instructor Rating for the 2 Methods of Instruction

Instructor	SBSW		t values	RBSW		t values
	Case	Lect.		Case	Lect.	
A	5.65	5.69		5.51	5.61	.96
B	5.59	5.71		5.61	5.60	
Total	5.62	5.70	.71	5.56	5.61	.65

Classroom Observation

Four out of the eight classes covered by this experiment were observed to record the extent to which class plans representing the two methods of instruction were applied. The observation results showed that case-based and the lecture-based classes were comparable on the extent to which the activities planned for the class were implemented (See Appendix A for a sample of class plans). In both classes, all topics, subtopics and operationalized aspects of the two teaching methods were covered as planned. However, one should note that this observation data does not reveal the quality of the

implementation of the methods of instruction. This observation involved only the low inference, descriptive variables specified in the class plan. In addition, the coaching and scaffolding aspects of the case-based method of instruction could not be recorded completely by the observers because it also occurred in the several small groups simultaneously.

The case-based and the lecture-discussion sections of each class were also compared on the extent to which the total time allotted to each section of the class was used. In the SBSW class, 11 hours and 52 minutes out of the total of 12 hours (98.9%) were used in the lecture-discussion section, while all 12 hours were used in the case section. The eight minutes difference was due to the class starting four minutes late in the morning and two minutes late after the break in the 6th week of class (the second week of observation).

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Case-based instruction has a long history of use in business and legal education and its application is increasing in several professional fields including medicine, teacher education and social work. Theoretical and anecdotal support for the utilization and the value of case-based instruction is abundant. However, empirical evidence of the effectiveness of case-based instruction is limited and inconclusive. The majority of research into the effectiveness of case-based instruction has been conducted in the fields of business, medicine, and teacher education. To this researcher's knowledge, there is no research comparable to the present study which compares case-based instruction to other methods of instruction in social work.

It has been suggested in the literature on case-based instruction that there might be a reciprocal relationship between case-based instruction and self-regulated learning. On the one hand, self-regulated learning may be an important learner characteristic that can either facilitate or hinder learning from case-based instruction. On the other hand, if students engage in case-based instruction their self-regulated learning skills may increase. To this researcher's knowledge, however, no controlled experiment has been conducted so far to examine the claims of the effectiveness of case-based instruction in promoting self-regulated learning or the positive interaction between case-based instruction and levels of learner self-regulation in any content area. The present study contributes to the literature in this regard. This discussion of the findings of the present study will be organized as follows: discussion of the results, generalizability and limitations of the results, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research.

<center>Discussion of the Results</center>

<u>Multicultural Social Work Competence</u>

Findings of the present study revealed evidence supporting the effectiveness of

case-based instruction in fostering the overall development of multicultural social work

competence. Multicultural social work competence refers to the appropriateness of a

social worker's use of attitudes, knowledge, relationship, and skills to effective social

work practice with persons from cultural backgrounds different than his/her own. Both in

the RBSW and SBSW classes, participants in the case-based instruction group

demonstrated significantly higher multicultural social work competence as compared to

the lecture-discussion group. This difference between the experimental and the

comparison groups was both in terms of students' self-report and performance on case

analyses.

This study also investigated separately several components of multicultural social

work competence: multicultural awareness, multicultural knowledge, multicultural

relationship, and multicultural skills. Each will be discussed in turn in the following

paragraphs.

<u>Multicultural social work awareness.</u> The social worker's awareness and

appreciation of his/her own and the client's worldview and biases and how this may

affect the helping process was one of the components of multicultural social work

investigated in this study. Several studies in teacher education have found that case-based

instruction is suitable to address teacher biases, prejudices, and to foster the development

of positive attitudes toward multiculturalism (Dana & Floyd, 1992; Kleinfeld, 1991; J.

Shulman, 1992b). The results of the present study concur with the preliminary findings of

these studies. The case-based sections of both classes showed higher multicultural social work awareness than the lecture-discussion sections (see Table 6 for the adjusted means and standard deviations). The theory of perspective transformation might explain this result. It seems that multicultural cases provided students with trigger events that stimulated their critical self-reflection, as they were confronted with worldviews different from their own and alternative ways of conceptualizing and intervening with these cases. These culturally different ways of conceptualizing the problems and proposing solutions to them came from various sources. These included the instructors' critical questioning throughout the class, peer interactions during small group discussions, and the different perspectives of the characters in the case. The findings of the present study support J. Shulman's (1991) and Dana and Floyd's (1993) suggestions that case-based instruction gives students the opportunity to identify their underlying assumptions and to reflect on them.

Multicultural social work knowledge. The social worker's knowledge of the personal and social aspects of the theoretical underpinnings of multicultural social work was also investigated in this study. Findings indicated that case-based instruction was more effective than the lecture-discussion method in the SBSW class but not in the RBSW class. One of the few studies to investigate this area, Sudzina (1993), compared case-based instruction with cooperative learning and found the former to be more effective in increasing understanding of multicultural issues. In the present study, the difference between the two classes may be attributed to the fact that students in the SBSW might possess higher levels of intellectual ability reflected by their higher level of education. It is generally established in the literature that students with higher intellectual

ability perform better than intellectually less able students in most educational situations (e.g, Mckeachie et al., 1991). There is also a suggestion in the literature that different methods of instruction might be more effective in helping students with varying intellectual abilities learn (e.g., Cronback & Snow, 1977; Corno & Snow, 1986). However, it was beyond the scope of this study to investigate whether there is interaction between method of instruction (lecture vs. case-based instruction) and students' level of education.

Multicultural social work skills. Students' culturally appropriate social work assessment and intervention skills were found to be more enhanced by case-based instruction as compared to lecture with discussions in this study. These results are in line with those of a study in business education (Watson, 1975) where case-based instruction was superior to the lecture in fostering the enhancement of students' ability to apply business principles. Tillman (1993) also found an advantage for case-based instruction in the enhancement of preservice teachers' problem solving as compared to a lecture/discussion format. These findings make sense because, unlike students who are taught through the lecture method, students in the case-based instruction method are able to practice the cognitive skills needed to solve problems in their domain. In addition, the instructors in this study modeled instances of how to analyze and devise an intervention plan for specific multicultural cases. According to the cognitive apprenticeship model, modeling of cognitive processes such as problem solving, reasoning, and decision making facilitates learning because it makes visible to students these otherwise invisible mental processes.

Multicultural relationship. Finally, multicultural relationship as a dimension of multicultural social work competence was also examined in the present study. In both classes, case-based instruction was found to be more effective in enhancing student multicultural relationship skills. The literature on case-based instruction argues that case-based instruction should be an effective method of instruction for enhancing interpersonal skills (Levin, 1995, Wasserman, 1993). The rationale for this argument is that case-based instruction encourages student interaction and thus supports the practice of interpersonal skills. This argument applies to the present study because students in the case-based instruction sections had more opportunity to interact with each other both in the small groups and in the class as a whole as compared with the students in the lecture-discussion sections. Group interaction is also an integral part of both the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of transformative learning (e.g., Collins et al., 1989; Cranton, 1994) which guided this study.

Self-Regulated Learning

Self-regulation by method of instruction interaction. Whether there is interaction between the method of instruction and students' levels of self-regulation was also of interest in this study. It is suggested in the literature that students with low self-regulation skills might not have the skills necessary to learn from case-based instruction because case-based instruction puts more demands on them to act and think independently than teacher-centered teaching methods (Blumenfeld, Soloway, Marx, Krajcik, Guzdial, and Palincsar, 1991; Ertmer et al., 1996). In case-based instruction, students engage in complex, ambiguous learning tasks as they analyze problems from different perspectives and make decisions on the basis of competing pieces of evidence. These processes are

also generally viewed as integral parts of self-regulated learning (Ertmer et al., 1996; Paris & Newman, Zimmerman, 1990, 1994). Therefore, the implication is that case-based instruction might be more beneficial for students with higher levels of self-regulated learning. However, the results of the present study do not support this view. In both classes, there was no significant interaction between the method of instruction and students' reported levels of self-regulated learning. This may be due to the particular model of case-based instruction used in the present study which integrates the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of transformative learning. Theoretically, the teaching strategies inherent in the cognitive apprenticeship model including modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulation, reflection, and fading, may support students with low self-regulatory skills. Specifically, instead of being immersed into a complex, ambiguous task without an appropriate mental model, students see how the instructor uses theoretical principles and strategies to analyze and devise intervention plans for cases (modeling). Students are then given the opportunity to solve problems on their own while they know that various degrees of help is available as needed (coaching, scaffolding, and fading). Students then gradually take control over their learning as they enhance their skills in case analyses in that domain. Both the theory of transformative learning and the cognitive apprenticeship model emphasize student reflection which is also an important learning strategy (e.g., Collins et al., 1989; Cranton, 1994).

Enhancement of Self-regulated Learning. This study also investigated the effect of method of instruction on self-regulated learning. In both classes, there was no significance difference between the experimental and control groups, which indicates that case-based instruction is not more effective than lecture-discussion in promoting self-

regulated learning. In an exploratory study, Ertmer et al. (1996) compared how students with low levels of self-regulation and those with high levels of self-regulation approached and responded to case-based instruction. The authors argued that the processes inherent in case-based instruction might enhance students' self-regulated learning skills. The rationale for their argument was that students in case-based instruction practice skills such as collaborative learning, active learning, problem solving in a meaningful context, and reflection which are similar to those possessed by high self-regulators. The results of the present investigation do not support their assertion. A possible explanation of any undetected difference is that, like other self-report instruments, the MSLQ might not be sensitive enough to measure the dynamics of self-regulated learning (Pintrich, 1993, as cited in Ertmer et al., 1996; Garcia, et al., 1994).

Student learning motivation was also investigated in this study as one of the two components of self-regulated learning. There is a suggestion in the literature that case-based instruction effectively supports student motivation to learn. Wassermann (1993) put it this way: "cases, by their very nature, drive us to find the information we need to arrive at more informed decisions. They are natural motivators that spur the need to know." (p.30). The findings of the present study only partly support this view. Students in the case-based instruction section of the SBSW class reported higher levels of learning motivation, but students in the RBSW class did not. As mentioned earlier, students in the SBSW class had a higher level of education on average. Further research is needed to determine whether there is an interaction between level of education and method of instruction (case-based instruction vs. lecture-discussion) in terms of enhancing student learning motivation.

Finally, enhancement of students' learning strategies was considered in the present study. As stated earlier, the processes inherent in case-based instruction including active learning in a meaningful context, collaborative learning, problem solving, and reflection require and may subsequently enhance learning strategies (Ertmer et al., 1996; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989). The result of the present study does not support this assertion. In both classes, no significant difference was found between case-based instruction and the lecture-discussion method in terms of enhancing student learning strategies. However, the limitations of self-report instruments in capturing the complexity of learning strategies should be noted.

In summary, as explained in the section on case-based instruction, there are several versions of case-based instruction noted in the literature. The version used in this study was guided by the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of transformative learning. However, more research needs to be done to determine whether the superiority of case-based instruction found in the present study is due to case-based instruction in general or the particular format of case-based instruction used in the present study.

Generalizability and Limitations of the Results

The difficulty of conducting experiments which are both internally and externally valid in educational research is well-documented in the literature (e.g., Campell & Stanley, 1963; Borg & Gall, 1989). On the one hand, findings from the more internally valid laboratory studies cannot be safely generalized to real-world educational practice. On the other hand, it is difficult to adequately control the extraneous variables in more externally valid experiments (and thus claim causal relationship between the independent and the dependent variables). As a compromise, there is a need for controlling the threats

to internal and external validity as much as reasonably possible. The ways that these threats were addressed in this study is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Internal Validity

Of the eight types of potential threats to internal validity specified by Campbell and Stanley (1963), seven are unlikely to affect the present study. *History, maturation,* and *testing,* are assumed to be controlled in this study since the experimental and the comparison groups had equal chance of being affected by these factors. *Instrumentation* was not a threat to the validity of this study since no change in instrumentation was made from pretest to posttest. *Statistical regression* did not affect this study because the groups were not selected on the basis of their extreme scores. *Differential selection* and *selection-maturation interaction* were not a concern in this study since participants in each class (SBSW and RBSW) were randomly assigned to the case-based instruction and lecture-discussion sections. The influence of *Experimental Mortality* was highly unlikely because attrition was random and minimal. In the SBSW class, one participant in the experimental condition and another participant in the comparison condition did not complete the study. In the RBSW class, one participant did not complete the posttest and was thus dropped from the analyses. The initial random assignment of students to the experimental and comparison groups is expected to minimize the effect of attrition in this study.

By contrast, *Experimental Treatment Diffusion* is one of the extraneous variables identified by Campell and Stanley (1963) that might have influenced the results of this study. Borg and Gall (1989) explained *Experimental Treatment Diffusion* as follows: "if the treatment condition is perceived as very desirable relative to the control condition,

members of the control group may seek access to the treatment condition." (p. 647). To reduce the possibility of this kind of threat to the internal validity of the experiment, it was explained to students that the whole class would be taught through both methods of instruction after the end of the experiment. The assumption was that if students knew that they would be exposed to both methods of instruction they would be less inclined to seek information about the method of instruction of sections different than their own. However, there was still a possibility of *Experimental Treatment Diffusion* particularly because students often take other courses together and work on projects in these courses together.

External Validity.

External validity refers to "the extent to which the findings of an experiment can be applied to particular settings." (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 649). Bracht and Glass (1968) distinguish two types of external validity: population validity and ecological validity.

Population validity. Bracht and Glass (1968) further specified two kinds of population validity. The first category is the extent to which findings can be generalized from the sample to a defined population. Most of the cohort of students in the SBSW and BSW programs participated in the study. The results of the present study, therefore, might be generalized to students in the program at the university from which the sample was drawn. The second type of population validity is "the extent to which personological variables interact with treatment effects." (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 650). The fact that no significant interaction was found between students' age, level of social work experience and GPA in both classes boosts the external validity of this study. Students in the SBSW and the RBSW classes represent different levels of age and academic backgrounds and in

both classes case-based instructions turned out to be superior to lecture-discussions in terms of overall multicultural competence, multicultural awareness, multicultural relationship and multicultural skill. The only two dependent variables in which there were inconsistent findings in the two different classes were multicultural knowledge and motivation. The relatively high consistency of the study findings seem to support their generalizability to social work students of different characteristics. However, one has to be cautious in generalizing this study to all post-secondary education students or even to all social work students.

Ecological validity. Borg & Gall explained that ecological validity "concerns the extent to which the results of an experiment can be generalized from the set of environmental conditions created by the researcher to other environmental conditions." (1989, p. 650). The *Hawthorne Effect* which is one of the potential threats to ecological validity specified by Bracht and Glass (1968) may have affected the present study. Various steps were taken to reduce the influence of the Hawthorne Effect. First, students were given the least ethically possible information about the nature of the study. Second, students were assured that all of them would experience the two methods of instruction after the study was over. Finally, the fact that the experiment extended over a period of eight weeks might have reduced the novelty of case-based instruction. That being said, it remains a possibility that this threat to ecological validity affected this study for at least two reasons. First, for ethical reasons, students were told that they were participating in a study and this might have influenced their performance on the instruments. Secondly, students also knew that the systematic use of case-based instruction was new to the

School of Social Work and some students might have perceived it as more desirable than conventional instruction.

As Borg and Gall point out (1989) "the generalizability of the experiment may be limited by the particular pretest and posttest designed to measure achievement gains or other outcome variable." (p. 653). Only one self-report instrument was used to measure multicultural social work awareness, multicultural social work knowledge, multicultural social work relationship, multicultural social work skill, and self-regulated learning. Although each of these instruments has high validity and reliability (see the section on Instrumentation, in the Methodology chapter), triangulation of different sources of data would have increased the validity of the results and their generalizability to other instruments.

Experimenter bias is another threat to ecological validity. One form of this concerns the equivalency of the experimenters. Borg and Gall (1989) explained that "an experimental treatment may be effective or ineffective because of the particular experimenter who administers it" (p. 651). Several steps were taken to control this threat to generalizability. First, instructors were trained in using case-based instruction to ensure that they were able to implement the two methods of instruction as prescribed. Secondly, written class plans were developed for each condition which were true to the methods of instruction. Finally, the instructors alternated teaching the four treatment conditions.

To ensure that the instructors followed the written class plans (in other words, treatment fidelity), two procedures were followed. First, two trained observers recorded the extent to which instructors followed written class plans in each class. The results of this observation indicated high treatment fidelity. In both classes, all topics, subtopics and

operationalized aspects of the two teaching methods were covered as planned. All of the allotted 12 hours were used both in the lecture-discussion and case-based sections of the RBSW class. However, in the SBSW class, 11 hours and 52 minutes out of the total of 12 hours (98.9%) were used in the lecture-discussion section, while all 12 hours were used in the case section. Second, students rated the extent to which instructors implemented each method of instruction. This data also revealed good but not perfect treatment fidelity. Although the two teaching methods were not implemented perfectly in any class, student ratings reflected a good match. Students' mean ratings of both instructors in terms of implementing all methods of instruction were between 5.51 and 5.71 with 5 representing very often and 6 representing almost always. The degree to which the two methods were implemented in each class was the same (see Table 16 for the t-test results of mean instructor rating scores for the two methods of instruction in each class). One has to note here that the two instruments used to measure the two methods of instruction are new and their reliability and validity are unknown.

Implications for Practice

The case-based instruction group demonstrated consistently higher overall multicultural competence than the lecture-discussion group with the same amount of instructional time. This includes multicultural social work competence as measured through student self-report and by scoring their performance on case analyses. It must be noted here that the lecture-discussion method in this study was carefully constructed and implemented. Various lecturing styles are used in higher education. However, in this researcher's opinion, the version used in this study represented close to the best that this method of instruction could offer because it was based on elements of effective lecturing

synthesized from both the theoretical and the research literature. Therefore, in this researcher's view, the present study represents a true test of the potential of case-based instruction against a form of instruction that is often the norm in universities.

Therefore, one can conclude from this study that case-based instruction taught through the cognitive apprenticeship model and the theory of transformative learning is more effective than lecture with discussions in terms of promoting multicultural social work competence. This is the case for all components of multicultural social work competence except the cultural knowledge component. It is stressed throughout the literature that one has to consider practical significance carefully in addition to statistical significance (e.g., Borg & Gall, 1989, Stevens, 1996). Effect size is one of the most popular ways of estimating practical significance. The multivariate effect size estimates were .56 and .65 for the RBSW and SBSW classes, respectively. Cohen (1969) indicated that an effect size of .80 should be considered large for most psychological research.

In light of the foregoing, this research would support the use of case-based instruction in courses addressing multicultural social work with some limitations. The fact that no significant difference was found between case-based instruction and lecture-discussion in terms of multicultural knowledge in the RBSW class and in terms of self-regulated learning in both classes does not invalidate this recommendation. However, instructors implementing the case-based instruction should be trained in using it skillfully. They should be aware of the possible limitations of case-based instruction and must be able to use it effectively. This study has proven the effectiveness of one particular method of case-based instruction over lecture-discussions and any

generalization to other forms of case-based instruction or methods of teaching would be unjustified.

It should also be noted that the superiority demonstrated by the groups in the case-based sections on case analyses performance and self-reported multicultural competence may not generalize to actual practice situations. However, in this researcher's opinion, by analyzing and making decisions about realistic cases faced by professionals in the field, students are better prepared for real-world problems. In other words, the kinds of thinking involved in practice with multicultural case analyses and intervention planing are the precursor to competent practice in real situations.

<u>Recommendation for Further Research</u>

1. Replication of this study comparing two formats of case-based instruction to determine whether the results of this study are due to the particular model of case-based instruction.

2. Replication of this study comparing this model of case-based instruction to other instructional strategies often used in the social work classroom such as lecture with role-playing to find out whether the results hold only for lecture-discussions.

3. Replication of this study to investigate whether there is interaction between method of instruction (lecture-discussion vs. case-based instruction) and students' level of education.

4. Conceptualization and testing of a structural equation model to investigate the relationships between the different aspects of the cognitive apprenticeship/transformative learning theory model used in the present study and the different dimensions of multicultural social work competence.

5. Investigation of whether the differences between the two methods of instruction hold in observable behaviours in the context of real-world multicultural social work practice.

Bibliography

Acosta, F., Yamamoto, J., & Evans, L. (1982). Effective psychotherapy for low-income and minority patients. New York: Plenum Press.

Albert, R. D. (1983). The intercultural sensitizer or culture assimilator: A cognitive approach. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. XI. pp. 186-194). New York: Pergamon Press.

Albert, R. D., & Adamopoulos, J. (1980). An attributional approach to culture learning: The culture assimilator. In M. Hamnett & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Research in culture learning: Language and conceptual studies. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Allen, J. D. (1995, April). The use of case studies to teaching educational psychology: A comparison with traditional instrcution. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Reproduction Service no. ED 387 491).

Altamirano, C. (1997). L'intervention jeunesse et la diversification ethnoculturelle: Comment s'adapter ses competences. Quebec: Centre de Psycho-education du Quebec.

Aponte, H. (1986). "If I don't get simple, I cry." Family Process, 25, 531-548.

Aponte, H. (1991). Training on the person of the therapist for work with the poor and minorities. Journal of Independent Social Work, 5, 23-39.

Aponte, J. F., Rivers, R. Y., & Wohl, J. (Eds.). (1995). Psychological interventions and cultural diversity. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Barnett, C. (1991). Building a case based curriculum to enhance the pedagogical content knowledge of mathematics teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 42, 263-

272.

Barron, L. (1993, April). Using cases as a pedagogical technique in an elementary methods course: An example using integrated media technology. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tande, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Berliner, D.C. (1985). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36, 2-8.

Black, A. & Ammon, P. (1992). A developmental constructivist approach to teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. 43, 323-335.

Black, S. J., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. Academy of Management Review, 15, 113-136.

Blake, B. F., & Heslin, R. (1983). Evaluating cross-cultural training. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 1, pp. 203-222). New York: Pergamon.

Blumenfeld, B. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S. Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. Educational psychologist, 26, 369-398.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, D. M. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Boucher, N. (1990). Are social workers concerned with Canadian immigration and multicultural policies? The Social Worker, 58, 153

Boyce, A. (1992). Making the case for the case method approach in physical education pedagogy classes. Journal of Physical Education Recreation and Dance, 63, 17-20.

Braverman, L. (1986). Social casework and strategic therapy. The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 67, 234-239.

Brislin, R. W., Landis, D., & Brandt, M. (1983). Conceptualization of intercultural behavior and training. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 1, pp. 1-36). New York: Pergamon.

Brislin, R. W., & Pedersen, P. (1976). Cross-cultural orientation program. New York: Gardner.

Broaddus, D. L. (1986). Use of the culture-general assimilator in intercultural training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana State University.

Brookfield, S., (1987). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Broudy, H.S. (1990). Case studies-why and how. Teachers College Record, 21, 449-459.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18, 32-42.

Browne, D. L., & Ritchie, D. C. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: A model of staff development for implementing technology in schools. Contemporary Education, 63, 28-34.

Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds, possible worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Burgest, D. (1989). Social work practice with minorities (2nd ed.). New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press Inc.

Butler, E. D. (1966). An experimental study of the case method in teaching the social foundations of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee.

Campbell, D., & Stanley, J. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Carey, J., Reinat, M., & Fontes, L. (1990). School counselors' perceptions of training needs in multicultural counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 29, 155-169.

Carney, C. G., & Kahn, K. B. (1984). Building competencies for effective cross-cultural counseling: A developmental view. The Counseling Psychologist, 12, 111-119.

Carroll, J. B., Paine, F. T., & Ivancevich, J. J. (1972). The relative effectiveness of training methods—expert opinion and research. Personnel Psychology, 12, 495-509.

Carter, K., & Unklesbay, R. (1989). Cases in teaching and law. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 21, 527-536.

Carter, L. D. (1995). Effectiveness of case-based method vs. traditional lecture in the retention of athletic training knowledge. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oregon State University.

Carter, R. T., White, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). White student attitudes toward Blacks: Implications for Black student recruitment and retention. Journal of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 33, 165-175.

Chau, K. (1989). Sociocultural dissonance among ethnic minority populations. Social Casework, 70, 224-230.

Chau, K. (1990). A model for teaching cross-cultural practice in social work. Journal of Social Work Education, 26, 124-133.

Chau, K. (1991). Social work with ethnic minorities: Practice issues and potentials. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 1, 23-29.

Christensen, C. P. (1980). Effects of dissimilarity in initial interviews: An experimental evaluation of cross-cultural training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. McGill University.

Christensen, C. R., & Hansen, A. J. (Eds.). (1987). Teaching and the case method. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Clark, C., & Lampert, M. (1986). The study of teacher thinking: Implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 27-3 1.

Collier, S. C. (1995). Case-based approach to developing multicultural perspectives on issues of gender, culture, and social class in physical education teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Collins, A., Brown, J., S., & Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser (pp. 453-494). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Combs, A. W. (1971). Some basic concepts in perceptual psychology. In Avillla, D. L., Combs, A. W., & Purkey, W. E. (Eds.), The helping relationship sourcebook (pp. 117-126). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Combs, A. W., Richards, A. C., & Richards, F. (1976). Perceptual psychology: A humanistic approach to the study of persons.

Compton, B. R. & Galaway, B. (1994). Social work processes. Pacific Grove, CL: Brooks/Cole

Corcoran, K., & Fischer, J. (1987). Measures for clinical practice: A sourcebook. New York: Free Press.

Corno, L., Snow, R. E. (1986). Adapting teaching to individual differences among learners. In Wittrock, M. C. (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 605-629). New York: McMillan.

Cossom, J. (1991). Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 5, 139-155.

Craft, J. (1990). Statistics and data analysis for social workers. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Cranton, P. (1994). Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults. San Fancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cranton, P. (1996). Professional development as transformative learning : New perspectives for teachers of adults. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crobach, L. J., Snow, R. E. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for research on interactions. New York: Irvington.

Cruicks, D. (1986). Critical thinking skills for teachers. Teacher Education Quarterly, 13, 82-88.

Dana, N. F., & Floyd, D. M. (1993, April). Preparing preservice teachers for the multicultural classroom: A report on the case study approach. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1991). Exploring the different levels of multicultural counseling training in counselor education. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 78-85.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1990). The Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey. Honolulu: University of Hawaii-Manoa.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. Journal of Counseling & Development, 1, 143-150.

De Anda, D. (1984). Bicultural socialization: Factors affecting the minority experience. Social Work, 29, 101-107.

Devore, W., & Schlesinger, E. (1991). Ethnic sensitive social work practice (3rd ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Chicago: Repery.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: MacMillan

Dodge, S. (1990). Schools eye reforms that could revolutionize medical training. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37, 37-39.

Dooley, A., & Skinner, W. (1977). Casing the case methods. Academy of Management Review, 31, 35-40.

Doyle, W. (1990). Case methods in the education of teachers. Teacher Education Quarterly, 17, 7-15.

Easterly, J. L. (1992). Classroom management in elementary school: Using case

reports to bridge the gap between theory and practice. In J. Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp. 194-210). New York: Teachers College Press.

Erskine, J. A. , Leenders, M.R., & Maufette-Leenders, L. A. (1981). Teaching with cases. London, Ontario: Research and Publications Division, School of Business Administration, University of Western Ontario.

Ertmer, P. A., Newby, T. J., McDougall, M. (1996). Student's responses and approaches to case-based instruction: The goal of reflective self-regulation. American Educational Research Journal, 33, 719-752.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and teacher education (pp. 305-325). New York: McMillan.

Fenstermacher, G. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. Review of Research in Education, 20, 3-56.

Frederick, P. (1986). The lively lecture – 8 variations. College Teaching, 34, 43-50.

Freire, P. (1987). Thinking and believing. College Teaching, 35, 89-91.

Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Fiedler, F., Mitchell, T., & Triandis, H. (1971). The culture assimilator: An approach to cross-cultural training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 95-102.

Fisher, C. F. (1972). The use and effectiveness of case study method in the inservice training of college and university administrators. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Flaskerud, J. H. (1986). The effects of culture-compatible interventions on the utilization of mental health services by minority clients. Community Mental Health Journal, 22, 127-141.

Fox, W. M. (1963). A measure of the effectiveness of case method in teaching human relations. Personnel Administration, 3, 53-57.

Fukuyama, M. (1990). Taking a universal approach to multicultural counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 30, 6-17.

Garcia, J. A. (1996). In search of cross-cultural competency: An empirical examination of cross-cultural training efforts in social work education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California.

Gelfand, D. E., & Fandetti, D. V. (1986). The emergent nature of ethnicity: Dilemmas in assessment. Social Casework, 67, 542-550.

Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, S., & Habeshaw, T. (1987). Improving student learning during lectures. Medical Teacher, 9, 11-20.

Gladstein, M., & Mailik, M. (1986). An affirmative action approach to ethnic diversity in field work. Journal of Social Work Education, 22, 41-49.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, D. K. (1996). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glass, G. V., Peckham, P. D., & Sanders, J. R. (1972). Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying the fixed-effects analysis of variance and covariance. Review of Educational Research, 42, 237-288.

Goodenough, W. J. (1963). Cooperation in change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Graham, K. (1991). The influence of teacher education on preservice teacher development: Beyond a custodial orientation. Quest.43, 1-19.

Grant, G. (1992). Using cases to develop teacher knowledge: A cautionary tale. In J. Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp. 211-226). New York: Teachers College Press.

Green, J. (1995). Cultural Awareness in the Human Services. In J. Green (Ed.), Cross-Cultural Problem Resolution (pp. 157-178). Boston.: Allyn & Bacon.

Green, J. (1982). Cultural awareness in the human services. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Green, J. (1995). Cultural awareness in the human services: A multiethnic approach (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Greeno, J. G. (1991). A view of mathematical problem solving in school. In M. U. Smith (Ed.), Toward a unified theory of problem solving (pp. 69-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Greenwood, G.E., & Parkay, F.W. (1989). Case studies for teacher decision making. New York: Random House.

Gudykunst, W., & Hammer, M. (1983). Basic training design: Approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of- intercultural training (Vol. 1, pp. 118-153). New York: Pergamon.

Hansen, J. C., Robins, T. H., & Grimes, J. (1982). Review of research on practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Super vision, 22, 15-24.

Harrington, H. (1991). The case method. Action in Teacher Education, 12, 1-10.

Haynes, A., & Singh, R. (1992). Ethnic-sensitive social work practice: An Integrated, Ecological, and Psychodynamic approach. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 2, 43-53.

Healy, L. (1988). Curriculum building in international social work: Toward preparing professionals for the global age. Journal of Social Work Education, 24, 221-228.

Heath, A., Neimeyer, G., & Pedersen, P. (1988). The future of cross-cultural counseling: A Delphi Poll. Journal of Counseling & Development, 67, 27-30.

Henson, K.T. (1988). Case study in teacher education. The Educational Forum, 52, 135-142.

Herberg, D. C. (1993). Frameworks for cultural and racial diversity: Teaching and learning for practitioners. Toronto : Canadian Scholars' Press.

Herberg, D. C. (1990). Social work with new immigrants. In Y. A. Shankar (Ed.), Proceedings of the Settlement and Integration of New Immigrants to Canada Conference (234-251). Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Herbert, J., White, B., & McNerpey, R. (1992, April). Producing, using and evaluating videotaped multicultural cases of teaching and learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Hernandez, A. G. (1986). Evaluating the triad model of cross-cultural training Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Ho, M. K. (1991). Use of Ethnic-Sensitive Inventory (ESI) to enhance practitioner skills with minorities. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 1, 57-67.

Hood, A. B., & Arceneaux, G. (1987). Multicultural counseling: Will what you don't know help you? Counseling Education and Supervision, 26, 173-175.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, NE: Author.

Hough, R., Landaverk, J., Karno, M., Burman, A., Timbers, D., Escobar, J., & Regier, D. (1987). Utilization of health and mental health services by Los Angeles Mexican Americans and Non-Hispanic Whites. Archives of General Psychiatry, 44, 702-709.

Hyos, G. D., Hyos, A. D., & Anderson, C. (1986). Sociocultural dislocation: Beyond the dual perspective. Social Work, 31, 61-67.

Ibrahim, F. A., & Arredondo, P. (1986). Ethical standards for cross-cultural counseling: Counselor preparation, practice, assessment, and research. Journal of Counseling & Development, 64, 349-352.

Ibrahim, F. A., & Arredondo, P. (1990). Ethical issues in multicultural counseling. In B. Herlihy & L. Golden (Eds.), Ethical standards casebook (pp.137-145). Alexandria, VA: American Association of Counseling and Development.

Ifill, D. (1989). Teaching minority practice for professional application. Journal of Social Work Education, 25, 29-35.

Ivey, A. E., & Authier, J. (1978). Microcounseling innovations in interview training. Springfield, IL: Charles G. Thomas.

James, F. (1991). An analysis of case-based instruction in teacher preparation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Virginia.

James, F. (1992, April). Case-based or traditional didactic instruction: Which tells the story for preservice teachers? Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Jayaratne, S., Gant, L., Brabson, H., Nagda, B., Singh, A., & Chess, W. (1992). Worker perceptions of effectiveness and minority-relevant education as a function of worker and client ethnicity. Journal of Teaching Social Work, 6, 93-116.

Kagan, D. M. (1993). Contexts for the use of classroom cases. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 703-723.

Katz, J. (1977). The effects of a systematic training program on the attitudes and behaviors of white people. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 77-89.

Kennedy, M. (1987). Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of expertise. In E. Rothdopf (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, (pp. 133-167). Washington, D.C: American Educational Research Association.

Kleinfeld, J. (1991, April). Changes in problem-solving abilities of students taught through case methods. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Reproduction Service no. ED 334154).

Kleinfeld, J. (1992). Learning to think like a teacher: The study of cases. In J. Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp. 33-49). New York: Teachers College Press.

Knirk, F. G. (1991). Case materials: Research and practice. Performance Improvement Quarterly, 4, 73-81.

Kowalski, T.J., Weaver, R.A., & Hensen, K.T. (1990). Case studies in teaching. New York: Longman.

Kurtz, M. E., Johnson, S. M., & Rice, S. (1989). Students' clinical assessments: Are they affected by stereotyping? Journal of Social Work Education, 25, 3-12.

Laboskey, V.K. (1992). Case investigations: Preservice teacher research as an aid to reflection. In J. Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp.175-193). New York: Teachers College Press.

LaFromboise, T. D., Coleman, H., & Hernandez, A. (1991, June). The development of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Los Angeles, CA.

Landis, D., & Brislin, R. (1983). (Eds.). Handbook of intercultural training: Issues in theory and design. New York: Pergamon Press.

Latting, J. K. (1990). Identifying the "isms": Enabling social work students to confront their biases. Journal of Social Work Education, 26, 36-44.

Latting, J., & Zundel, C. (1986). World view differences between clients and counselors. Social Casework, 67, 533-541.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. London: Cambridge University Press.

Lawrence, P. (1953). The preparation of case material. In Kenneth R. Andrews (Ed.), The case method of teaching human relations and administration, (pp. 215-224). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Lee, C. C. (1991). Promise and pitfalls of multicultural counseling. In C. C. Lee & B. L. Richardson (Eds.), Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity (pp. 1-13). Alexandria VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Lefley, H. P. (1986) . Evaluating the effects of cross-cultural training: Some research results. In H.P. Lefley & P. B. Pedersen (Eds.), Cross-cultural training for mental health professionals (pp.265-307). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Lefley, H. P., & Pedersen, P. B. (Eds.). (1986). Cross-cultural training for mental health professionals. Springfield Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Leinhardt, G. (1993). On teaching. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in educational psychology, (Vol. 4, pp. 1-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Levin, B. B. (1993). Using the case method in teacher education: The role of discussion and experience in teacher's thinking about cases. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California at Berkeley.

Levy, J. (1983). Developing intercultural competence in bilingual teacher training programs. In D. Landis R., & W. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of intercultural training (Vol. 3, pp. 55-80). New York: Pergamon Press.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper.

Lewis, K. G. (1991). Introduction: Family systems applications to social work. Journal of Independent Social Work, 5, 1-7.

Li, P. (1990). Race and ethnicity. In P. Li (Ed.), Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada (pp. 3-17). Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Linder, R. W., Harris, B. (1992). Self-regulated learning: Its assessment and instructional implications. Educational Research Quarterly, 16, 29-37.

Lister, L. (1987). Ethnocultural content in social work education. Journal of Social Work Education, 23, 31-39.

Lloyd, A. P. (1987). Multicultural counseling: Does it belong in a counselor education program? Counselor Education and Supervision, 26, 164-167.

Locke, D. C. (1990). A not so provincial view of multicultural counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 30, 18-25.

Lum, D. (1992). Social work practice and people of color. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole publishing Co.

Manoleas, P. (1994). An outcome approach to assessing the cultural competence of MSW students. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 3, 43-57.

Margolis, R. L., & Rungta, S. A. (1986). Training counselors for work with special populations: A second look. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 642-644.

Martinez, K. (1994). Cultural sensitivity in family therapy gone awry. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 16, 75-89.

Masoner, M. (1988). An audit of the case study method. New York: Praeger Publishers.

McAninch, A. R. (1993). Teacher thinking and the case method: Theory and future directions. New York: Teacher College Press.

McDonald, J. M. (1976). A comparative evaluation of the experiential and case methods of teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Goergia.

McKeachie, W. J. (1999). Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for

college and university teachers. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

McKeachie, W. J., Pintrich, P. R., Lin, Y. G., & Smith, D. A. (1986). Teaching

and learning in the college classroom: A literature review. Ann Arbor: University of

Michigan.

McKenney, J. L. (1962). An evaluation of a business game in an MBA

curriculum. The Journal of Business, 4, 278-86.

McNair, M. P. (1954). The case method at the Harvard Business School. New

York: McGraw-Hill.

McRae, M., & Johnson, S. (1991). Toward training for competence in

multicultural counselor education. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 131-135.

Merseth, K. (1991). The case for cases. Washington, DC: American

Association for Higher Education and American Association of Colleges for Teacher

Education.

Merseth, K. (1992). Cases for decision making in teacher education. In J.

Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp. 50-63). New York: Teachers

College Press.

Merseth, K., & Lacey, C. A. (1993). Weaving stronger fabric: The pedagogical

promise of hypermedia and case. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9, 283-99.

Mesa-Bains, A., & Shulman, J. (1992). Instructor's guide for diversify in the

classroom: A casebook for teachers and teacher education. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Midgette, T., & Meggert, S. (1991). Multicultural counseling instruction: A challenge for faculties in the 21st century. Journal of Counseling & Development, 71, 136-141.

Montiel, M., & Wong, P. (1983). A theoretical critique of the minority perspective. Social Casework, 64, 112-117.

Nakanishi, M., & Rittner, B. (1992). The inclusionary cultural model. Journal of Social Work Education, 28, 27-35.

Norton, D. (1978). The dual perspective: Inclusion of ethnic minority content in social work curriculum. New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Noddings, N. (1991). Stories in dialogue: Caring and interpersonal coming. In Witherell, C., & Noddings, N. (Eds.), Stories lives tell: Narrative dialogue in education (pp. 157-170). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noordhof, K. & Kleinfeld, J. (1990). Shaping the rhetoric of reflection for multicultural settings. In Clift, R. T., Houston, W. R., & Pugach, M. C. (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and program (pp. 163-1 85). New York: Teachers College Press.

Nwachuku, U. T., & Ivey, A. E. (1991). Culture-specific counseling: An alternative training model. Journal of counseling & Development, 70, 106-111.

O'Brien, G., Fiedler, F., & Hewlett, T. (1971). The effects of programmed culture training upon the performance of volunteer medical teams in Central America. Human Relations, 24, 209-231.

Painchaud, R. L. (1984). A comparison of perceptions of selected Germanic executives to determine if case-study analysis education affects their decision-making process. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Dakota.

Pedersen, P. (1977). The Triad model of cross-cultural counseling. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 480-484.

Pedersen, P. (1982). Cross-cultural triad model. In E. K. Marshall & P. D. Kurtz (Eds.), Interpersonal helping skills (pp.238-284). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pedersen, P. (1988). A handbook for developing multicultural awareness. Alexandria, VA: American Association of Counseling Development.

Pedersen, P. (1991). Multiculturalism as a generic approach to counseling. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 6-12.

Pedersen, P., Holwill, F., & Shapira, J. (1978). A crosscultural training procedure for classes in counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 17, 233-237.

Perlman, H. H. (1957). Social casework, a problem-solving process. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Piaget, J. (1971). The construction of reality in the child. New York: Ballantine.

Pincus, A., & Minahan, A. (1973). Social work practice: Model and method. Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Pinderhughes, E. B. (1979). Teaching empathy in cross-cultural social work. Social Work, 24, 312-316.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning (MSLQ). Ann Arbor, MI: University

of Michigan, National Centre for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the Strategies for Learning (MSLQ). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53, 801-813.

Ponterotto, J. G., & Casas, J., (1987). In search of multicultural competence within counselor education programs. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65, 430-434.

Ponterotto, J. G., & Casas, J., (1991). Handbook of racial-ethnic minority counseling research. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Ponterotto, J., Rieger, B., Barrett, A., & Sparks, R. (1994). Assessing multicultural counseling competence: A review of instrumentation. Journal of Counseling & Development, 72, 316-322.

Ponterotto, J. G., Sanchez, C. M., & Magids, D. M. (1991). The Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS) Form B: Revised Self-Assessment. New York: Fordham University.

Pope-Davis, D., & Ottavi, T. (1994). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: A replication and extension. Journal of Counseling & Development, 72, 293-297.

Powell, J. L. (1994). Case method in higher education: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kansas State University.

Prion, S. (1994). The case method used inductively as an instructional approach to create cognitive schema in undergraduate nursing students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of San Francisco.

Ramsden, P. (1992). Learning to teach in higher education. London: Routledge.

Randolph, G., Landis, D., & Tzeng, O. (1977). The effects of time and practice upon Culture Assimilator training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1, 105-119.

Resnick (1996). Situated learning. In E. De Corte, & F. E. Weinert (Eds.), International encyclopedia of developmental and instructional psychology (pp. 341-347). Oxford: Pergamon.

Resnick, L. B., & Klopfer, L. E. (1989). Toward the thinking curriculum: An overview. In L. B. Resnick, & L. E. Klopfer (Eds.), Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research (pp. 3-18). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Richert, A. (1991). Case method and teacher education: Using cases to teach teacher reflection. In B. R. Tabachnick & K- Zeictmer (Eds.), Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (pp. 130-150). London: Falmer press.

Richert, A. (1992). Writing cases: A vehicle for inquiry into the teaching process. In J. H. Shulman (Ed.), Case methods in teacher education (pp. 155-174). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ridley, C. R., Mendoza, D. W., & Kanitz, B. E. (1994). Multicultural training: Reexamination, operationalization, and integration. The Counseling Psychologist, 22, 227-63.

Romiszowski, A., Mulder, M., & Pieter, J. (1990). The case-study methodology and instructional development. Instructional Development, 1, 7-32.

Ronnau, J. (1994) . Teaching cultural competence: Practice ideas for social work educators. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 3, 29-42.

Rosenthal, B. S. (1993). Graduate social work student's beliefs about poverty and attitudes toward the poor. Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 7, 107-121.

Ross, D. (1992). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 22-30.

Ruben, B., & Kealey, D. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3, 15-47.

Salcido, R., & Cota, V. (1995). Cross-cultural training for child welfare workers when working with Mexican-American clients. Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 6, 36-43.

Salcido, R., Garcia, J., Cota, V., & Thomson, C. (1995). A cross-cultural training model for field education. Arete, 20, 26-36.

Sanders, D. (1980). Multiculturalism: Implications for social work. International Social Work, 23, 9-16.

Saroyan, A. & Snell, L. (1997). Variations in lecturing styles. Higher Education, 33, 85-104.

Scardamalia, M., Bereiter, C. (1989). Conceptions of teaching and approaches to core problems. In M. Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for beginning teachers (pp. 37-45). Oxford: Pergamon.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner San Francisco:

JosseyBass.

Shulman, J. H. (Ed.). (1992). Case methods in teacher education. New York:

Teachers College Press.

Shulman, J. H., &Colbert, J. A. (Eds.). (1987). The mentor teacher casebook

San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Shulman, J. H., &Colbert, J. A. (Eds.). (1988). The intern teacher casebook:

Cases and commentaries. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research

and Development; Portland, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching.

Educational Researcher 5, 4-14.

Shulman, L.S. (1992). Toward a pedagogy of cases. In J.H. Shulman (Ed.),Case

methods in teacher education (pp. 1-32). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sikula, J. (1990) National commission reports of the 1980's. In W.R. Houston,

M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 72-

82). New York: Macmillan.

Sims, P. J. (1994). Utilizing the peer group method with case studies to teach

pharmaceutics. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 58, 78-81.

Singleton, S. M. (I 994). Faculty personal comfort and the teaching of content on

racial oppression. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 3, 31-37.

Silverman, R., Welty, W. M., & Lyon, S. (1991). Case studies for teacher

problem solving. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Slavin, R. (1990). Cooperative learning: Theory, practice, research.

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Snowden, L. R. (1987). The peculiar successes of community psychology: Service delivery to ethnic minorities and the poor. American Journal of Community Psychology, 15, 575-586.

Sowers-Hoag, K. M., & Sandau-Beckler, P. (1996). Educating for cultural competence in the generalist curriculum. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 4, 37-56.

Speight, S., Myers, L., Cox, L., & Highlen, P. (1991). A redefinition of multicultural counseling. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 29-35.

Spiro, R. J., Vispoel, W., Schmitz, J., Samarapungavan, A., & Boerger, A. (1987). Knowledge acquisition for application: Cognitive flexibility and transfer in complex content domains. In B. C. Britton & S. Glynn (Eds.), Executive control processes (pp.117-200). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.

Spradley, J. P. (1972). Culture and cognition. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.

Stake, R. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stevens, J. (1996). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stevens, R. (1983). Law school: Legal school in America from the 1850s to the 1980s. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 477-486.

Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. E., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P., Smith, E. J., &

Nuttall, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. The

Counseling Psychologist, 10, 45-52.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1977). Barriers to effective cross-cultural counseling

competencies. Counseling Psychologist, 10, 45-52.

Sue. D. W.. & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the culturally different (2nd ed.). New

York: Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W. (1979). Preliminary data from the DISC evaluation report #1.

Hayward, CA: California State University.

Sue, D. W. (1991). A model for cultural diversity training. Journal of Counseling &

Development, 70, 99-105.

Sue, S. (1977). Community mental health services to minority groups: Some

optimism, some pessimism. American Psychologist, 32, 616-624.

Sue, S., Fujino, D., Hu, L., Takeuchi, D., & Zane, N. (1991). Community mental

health services for ethnic minority groups: A test of the cultural responsiveness

hypothesis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59, 533-540.

Taylor, E. W. (1994). Intercultural Competency: A transformative learning process.

Adult Education Quarterly, 44, 155-174.

Teich, P. F. (1986). Research on American law teaching: Is there a case against the

case system. Journal of Legal Education, 35, 167-188.

The Cognition & Technology Group at Vanderbilt (1990). Anchored instruction

and its relationship to situated cognition. Educational Researcher, 19, 2-10.

Tillman, B. A. (1992). A study of the use of case methods in preservice teacher

education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Timmons, T. G. (1995). Effects of a teacher preparatory program using a case study method. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Dakota.

Toseland, R., & Spielberg, G. (1982). The development of helping skills in undergraduate social work education: Model and evaluation. Journal of Education in Social Work. 18, 66-73.

Tully, C. T., & Greene, R. (1994). Cultural diversity comes of age: A study of coverage, 1970-1991. Arete, 19, 37-44.

Van Soest, D. (1994). Social work education for multicultural practice and social justice advocacy: A field study of how students experience the learning process. Journal of Multicultural Social Work. 3, 17-28.

Van Soest, D. (1995). Multiculturalism and social work education: The non-debate about competing perspectives. Journal of Social-Work-Education, 31, 55-66.

Vega, W., & Kolody, B. (1993). Mental health service utilization among rural Mexican Americans: An agenda for rural research. Berkeley: Institute for Mental Health Services Research.

Vinton, L., & Harrington, P. (1994). An evaluation of the use of videotape in teaching empathy. Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 9, 71-84.

Vontress, C. E. (1988). Social class influences on counseling. In R. Hayes & R. Aubrey (Eds.), New directions for counseling and human development (pp. 346-364). Denver, CO: Love Publishing.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (original work published in 1934).

Wassermann, S. (1993). Getting down to cases: Learning to teach with case studies. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wassermann, S. (1994). Using cases to study teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 602-611.

Watson, C. (1975). The case-study method and learning effectiveness. College Student Journal, 32, 109-116.

Welty, W. M. (1989). Discussion method of teaching: How to make it work. Change, 2, 40-49.

Weinstein, C. S. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 31-40.

Williams, G. (1985, August). The case method: An approach to teaching and learning in educational administration. The Professional Preparation and Development of Educational Administrators in Commonwealth Developing Areas. A symposium, Barbados. (ERIC Reproduction Service no. ED 276 135).

Williams, S. M. (1992). Putting case-based instruction into context: Examples from legal and medical education. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 24, 367-427.

Wyman, S. L. (1993). How to respond to your culturally diverse student population. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods, Newbury Park. CA: Sage Publications.

Yutrzenka, A. (1995). Making a case for training in ethnic and cultural diversity in increasing treatment efficacy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63, 197-210.

Zane, N. W., Sue, S., Hu, L., & Kwon, J. (1991). Asian-American assertion: A social learning analysis of cultural differences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 63-68.

Zeichner, K. (1987). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. International Journal of Educational Research, 11, 567-575.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 23-48

Zimpher, N. (1989). The RATE Project: A profile of teacher education students Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 27-30.

Appendix A

Human Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Abdi Barise and I am a doctoral student at the Department of Educational and Counseling psychology, McGill University. The study I am requesting you to participate in will compare different methods of teaching cross-cultural social work. The results of this study are expected to increase our knowledge about learning and teaching cross-cultural social work. Your total time commitment to this study is a maximum of three hours. Please note that participation in this study is voluntary and that your refusal to take part will not result in loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You have been randomly assigned to one of the two sections of the class where you will be taught through one of two teaching methods commonly used in the classroom. This random assignment will not pose a problem of inconvenience for you since the two sections of the class will be taught at the same time and as specified in the undergraduate course schedule. Your confidentiality and anonymity will be ensured in this study in the following manner. As you can see, response forms with code numbers taken from the table of random numbers and wallet-sized cards have been distributed to you. If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign these consent forms (below) and copy your code numbers to your cards and store them in your wallets because you will need your code-numbers in the second phase of this study (if you decide to continue your participation). The consent forms will be collected and kept separately from the response forms. Also, please complete the instruments and analyze the case according to the directions given. During the third week of the semester, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire concerning your views about and approaches to learning in this course. Towards the end of the semester, you will again be asked to perform the same tasks as at the beginning of the course.

If you have any questions about this study or your rights and concerns, I encourage you to contact me (334-0663 or 398-6648). Thank you for your interest in helping me in what promises to be valuable, practical research.

Sincerely,

Abdi Barise, M.S.W.
The Principal Investigator

Participant:

I agree to participate in this study and understand that all information given will remain confidential and anonymous. I understand that I am being asked to participate in a study that is comparing two methods of teaching cross-cultural social work. I also understand that I am under no obligation to participate in this study, that I may discontinue participation at any time, and that my refusal to participate will not result in loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

_____	_____
Participant	Date

Appendix B

Case Studies

Harassment of Black Youth by Law Enforcement Agents[1]

In a recent incident, police officers from Station 24 lured a group of young Black high school students during break time with offers of pizza lunch as part of a police/community program. The youth were detained and used in a criminal line-up without the consent of either the school authorities or their parents. Some of the students came out of this incident very angry. One student said to the school authorities "I am very disappointed, it is like we are all criminals. So, anything can be done to us. It doesn't matter because we are Black"

The public relations officer at Station 24 where the incident had occurred had informed the school authorities that "this kind of line-up is the only way that criminals can be properly identified." School authorities could not reach the officers involved in this incident.

Suppose that you are the school social workers who have been assigned to work with the students involved in this incident. School authorities believe that these students are highly traumatized by this experience. You have been informed by the school authorities that two Organizations in the Black Community of Montreal had called the school and voiced their concern about various kinds of harassment of Black youth in Montreal by law enforcement agents. The school authorities have informed you that the two different Black Community leaders mentioned several cases of Black youth being denied access to the Metro and being detained by Metro security guards for not having proper identification.

How would you define the problem as well as assess and intervene in this case? Specifically:

A. Case Conceptualization/Assessment:

1. a. What are the central problems in this case?

   b. How would you prioritize these problems?

   c. what assumptions and values guide your understanding of these problems?

   d. What are the origins of these assumptions and values (how did you come to espouse them)?

   e. How do you know that these assumptions are valid (how can you defend/support them)?

   f. How would you characterize the behaviours exhibited by the different players in this case (what do they mean)?

   g. what power relationships can you see at play in this case and how this might influence your social work assessment and intervention processes?

   h. what is the significance of racism in this case and how would you address it in your assessment and intervention?

2. a. How might your background and identity affect your work with the parties involved?

   b. How would you deal with the possible impact of your identity on the helping process?

3. What additional information would you seek in order to complete the assessment of this case?

B. Intervention Plan

4. a. Based on the information presently available to you, outline an intervention

plan designed to help the youth and the Black community on the one hand, and the

police and the Metro Security agents on the other hand.

b. what are some of the possible consequences of your suggested intervention?

c. What makes you believe that your suggested solution will work ?

Services for Abused Immigrant Women[1]

Lamana is a 35 year old women of Rwandan Tutsi heritage. She was born in Rwanda and lived there until the outset of the Tutsi minority genocide by the Hutu majority extremists. She subsequently ran away to live in a refugee camp in North Eastern Kenya. Lamana met Bukera, a 37 year old Tutsi man in the refugee camp and they subsequently got married.

Bukera left his pregnant wife behind to come to Canada and claim refugee status. He bought a Kenyan passport with a false American Visa and entered Canada through the United States. Bukera was subsequently accepted as a conventional refugee in Canada. Bukera filed an application with the Canadian Immigration to sponsor his wife under the family re-unification program. However, the Canadian Immigration authorities did not recognize the couple's marriage because they could not produce a marriage certificate from Rwanda. Therefore, he sponsored Lamana as his Fiancee, as suggested by the immigration authorities. Lamana and couple's one-year-old son, Paul, arrived at Montreal to join Bukera, about two year from the time he left his pregnant wife in the refugee camp. Lamana was granted two months residence by the Canadian Immigration authorities at Mirabel airport and was told to get married to her Fiancee within 90 days to stay in Canada.

When Lamana came to Montreal, Bukera asked her to live in a two bedroom apartment with him and his girlfriend. Lamana was shocked to hear this but she nevertheless obeyed

---

[1] Abdi Barise and Michael Baffoe wrote this case; it is a real case.

her husband because she did not know of any alternatives. However, she insisted that the girl friend leave the house in the near future. Bukera threatened Lamana with cancellation of her sponsorship and deportation to Rwanda. One night, Bukera physically assaulted Lamana following an argument about Bukera's girl friend. Lamana consulted with another Rwandan women, Nicole, whose relatives she knew in Rwanda. Following Nicole's advice, Lamana went to a Women's Shelter in the area with her child.

Suppose that Lamana came to the Shelter where you work and you have been asked by the prevention committee at the Shelter to propose a program of assistance for women whose sponsorships have been threatened by their husbands. In particular, the committee is concerned with women like Lamana who have arrived in Montreal as sponsored immigrants under the Family Re-unification program, after escaping civil wars in their own countries. Like Lamana, some of these women had spent some time in refugee camps prior to their arrival in Canada. These women often tolerate substantial abuse from their husbands out of fear that they will be sent back to their war-ravaged countries should immigration sponsorships be withdrawn.

Discussion Questions:

Assessment:

1. a. What are the central problems in this case?

    b. How would you prioritize these problems?

c. what assumptions and values guide your understanding of these problems?

d. What are the origins of these assumptions and values (how did you come to espouse them)?

e. How do you know that these assumptions are valid (how can you defend/support them)?

f. How would you characterize the behaviours exhibited by the different players in this case (what do they mean)?

g. what power relationships can you see at play in this case and how this might influence your social work assessment and intervention processes?

2. a. How might your background and identity affect your work with the parties involved?

    b. How would you deal with the possible impact of your identity on the helping process?

3. a. What are the implications of the Canadian and Quebec immigration laws/policies for these women?

    b. What other provincial or federal laws policies may positively or negatively impact on the services for these clients?

4. What additional information would you seek in order to complete the assessment of this case?

B. Intervention Plan

5.   a. Based on the information presently available to you, outline an intervention

plan designed to help Lamana and other women in her situation.

b. what are some of the possible consequences of your suggested intervention?

c. What makes you believe that your suggested solution will work ?

d. What policies need to be changed in order for these clients to enhance their

functioning?

e. How can any service barriers affecting these clients' circumstances be

eliminated?

f. What kind of advocacy do these clients need?

Inhumane Treatment of Refugees[1]

Mrs. Mukanda escaped from the brutal regime of Mobutu Sese Seko in Zaire (now known as the Democratic Republic of the Congo) after government soldiers had killed her two brothers on suspicion of belonging to an underground rebel movement. She came to Canada in May 1992 and claimed refugee status.

In 1993 her refugee claim was rejected by the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada and was ordered to be deported back to her war-torn country where war was then raging between Mobutu's government and a group of rebels.

When officials from the Enforcement Branch of Canadian Immigration arrived at her home in Ville St. Laurent in June 1994 to deport her, she had just arrived from hospital where she had been admitted for complications in her five-month-old pregnancy. She was arrested and detained at the Tanguay prison for women while her deportation papers were being processed.

In spite of her poor health condition, the officials drugged her to put her on an Air France plane found for Paris and Kinshasa, Zaire. Escorting her were two Immigration Officials and a female nurse whose job was to administer continuous doses of some strong medication to keep her asleep and weak until the plane landed in Zaire. They dumped her in the airport in Kinshasa and returned to spend a three-day vacation in Paris.

---

[1] This case was written by Abdi Barise and Michael Baffoe; it is a real case.

When news of the drugging and deportation of the pregnant woman became public, the Immigration Department claimed that they administered the drug on the advise of her doctor. It turned out that no doctor saw Mrs. Mukanda prior to her deportation.

Discussion questions:

What are your reactions to the Mukanda case?

How would you know whether Mrs. Mukanda is a refugee?

What changes should be made to the refugee determination process to avoid such tragic situation?

Suppose that Mrs. Mukanda came to the refugee services agency where you work prior to the rejection of her refugee claim, how would you have helped her?

Now, suppose that she came to your agency after the rejection of her refugee claim and prior to her deportation, how would you have helped her.

What are the implications of the Canadian and the Quebec Human Rights legislation for Mrs. Mukanda's case?

Racial Tensions Among Teenage Students in Schools[1].

You are a social worker in a high school in the East End of Montreal. Recently, there has been a fighting between a group of Haitian students and a group of French Canadian students in your school. The French Canadian students said that the Haitians first insulted them in Creole, resulting in a scuffle. The Haitian students, on the other hand, argued that the real issue was over French Canadian girls. They alleged that the French Canadian group was angry over several French Canadian girl friends of Haitian students. The Haitians accused the other group of attacking them and calling them Nigres salles. Luc, a 16-year-old French Canadian student was injured on the face during the shoving.

The school principal reports that, in the past, there have been problems in the school concerning conflict and violence among groups of students based on ethnicity. The principal adds that the main problem seems to be between groups of Haitian and French Canadian students. These students, mostly male, band together in these groups, and each group has its clothing style and music. Between periods and after school, groups spar with each other, trade insults, and racial/ethnic slurs.

Suppose that the school administration asked you to propose a resolution to the conflict between the two groups involved in this case. In addition, the administration wants you to propose a culturally sensitive approach to reduce teenage racial tension in the school, in general.

---

[1] This case was written by Abdi Barise and Michael Baffoe; it is based on a real incident.

Edwin's Case[1]

Edwin is a 14-year-old boy of mixed parentage. He is visibly Black but is confused about his identity. Edwin's mother, Isabelle, is a 40-year-old French Canadian. She does not see Edwin as Black. She openly admits to not exploring or even thinking about her son's Blackness. She also has a negative attitude toward the boy's father and therefore there has been limited contact between Edwin and his father. She is a high school graduate and has been taking evening courses to upgrade her computer skills. She had limited contact with her family since her marriage to Edwin's father. Since separating from Edwin's father, Isabelle and Edwin have lived with her common-law husband, Benoit. Isabelle works as an office clerk in a coat factory.

Edwin's father, Leslie, is a 38-year-old Black man of West Indian origin. He came to Canada 15 years ago in search of work as a mechanical engineer. He originally arrived in Alberta hoping to find a job working in the oil fields. Failing to find a permanent job after two years, he moved to Montreal. Since then he has been unable to find work in his field. His parents and several siblings remain in the West Indies. He maintains ties with the West Indian community in Montreal. Edwin's parents were married but split up a few years after the birth of Edwin, and eventually got divorced.

---

[1] Dr. Karen Swift and Michael Baffoe wrote this case; it is realistic.

Isabelle says that she feels overwhelmed by the demands of daily life and complains that her ex-husband is of little help in caring for their son. She loves her son but believes that she has lost control of him. Leslie is largely unaware of the problems his son is facing. He has had minimal contact with his son over the past several years, and does not talk to his ex-wife.

Edwin is exhibiting very disruptive behaviour in class. He has been suspended from school on numerous occasions. He has recently been expelled from school. Edwin's case has been signaled to Youth Protection previously, but has never been retained because the security and development of Edwin was not deemed at risk. Since Edwin has been expelled from school, his case has been re-signaled and finally retained. Lately, Edwin has begun hanging out with a negative peer group who are involved in minor, property crimes. Edwin's relationship with his mother has been difficulty recently, and he states that she does not understand him.

Lately, Edwin has had difficulties at home as well. He complains that his mother does not love him and that his step-father hates him. Edwin ran away from home for four days before he was picked up by the police in a shopping mall in the downtown area of Montreal. He refuses to go back home complaining of physical abuse by his mother and step-father.

Suppose that the case has been signalled to a youth protection agency where you work and subsequently assigned to you for assessment and intervention planning.

During your first interview with the family, Isabelle angrily denounced Edwin describing him as "troublemaker", "good for nothing", "who has no place in my home if does not change his ways. Edwin's step-father echoes Isabelle's charges entreating you to "find a place for this troublesome boy."

Prepare comprehensive assessment and intervention plan of this case. Specifically:

What initial steps would you take in order to prepare for working with this family?

If you decide to that Edwin is to be placed, what issues would you take into consideration in finding an appropriate placement?

Appendix C

Instructor Rating Questionnaire (Lecture-Discussion)

Instructor Rating Questionnaire (Lecture-Discussion)

Thank you for responding to this questionnaire thoughtfully. Please circle the number that most closely matches your response for each instructor. Please use the following scale: 1—almost never; 2—seldom; 3—occasionally; 4—often; 5—very often; 6—almost always

1. The instructor summarizes the concepts covered in the previous class and links it to the present topic.

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. The instructor presents an outline showing the structure of each lecture (using either the blackboard or an overhead projector);

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. The instructor asks questions about the main points of the present topic before starting the lecture;

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. The instructor limits the content of each lecture to avoid student overload

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. The instructor uses examples or metaphors frequently to illustrate concepts

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. The instructor encourages students to stop the lecturer and ask him questions or disagree with him

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. The instructor poses questions during lectures to check student understanding

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. The instructor informs students when he moves from one topic to another

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. At the end of each topic, the instructor tells students what topic would be covered
next

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. The instructor gives students a chance to ask questions or raise points;

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

11. The instructor links the concepts covered that day to that which would be covered the
in the following lecture.

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. The instructor is enthusiastic

Abdi	1	2	3	4	5	6
Michael	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Instructor Rating Questionnaire (Case Method)

Instructor Rating Questionnaire (Case-Based Method)

Thank you for responding to this questionnaire thoughtfully. Please circle the number that most closely matches your response for each instructor. Please use the following scale: 1—almost never; 2—seldom; 3—occasionally; 4—often; 5—very often; 6—almost always

1. The instructor models how to analyze cases when needed.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

2. The instructor gives students guidance and feedback on case analyses.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

3. The instructor helps students when they need assistance in case analyses.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

4. The instructor does not intervene (e.g. comment) when there is no need for intervention.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

5. The instructor encourages students to articulate their understanding of the cases.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

6. The instructor encourages students to analyze new cases on their own.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

7. During case discussions, the instructor challenges student opinions respectfully.

   | Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

8. The instructor creates a supportive learning climate in the classroom.

| Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

9. The instructor encourages students to reflect on the assumptions underlying their approaches to case analyses.

| Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

10. The instructor is enthusiastic about the subject matter

| Abdi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Michael | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Appendix E

Pretest-posttest Case Study

Differential Acculturation: Parent-Teenage Conflict[1]

The A family is a Sikh family who emigrated from India and came to Canada eight years ago. The family is composed of 7 members. Mrs. A is the 38-yearold mother of the 5 children. She stays at home to take care of the young children. Mr. A who is the father of the children is a 45-year-old store-owner. Fi (15 years old daughter) is the eldest child in the family. The family has four other children aged 14, 12, 9 and 2 (all boys).

Suppose that the case of Fi and the A family has been referred to your agency under the Youth Protection Act. The precipitating incident was that Mrs. A had slapped Fi after Fi had gone out at six p.m. without her parents' permission and came home at 10:00 p.m. A neighbor called 911 after she heard Mrs. A screaming and Fi crying. The case was subsequently signaled under the Youth Protection Act and was taken over by the family services agency where you work.

Now suppose that the following is the scenario at the outset of your first meeting with the family:

Mrs. A angrily says to her daughter "You have no shame, soon I will have to kick you out of the house. Your behaviour and the way you are talking back to me is absolutely unacceptable. Even I cannot do that now to my parents. . . ."

---

[1] This case was written by Abdi Barise; it is a real case.

Fi says to you "At school, my parents want me to hang out only with girls from my country of origin. They want me to stay at home and do the chores when I am not at school. My younger brother is allowed to go out and have fun with his friends but I am not. He is not required to do the chores. When I say that is unfair my parents scream at me. But after all, this is Canada. I will not accept that kind of treatment. I can take care of myself."

Mr. A sits in a corner and does not say a word. However, he nods whenever Mrs. A speaks.

Please briefly discuss how you would assess and intervene with the A family in cross-culturally competent manner. Please state the rationale behind all of your responses and be as brief and complete as possible. Specifically:

1. a. What are the central issues in this case?

   b. How would you prioritize these issues?

   c. what assumptions and values guide your understanding of these issues?

   d. How would you characterize the behaviour exhibited by each family member (what does it mean)?

2. a. How might your background and identity affect your work with this family?

b. How would you deal with the possible impact of who you are on the helping process?

3. a. During this particular interview, which family member would you address first and why?

b. What would you say to that person? Please provide at least two different quotes of what you would say.

c. If you were to address every other family member (one at the time), what would you say to her/him? Please provide quotes.

4. a. What federal or provincial policies/laws may be impacting on the services for the A family?

b. What kind of advocacy might this family need?

5. a. In general, what are some of the possible main components of your possible intervention plan for this family?

b. what are some of the possible consequences of your suggested intervention?

Appendix F

Sample Class Plan Checklist

Class_____ Section_____ Date_____

Instructor _____ Observer _____

Class Plan

Topic: Social Policy Context: Immigrant adaptation

Please check only if implemented otherwise comment in the provided space.

8:30—10:15—Sources of Adaptation Difficulties

---Linking the present topic to previous class

---providing an outline of today's lecture on OHP

--Asking students: what are the sources of adaptation difficulties for immigrants
        new immigrant? and writing the responses on the blackboard or OHP

---using an example, ---Explaining the sources of adaptation difficulties including:

    --Employment-related

                --Unemployment

                --Exploitation

                --Downward mobility

    --Racism

                --Institutional (laws, policies, etc.)

                --Societal (prejudice, unfounded fear for jobs, fear for culture, etc.)

    --Language

    --Culture-related

                --Culture Shock

                --Acculturation stress

--Inability to practice aspects of culture

--- To check student understanding, posing the question: how may these factors
lead to adaptation difficulties?

---Providing a summary of what have been covered from so far;

---Informing students that social work intervention will be dealt with next

---Encouraging students to stop the lecturer and ask him questions or disagree with him;
(e.g., any questions so far?)

10:15-10:30—Break

10:30--11:25—Social Work Intervention

--Asking students: what can social workers do to facilitate immigrant adaptation?
Or a similar question and writing the responses on the blackboard or OHP.

---using an example, ---Explaining the possible areas of social work intervention including:

--Macro & Micro-level

--Employment-related

--Racism

--Language

--Culture-related

11:25-11:30—wrapping up the class.

Overall observer comments

Appendix G

Course Outline for Cross-Cultural Perspectives in Social Work Practice

McGill University
School of Social Work

Cross-Cultural Perspectives in Social Work Practice

Session: 407-344B   Instructors:
                                                              Abdi Barise
Winter 1988   Michael Baffoe

Course Learning outcomes:

At the end of the course, students should be able to:

- Analyze and appreciate the impact of their own identity (racial, cultural, ethnic, etc.) as well as their power/powerlessness on the helping process.

- Assess the application and impact of Canadian social policies/ laws such as Multiculturalism, immigration, and human rights legislation and their effects on the social service delivery to people of various cultural and racial backgrounds.

- Enhance their abilities to apply cross-cultural social work principles in their assessment of and intervention with clients of different cultural, ethnic or racial backgrounds than their own.

- Demonstrate a beginning ability to apply multicultural social work knowledge to analyse and devise intervention plans for specific problems faced by specific minority groups.

Recommended Text: (On reserve)

    Pinderhughes, Elaine. (1989). Understanding Race, Ethnicity and Power.
N.Y. : The FreePress

    Devore, W. & Schlesinger, E. (1996). Ethnic-Sensistive Social Work. Toronto: Collier
Macmillan, Canada, Inc.

    Li, Peter (ed.). (1990). Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada. Toronto, Oxford University
Press

    Dominelli, L. (1988). Anti-Racist Social Work. London: Macmillan.

PART I: IDENTITY/DIFFERENCE

Session 1: Introduction to course themes and concepts

Difference
Race
Ethnicity
Culture

Required Readings:

Gutierrez, L. & Nagda, B: "The Multicultural Imperative in Human Service Organizations" In Raffoul, P.R. & McNeece, C.A (1996). Future Issues for Social Work Practice. Toronto: Allyn & Bacon

Pinderhughes, Ch. 6: "Understanding Difference", pp. 109-146

Session 2: Course Themes & Concepts (Continued)
Power/Power Differentials
Racism: Cultural, Institutional Racism and how that impacts on the helping process

Required Readings:

Li, Peter. "Race and Ethnicity". in Li, Peter op.cit., pp3-17

Slonin, M. (1991). "The role of Culture and Ethnicity in Personality Development" in Children, Culture and Ethnicity. N.Y; Garland Publishing Inc. pp. 3-19.

Devore, W. & Schlesinger E. "The Layers of Understanding" in Ethnic Sensitive Social Work Practice (4th Ed. 1996)

PART II: CANADIAN/ QUEBEC CONTEXT:

Session 3: Demographics, Immigration, Social policy

Sessions 4 & 5: Human Rights & Multiculturalism Legislation

Required Readings:
Elliot, J. & Fleras, A. "Immigration and the Canadian Ethnic Mosaic". in Li, Peter, op. cit. 51-76

Beheils, Michael. "Quebec and the Question of Immigration". Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association. 1991

Sessions 6 & 7: Program Development.

Required Readings:
Dominelli, Anti-Racist Social Work, Chaps. 5, 6, & 7

Boucher, N. (1990). "Are Social Workers Concerned with Canadian Immigration and
multicultural Policies?" The Social Worker. 58 (4): 153.

PART III: FAMILY PRACTICE

Session 8 & 9: Cross-Cultural Assessment and intervention with families.

Required Readings:

Pinderhughes (Chapter on Assessment)

Green, J. (1995).Cultural Awareness in the Human Services 2nd Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon,
Chap. 5, "Cross-cultural Problem Resolution".

Brown, R.(1990). Overcoming Sexism & Racism- How ?

Session 10-12: More case analyses; sessions with guest speakers from field agencies; cross
cultural communication between clients & workers in social work practice; relevant issues
·   discussed in earlier sessions

Session 13:   Wrap-Up Session

ASSIGNMENTS

#1.   Personal Identity Paper: 5-6 pages in length worth 30% of the final mark.
                                        Due at end of Session 4 on January 30

Based on their understanding of the concepts discussed in Sessions 1 & 2, students will
prepare a 5-6 page paper exploring their personal, racial, ethnic identity and
power/powerlessness. How will these impact on their professional practice as Social
Workers? Students should explicitly incorporate the following elements in their discussion:
1. Historical development of one's identity in the context of *race, ethnicity, culture*
and *power/powerlessness*. 2. Implications for social work practice

#2. A 12-14 page paper on a topic of interest to the student related to any of the topics and issues discussed during the course. This will be an exploration of the implication of the selected issue to social work practice with appropriate reference to the literature. Guidelines for this paper will be available at the end of Session 6. This paper is worth 60% of the final grade. Due on April 8th

\# Attendance in this course is compulsory and is worth 10% of the final grade.

Reading List

Boucher, N. (1990). Are social workers concerned with Canadian immigration and multicultural policies. *The Social Worker, 58*, 153-8.

Brown, R. (1990). Overcoming Sexism and Racism: How? In O. McKague (Ed.), *Racism in Canada* (pp. 126-164). Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers.

Elliot, J. F., A. (1990). Immigration and the Canadian Ethnic Mosaic. In P. Li (Ed.), *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Green, J. (1995). Cultural Awareness in the Human Services. In J. Green (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural Problem Resolution* (pp. 157-178). Boston.: Allyn & Bacon.

Gutierrez. (1996). The Multicultural Imperative in Human Service Organizations. In C. R. Raffoul, & McNeece, C.A. (Ed.), *Future Issues for Social Work Practice* . Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.

Li, P. (1990). Race and ethnicity. In P. Li (Ed.), *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada* (pp. 3-17). Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Pinderhughes, E. (1989). Understanding Difference, *Understanding Race, Ethnicity, and Power* (pp. 109-146). N.Y.: The Free Press.

Pinderhughes, E. (1989). Assessment. In E. Pinderhughes (Ed.), *Understanding, Race, Ethnicity, and Power* (pp. 147-162). N.Y.: Free Press.

Slonin, M. (1991). The role of culture and ethnicity in personality development. In M. Slonin (Ed.), *Children, Culture, and Ethnicity* . N.Y.: Garland Publishing Inc.

Appendix H

Demographic Background Questionnaire

Demographic Background Questionnaire

Please complete the demographic items listed below by checking the answer which most nearly applies to you or writing the answer in the space provided.

Code number-------------------- Gender----------------

Age-------------------------------

Ethnic \ Cultural Background-----------
                                      .

Who immigrated to Canada?

You------- your Parents-------your Grandparents---------

Other (e.g., member of the First Nations community). Please specify ----------------

Degree(s)/Diploma(s) held--------------------------Previous field of study----------------

What is your current year/level (regular BSWs only)? U2------   U3------

Have you already taken or currently taking a course on crisis intervention?

No-------- Yes--------------

Have you undergone cultural sensitivity training before? No---- Yes----

If yes, please describe briefly

What is your current GPA?------------

How long is your social work experience, in terms of full-time work (paid or volunteer, excluding field placement)?

------Years and------------months.

Are you currently working (paid or volunteer)? No-----Yes--------

If yes, how many hours per week?--------hours.

Is your work related to social work? No--- Yes----

Appendix I

The Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire

Part A. Motivation

The following questions ask about your motivation for and attitudes about
this class. **Remember there are no right or wrong answers, just answer as
accurately as possible.** Use the scale below to answer the questions. If you
think the statement is very true of you, circle 7; if a statement is not at all true
of you, circle 1. If the statement is more or less true of you, find the number
between 1 and 7 that best describes you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true of me						very true of me

1. In a class like this, I prefer course material   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    that really challenges me so I can learn
    new things.

2. If I study in appropriate ways, then I   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    will be able to learn the material in this
    course.

3. When I take a test I think about how   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    poorly I am doing compared with other
    students.

4. I think I will be able to use what I learn   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    in this course in other courses.

5. I believe I will receive an excellent grade   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    in this class.

6. I'm certain I can understand the most   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    difficult material presented in the
    readings for this course.

7. Getting a good grade in this class is the   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    most satisfying thing for me right now.

8. When I take a test I think about items   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
    on other parts of the test I can't answer.

		not at all true of me						very true of me

9. It is my own fault if I don't learn the material in this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. It is important for me to learn the course material in this class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. The most important thing for me right now is improving my overall grade point average, so my main concern in this class is getting a good grade.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I'm confident I can learn the basic concepts taught in this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. If I can, I want to get better grades in this class than most of the other students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. When I take tests I think of the consequences of failing.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I'm confident I can understand the most complex material presented by the instructor in this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. In a class like this, I prefer course material that arouses my curiosity, even if it is difficult to learn.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I am very interested in the content area of this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. If I try hard enough, then I will understand the course material.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I have an uneasy, upset feeling when I take an exam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

	not at all true of me						very true of me

20. I'm confident I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I expect to do well in this class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. The most satisfying thing for me in this course is trying to understand the content as thoroughly as possible.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I think the course material in this class is useful for me to learn.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. When I have the opportunity in this class, I choose course assignments that I can learn from even if they don't guarantee a good grade.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. If I don't understand the course material, it is because I didn't try hard enough.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I like the subject matter of this course.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. Understanding the subject matter of this course is very important to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I feel my heart beating fast when I take an exam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I'm certain I can master the skills being taught in this class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. to do well in this class because it is important to show my ability to my family, friends, employer, or others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. Considering the difficulty of this course, the teacher, and my skills, I think I will do well in this class.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3

Part B. Learning Strategies

The following questions ask about your learning strategies and study skills for this class. Again, there are no right or wrong answers. Answer the questions about how you study in this class as accurately as possible. Use the same scale to answer the remaining questions. If you think the statement is very true of you, circle 7; if a statement is not at all true of you, circle 1. If the statement is more or less true of you, find the number between 1 and 7 that best describes you.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not at all true of me						very true of me

32. When I study the readings for this course, I outline the material to help me organize my thoughts.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. During class time I often miss important points because I'm thinking of other things.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. When studying for this course, I often try to explain the material to a classmate or friend.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. I usually study in a place where I can concentrate on my course work.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. When reading for this course, I make up questions to help focus my reading.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. I often feel so lazy or bored when I study for this class that I quit before I finish what I planned to do.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. I often find myself questioning things I hear or read in this course to decide if I find them convincing.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. When I study for this class, I practice saying the material to myself over and over.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. Even if I have trouble learning the material in this class, I try to do the work on my own, without help from anyone.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

41. When I become confused about something I'm reading for this class, I go back and try to figure it out.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

42. When I study for this course, I go through the readings and my class notes and try to find the most important ideas.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

43. I make good use of my study time for this course.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

44. If course readings are difficult to understand, I change the way I read the material.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

45. I try to work with other students from this class to complete the course assignments.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

46. When studying for this course, I read my class notes and the course readings over and over again.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

47. When a theory, interpretation, or conclusion is presented in class or in the readings, I try to decide if there is good supporting evidence.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

48. I work hard to do well in this class even if I don't like what we are doing.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

49. I make simple charts, diagrams, or tables to help me organize course material.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

50. When studying for this course, I often set aside time to discuss course material with a group of students from the class.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

51. I treat the course material as a starting point and try to develop my own ideas about it.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

52. I find it hard to stick to a study schedule.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

53. When I study for this class, I pull together information from different sources, such as lectures, readings, and discussions.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

54. Before I study new course material thoroughly, I often skim it to see how it is organized.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

55. I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the material I have been studying in this class.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

56. I try to change the way I study in order to fit the course requirements and the instructor's teaching style.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

57. I often find that I have been reading for this class but don't know what it was all about.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

58. I ask the instructor to clarify concepts I don't understand well.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

59. I memorize key words to remind me of important concepts in this class.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

60. When course work is difficult, I either give up or only study the easy parts.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

61. I try to think through a topic and decide what I am supposed to learn from it rather than just reading it over when studying for this course.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

62. I try to relate ideas in this subject to those in other courses whenever possible.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

63. When I study for this course, I go over my class notes and make an outline of important concepts.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

64. When reading for this class, I try to relate the material to what I already know.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

65. I have a regular place set aside for studying.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

66. I try to play around with ideas of my own related to what I am learning in this course.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

67. When I study for this course, I write brief summaries of the main ideas from the readings and my class notes.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

68. When I can't understand the material in this course, I ask another student in this class for help.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

69. I try to understand the material in this class by making connections between the readings and the concepts from the lectures.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

70. I make sure that I keep up with the weekly readings and assignments for this course.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

71. Whenever I read or hear an assertion or conclusion in this class, I think about possible alternatives.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

		not at all true of me						very true of me
72.	I make lists of important items for this course and memorize the lists.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73.	I attend this class regularly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74.	Even when course materials are dull and uninteresting, I manage to keep working until I finish.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
75.	I try to identify students in this class whom I can ask for help if necessary.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76.	When studying for this course I try to determine which concepts I don't understand well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
77.	I often find that I don't spend very much time on this course because of other activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
78.	When I study for this class, I set goals for myself in order to direct my activities in each study period.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
79.	If I get confused taking notes in class, I make sure I sort it out afterwards.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
80.	I rarely find time to review my notes or readings before an exam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
81.	I try to apply ideas from course readings in other class activities such as lecture and discussion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7