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Occupational therapy students’ self-efficacy, experience of supervision, and perception of meaningfulness of Level II fieldwork

Abstract

Background: This study explored the relationship of perceived self-efficacy to demographic and fieldwork variables for occupational therapy (OT) students. Self-efficacy is related to student and employee success and competency.

Methods: OT students (n = 306) from 42 OT programs in the United States completed the Student Confidence Questionnaire and the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey addressing demographics, practice setting, students’ experience of supervision, and perceptions of the fieldwork’s personal meaning during Level II fieldwork. Correlational and regression methods examined the relationships among the variables. Analysis of variance methods tested differences between higher and lower self-efficacy student groups.

Results: The degree of self-efficacy was related to students’ experience of supervision, prior professional experience, and the meaningfulness of the fieldwork to the student. As the students’ perceived self-efficacy increased, their perception of the supervisory relationship as supportive increased.

Conclusion: Recommendations for further research include investigating how to imbue meaning in the fieldwork experience to foster student self-efficacy. The study results inform academic and fieldwork educators of the need to cultivate students’ self-efficacy to help students integrate feedback and actively participate in the supervisory relationship during Level II fieldwork.
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Occupational therapy (OT) fieldwork is the experience when academic preparation and clinical practice meet. As such, fieldwork may be a challenging period for students, as they grapple with changing expectations when they shift from the role of student to the role of health care professional. Academic programs; clinical sites, such as hospitals and schools; academic fieldwork coordinators; and fieldwork educators interface to provide a rich fieldwork experience to meet the learning needs of the students and the accreditation standards for educational programs (Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education [ACOTE], 2012). Fieldwork education has been identified as an important agent of change for the profession and is aligned with the Centennial Vision, as it provides an opportunity to prepare future therapists and, in the process, rearticulate the groundwork of the profession (Crist, 2007). Hence, research examining fieldwork experiences may suggest strategies to educate students in a way that is responsive to the profession’s need for competent OT students and entry-level OT practitioners.

Perceived self-efficacy, defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to perform a task despite the obstacles, has been linked with achievement, motivation, and performance in both academic (Brady-Amoon & Fuertes, 2011; Richardson, Abraham, & Bond, 2012) and work settings (Bandura, 1997; Brown, Lent, Telander, & Tramayne, 2011). Self-efficacy is an important construct to examine during professional fieldwork, when students are challenged to learn and demonstrate the entry-level decision making skills required of occupational therapists but struggle with their own sense of capability, which may hinder their performance (Crist, 2011; Derdall, Olson, Janzen, & Warren, 2002; Richard, 2008).

**Research Questions**

This study investigated the following research questions for OT students (OT assistant students were not included):

1. What is the relationship between student demographics (gender; first, second, or third fieldwork; type of OT educational program; and previous professional experience in a related setting) and OT students’ degree of perceived self-efficacy?
2. What is the relationship between characteristics of the fieldwork setting (practice setting, population served, choice in fieldwork site) and OT students’ degree of perceived self-efficacy?
3. What is the relationship between the meaningfulness of fieldwork and the experience of supervision, and OT students’ degree of perceived self-efficacy?
4. Do high, medium, and low scoring student groups, based on Student Confidence Questionnaire scores (degree of perceived self-efficacy), differ in their experience of supervision?

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived self-efficacy, as measured by the Student Confidence Questionnaire (Derdall et al., 2002), and demographic survey variables for OT students on Level II fieldwork in the United States. Variables related to demographics, practice setting, and the experience...
of supervision were correlated to self-efficacy to build on prior research (Derdall et al., 2002; Lew, Cara, & Richardson, 2007). Additional variables related to the experience of supervision and the personal meaning of the fieldwork were correlated to OT students’ self-efficacy, as no published literature to date had examined those relationships. This quantitative study focuses on students during their Level II fieldwork, in contrast to program reviews and the Student Evaluation of the Fieldwork Experience, which asks students to remember their fieldwork experiences after time has passed. There is evidence of a gap in the literature related to how students’ degree of perceived self-efficacy may influence their perception of the supervisory relationship and the degree of meaning ascribed to the fieldwork experience. Academic and fieldwork educators are able to influence student self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Margolis & McCabe, 2006). This study may indicate the need to foster students’ self-efficacy to enhance their ability to participate in the supervisory relationship and to enhance their fieldwork experience. To that end, this study examined the relationships among these variables.

**Rationale for Undertaking the Study and Literature Review**

**Self-efficacy, Competence, and Fieldwork**

A primary fieldwork goal delineated in the ACOTE standards (2012) is developing competent practitioners (C.1.11), and self-efficacy is related to competence and performance (Bandura, 1997; Brady-Amoon & Fuertes, 2011; Brown et al., 2011; Richardson et al., 2012). Bandura (1997) distinguished self-efficacy, with its focus on capability and competence, from self-confidence alone, which does not take performance into account. Also, Crist (2011) articulated that both self-efficacy and skill performance are required for OT students to be capable in their role as therapists. In addition, research has linked perceived self-efficacy and performance for health care students on fieldwork (Opacic, 2003) and has found that self-doubt may impair skills so that even highly capable individuals may not be able to perform under circumstances that undermine their belief in themselves (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy may be fostered during fieldwork through the following education approaches: (a) creating mastery experiences (i.e., successful experiences that are of moderate difficulty), (b) providing observation of others succeeding at a task, (c) providing verbal persuasion and guidance, and (d) promoting a positive mood through lowering students’ anxiety (Bandura, 1997; Margolis & McCabe, 2006). Mastery experiences are considered most effective for fostering self-efficacy, although the four approaches are recognized as interrelated (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is related to capability and success as a student (and later employee) and is an implicit aim of fieldwork (Crist, 2011; Lew et al., 2007). Furthermore, the interaction between knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy may explain why some OT students do very well in coursework and then have difficulty passing their fieldwork (Bandura, 1997).

Students’ degree of self-efficacy has been found to influence their ability to seek and incorporate feedback (Debowski, Wood, & Bandura, 2001; Nease, Mudgett, & Quiñones,
which in turn impacts the ability to learn from experiences. For example, a student with a high sense of self-efficacy may be able to benefit from feedback due to being able to view negative feedback as informative and correctable rather than devastating (Debowsk et al., 2001). However, a student with very low self-efficacy may view negative feedback as attributable to his or her limited abilities, which may not be readily changed (from the student’s perspective) (Bandura, 1997).

Students’ self-efficacy is also important because difficulty accepting and responding to feedback is a documented problem that leads to OT fieldwork failure (Dale, 2001; James & Musselman, 2005).

**Experience of Supervision and Fieldwork**

A fieldwork goal delineated in the ACOTE standards (2012) is providing supervision and role modeling that is responsive to the setting and the students’ abilities (C.1.16), hence it will be important to examine the relationship between the experience of supervision and student self-efficacy. Prior research indicated that the supervisory relationship was related to OT students’ fieldwork success (Derdall et al., 2002; James & Musselman, 2005; Lew et al., 2007). Rodger, Fitzgerald, Davila, Millar, and Allison (2011) found that supervisors’ traits associated with fieldwork learning included timely and constructive feedback, supportive communication, and guidance in skill development.

Problems with supervision during fieldwork, such as supervisors’ intolerance of differences, were cited as a significant factor in OT students having poor fieldwork experiences, even when they did pass the fieldwork (Lew et al., 2007).

**Fieldwork Meaning**

Another fieldwork goal delineated in the ACOTE standards (2012) is developing self-reflective practitioners (C.1.11). Richard’s (2008) study of fieldwork educators found that clinical reflection was essential for the learning process in fieldwork. The relevance and personal meaning ascribed to the fieldwork experience by students may indicate self-reflection and profound engagement in the learning process, hence it will be important to include in this study. The survey will examine the meaningfulness of the fieldwork through items such as the students’ perceptions of being active decision makers and feeling that the fieldwork was educational and promoted professional and personal growth.

**Demographics and Fieldwork Setting Variables**

An additional fieldwork goal delineated in the ACOTE standards (2012) is to develop professionalism and responsibility as a practitioner (C.1.11). Fieldwork allows the students to practice skills that contribute to professionalism but that are difficult to develop in the academic setting, such as therapeutic use of self and being part of an interdisciplinary team. Thus, this study will include previous professional experience in a related setting (e.g., working in a school previously as a teacher), which may capture students with perhaps greater worker readiness, a factor that is developed during fieldwork and may influence self-efficacy.

There is no current literature that explores how the type of OT program (i.e., bachelor to masters programs, entry-level masters programs, or occupational therapy doctoral programs) is related to student perceived self-efficacy. According to
James and Musselman (2005), inadequate academic preparation was most frequently cited by fieldwork educators as a factor contributing to OT students failing Level II fieldwork. Therefore, distinguishing between the type of OT program and how it may be related to student self-efficacy will add to the literature and might influence how OT education is delivered in the United States.

A goal delineated in the ACOTE standards (2012) is to provide fieldwork experiences in traditional and/or emerging settings (C.1.12), as practice changes in response to health legislation and society’s needs. Settings may vary widely in terms of procedures, documentation, pacing, and required skills. For example, Brandenburger-Shasby (2005) found that the majority of occupational therapists in school-based settings felt poorly prepared based on entry-level education alone. Therefore, it will be important to include the experience of learning specific skills and knowledge that may be needed in particular settings, and how that may be related to student self-efficacy. To summarize, the literature review supports the study of relationships among perceived self-efficacy, the experience of supervision, the meaningfulness of fieldwork, and demographic variables of the OT students (Crist, 2007; Crist, 2011; Dale, 2001; Derdall et al., 2002; James & Musselman, 2005; Lew et al., 2007; Rodger, Fitzgerald, Davila, Millar, & Allison, 2011).

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 306 OT students from 42 universities in the United States who were completing Level II fieldwork during summer 2009, fall 2009, or spring 2010. The universities were chosen to include diverse geographic locations representative of the United States and both public and private universities with bachelor (BS) to masters programs (MS), entry-level masters (ELM) programs, or occupational therapy doctoral (OTD) programs.

**Instrumentation**

Two measures were used in the study: the Student Confidence Questionnaire (Derdall et al., 2002) and the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey, which was designed by the researcher. The Student Confidence Questionnaire was used to examine the level of OT student perceived self-efficacy (defined as self-reported) during fieldwork (Derdall et al., 2002). Sample questions are provided in Table 1. The measure is based on Bandura’s self-efficacy work, as it examines both an affirmation of a level of perceived competence (e.g., “I am confident that I can explain the role of OT to clients/families”) and the strength of the belief (i.e., 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree), in contrast to confidence, which reflects strength in a belief without assertion of capability (Bandura, 1997; Derdall et al., 2002). Many of the items in the questionnaire correspond specifically with the clinical practice domains evaluated in the Fieldwork Performance Evaluation for the Occupational Therapy Student (American Occupational Therapy Association [AOTA], 2002). The Student Confidence Questionnaire was pilot tested for internal reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .96) and construct validity with a sample (29 students) from one university in Alberta, Canada. This study used...
total Student Confidence Scores of 157 and below to indicate the “lower scoring” OT student group (i.e., lowest score to first quartile and lowest 25% of data) and scores of 158 to 166 for the “middle scoring” group (i.e., first to third quartile and middle 50% of data). Scores of 167 and above indicated the “higher scoring” OT student group (i.e., third quartile to highest score and highest 25% of data), and 200 was the highest possible score.

Table 1
Sample Questions from Student Confidence Questionnaire (Derdall et al., 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Communication: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interact with clients.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicate assertively with team members.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Adaptability: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adjust to a new clinical setting.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Use alternate assessment strategies as needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Innovation: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Use my own ideas in clinical practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Use problem-solving techniques.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Risk Taking: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Use techniques which I have practiced.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Use techniques which I have observed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Supervision: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Function in the student-supervisor relationship.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Seek feedback from my supervisor, clients, and colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Clinical Practice: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Apply the role of OT in clinical practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Supervise client programs effectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Professional Competence: “I am confident that I can ….”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Analyse activity.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Select appropriate frames of reference.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The original numbering from the instrument was retained in these sample questions.

Items in the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey were chosen based on previous research indicating factors affecting fieldwork success and self-efficacy (Derdall et al, 2002; Lew et al., 2007; Opacic, 2003; Rodger et al., 2011) as well as new items related to the meaningfulness of fieldwork and the perception of supervision. Sample questions from the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey are provided in Table 2. The Demographic Questionnaire and Survey used a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) to rate the meaningfulness of fieldwork and the experience of supervision. A limitation of the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey was that it was not pilot tested and did not identify students who had no previous experience in a related setting.
Table 2
Sample Questions from Demographic Questionnaire and Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“During my fieldwork I experienced…..”</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. a gradual building of expectations and responsibilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. knowing clearly my objectives and duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. a fieldwork setting that was educational and promoted my learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a fieldwork experience in which I had opportunities to actively make decisions and choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a meaningful experience of personal and professional growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. open and warm communication with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. a supervision experience that was supportive and responsive to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures
Institutional Review Board approval of the study was received from San Jose State University. Academic fieldwork coordinators at 78 universities were contacted and asked if they would forward an email letter introducing the study to their OT students who were on Level II fieldwork. Students from 42 universities participated in the study. OT students who chose to participate clicked on the link in the email letter, which brought them to the SurveyMonkey website. The students gave their informed consent to participate in the study before proceeding to the survey. Approximately 1500 students received an email request to participate in the study and 306 responded, resulting in a 20% response rate.

The Student Confidence Questionnaire and the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey were scored by the researcher and all data were entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2009) version 18. Participant codes were used to preserve confidentiality. All of the results were aggregated and not separated by individual participants or participating schools.

Data Analysis
The data from the study were analyzed using correlational and regression methods to examine the relationships among the variables under study. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test differences in student groups based on degree of self-efficacy. The independent variables are related to participant characteristics, practice setting, the meaningfulness of the fieldwork, and the experience of supervision. The dependent variable is perceived self-efficacy.

Results
Participant Characteristics
See Table 3 for characteristics of the 306 participants. According to AOTA (2010), of the OT programs nationally, 2% are OTD programs, 65% are ELM programs, and 32% are BS to MS degree programs. The participant sample included 13% OTD students, 55% ELM students, and 31% BS to MS students, indicating there were more OTD student participants compared to the distribution of program types.
Table 3
Characteristics of Participants (n = 306)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Range 21-60 years)</td>
<td>Mean = 26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD = 5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>186 (93.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>108 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>165 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>119 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of educational program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors-to-master’s degree</td>
<td>96 (31.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-level master’s program</td>
<td>169 (55.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral-level occupational therapy program</td>
<td>39 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>2 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II Fieldwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st placement</td>
<td>126 (41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd or more</td>
<td>177 (57.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience in a related setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>96 (31.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professional</td>
<td>210 (68.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of fieldwork setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient hospital</td>
<td>131 (42.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>87 (28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>31 (10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>48 (15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>9 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercised choice in fieldwork setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>246 (80.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59 (19.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral health</td>
<td>43 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical dysfunction</td>
<td>159 (52.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>100 (32.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>4 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Regression of Number of Fieldwork, Type of OT Educational Program, and Professional Experience in Related Setting on Student Confidence (Perceived Self-Efficacy) (n = 306)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Confidence</td>
<td>Overall Model</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd or 3rd fieldwork</td>
<td>-1.587</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: BS to MS</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: ELM</td>
<td>-3.657</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience</td>
<td>7.010</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = significant at the 0.05 level.

Research Question 1: Relationships between self-efficacy and demographic variables.

Linear regression was used in order to determine if a relationship exists between perceived self-efficacy and demographic variables. Previous professional experience in a related setting was positively correlated (p = .019) with perceived self-efficacy as indicated in Table 4, even when controlling for age. All other demographic variables, such as age, level of educational program, and number of fieldworks completed were not related to OT students’ perceived self-efficacy.

Research Question 2: Relationships between self-efficacy and practice setting, population, and choice. Linear regression was used in order to determine if a relationship exists between perceived self-efficacy and practice setting variables. There were no significant relationships (p = .644) among practice setting, population served, having a choice in the fieldwork placement, and the OT students’ perceived self-efficacy.

Research Question 3: Relationships between self-efficacy and the meaningfulness of fieldwork and experience of supervision. In order to determine if a relationship exists between the meaningfulness of fieldwork, the experience of supervision, and perceived self-efficacy, a Spearman’s Rho was used. Nearly all variables were related to perceived self-efficacy as delineated in Table 5. The meaningfulness of fieldwork (i.e.,
items 1 to 5 in Table 5), such as the fieldwork being an opportunity for personal and professional growth, was significantly and positively related to the OT students’ perceived self-efficacy. The experience of supervision (i.e., items 6 and 7 in Table 5), such as open and warm communication with the supervisor, was significantly and positively related to the OT students’ confidence.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about Aspects of the Fieldwork and Experience of Supervision</th>
<th>Correlation with Student Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I experienced…”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gradual building of expectations and responsibilities.</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowing clearly my objectives and duties.</td>
<td>0.133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fieldwork setting was educational &amp; promoted my learning.</td>
<td>0.167*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Opportunities to actively make decisions and choices.</td>
<td>0.252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A meaningful experience of personal &amp; professional growth.</td>
<td>0.188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Open and warm communication with my supervisor.</td>
<td>0.136*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A supervision experience that was supportive and responsive to my needs.</td>
<td>0.143*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * = significant at the 0.05 level.

Research Question 4: Difference in experience of supervision subscores between low, medium, and high scoring OT student groups based on perceived self-efficacy scores.

A one-way ANOVA was used to examine whether those student groups with greater perceived self-efficacy experienced supervision differently from student groups with less self-efficacy. The Student Confidence scores were divided into low, medium, and high student groups based on total Student Confidence raw scores. The experience of supervision subscore was calculated by looking at the mean scores of the students’ responses to survey items 6 and 7 in Table 2 (i.e., the supervisor’s open communication and ability to respond to students’ needs).

The one-way ANOVA result is significant, meaning that the student self-efficacy groups differ in terms of the experience of supervision subscores. The subsequent Bonferroni multiple comparisons determined that the low and high self-efficacy student groups significantly differed in their supervision ratings, as did the medium and high self-efficacy student groups. Those students with greater perceived self-efficacy rated their experiences of supervision more positively in terms of their perception of the supervisor’s open and warm communication, support, and responsivity to students’ needs. The means plots in Figure 1 show that as the student perceived self-efficacy increases, their scores related to perceiving a supportive supervisory relationship increase.
Discussion

The study results support previous findings related to the students’ perceived self-efficacy and also add new findings which may influence both academic and fieldwork education. A key finding of the study was that previous professional experience in a related setting was positively related to perceived self-efficacy. The literature identifies worker readiness and comfort with the worker role during fieldwork as an area in need of development for OT students, and this area warrants further research (Rodger et al., 2011). This finding might influence OT program admission criteria through rating previous professional experience as part of the OT program application and might inform academic curriculum by building in more professional role development experiences.

Other key results were the significant positive relationships between both the meaningfulness of fieldwork and the experience of supervision and the students’ perceived self-efficacy. This study supports the results of other studies in which the supervisor’s supportive relationship was helpful for student success (Lew et al., 2007; Rodger et al., 2011). These findings suggest a need to continue to support fieldwork educators in the area of supervision skills to foster emerging self-efficacy in OT students (Crist, 2011).

A new finding of this study is the link between student self-efficacy and the meaningfulness of the fieldwork experience, such as having opportunities for personal growth and active decision making. Academic coursework might help students prepare for fieldwork through creating professional development plans. The plans could be shared with fieldwork educators and would include goals related to the student’s personal and professional growth. The plans might be refined and augmented in concert with the Level II fieldwork educator over the course of the fieldwork.
Practice setting, population served, and having a choice in the fieldwork placement were not related to the OT students’ perceived self-efficacy. This finding supports previous studies (Derdall et al., 2002). This finding suggests that perception of self-efficacy is not related to the specific characteristics of the practice setting or clientele.

It is a new finding that as the students’ perceived self-efficacy increases, their perception of the supportiveness of the supervisory relationship also increases. This finding relates to the student’s experience of supervision regardless of the unique supervisory relationship between the student and supervisor or the supervision model employed, and this area warrants further research. Students with greater self-efficacy may be better able to view even critical feedback as supportive to their learning process, which may foster their ability to integrate feedback, thus enhancing their performance.

Giving students face-to-face practice in hearing both positive feedback and areas needing improvement during their academic program might provide a foundation for active participation in the supervisory process during their fieldwork (Scheerer, 2003); this area warrants further research. Instructors during coursework and Level I fieldwork may need to develop skills in offering feedback, as well as help students’ learn to reframe feedback as welcomed and fundamental, to enhance students’ learning. Self-efficacy develops during fieldwork experiences and early clinical practice via constructive feedback (Hodgetts et al., 2007; Sweeney, Webley, & Treacher, 2001); therefore, this finding about the relationship between self-efficacy and the supervisory relationship has implications for both education and practice.

Limitations

The study limitations include not pilot testing all elements of the Demographic Questionnaire and Survey and using a measure of self-efficacy that was pilot tested with a small sample. Academic programs configure Level II fieldwork at different points in the curricula and this was not taken into account in this study. The selection bias in this study is assumed; the OT students who chose to participate may differ from those who did not, such as being more engaged with fieldwork or having more feelings about their fieldwork experience that they were motivated to share.

Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to examine relationships among OT students’ demographic variables, the meaningfulness of fieldwork, the experience of supervision, and the students’ perceived self-efficacy during Level II fieldwork. This study indicates that self-efficacy may be influenced by OT students’ perceptions of the meaningfulness of fieldwork and their experience of supervision, yet is not influenced by practice setting and population served. A key finding is that the students’ degree of self-efficacy is positively related to their experience of supervision as supportive. The study contributes to the literature, and the results inform academic and fieldwork educators of the need to cultivate students’ self-efficacy to help them integrate feedback and actively participate in the supervisory relationship during Level II fieldwork.
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