

## Evidence Related to Setting, Structure, and Outcomes of Occupational Therapy Nontraditional Level II Fieldwork: A Scoping Review

Maggie Graham, OTS, Kylee Hartman, OTS, MacKenzie LeMasters, OTS, Brette Moore, OTS, Lilly Reed, OTS, Gitte Thrysoe, OTS, Laurie Vera, MHS, OTR/L and Pamalyn Kearney, EdD, OTR/L

*Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Master of Health Sciences in Occupational Therapy degree at Augusta University*

### At the conclusion of the poster, attendees will:

1. Discuss 3 advantages from the literature for students in a nontraditional level II fieldwork setting compared to a traditional level II fieldwork setting.
2. Describe “nontraditional fieldwork” within the scope of occupational therapy.

**Purpose:** to address the gap in the literature by looking at widely available sources to provide relevant insight into nontraditional Level II Fieldwork for the interested audience.

### Methods:

- Scoping Review using Arksey and O'Malley guidelines (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005).
- Looked at 5 databases (PubMed, CINAHL, Eric, ProQuest, and JOTE).
- Search originally yielded 329 amount of articles total from the listed databases
- Inclusion Criteria: must follow search terms
- Exclusion Criteria:
  - Not within the past 38 years
  - Not available in English
  - Did not include level II fieldwork students
  - Supervision from an OTA
  - Project protocols
  - Traditional fieldwork experience
- Between May 2020 – June 2021 extracted data from 18 articles

### Results:

- The preliminary themes include areas of nontraditional fieldwork settings, educational outcomes of students, and the role of occupational therapists in these particular settings
- Our research question focuses on the evidence and models of practice relating to occupational therapy students, academia, and fieldwork sites participating in NTFW in comparison to traditional fieldwork
- After reading the full texts, data extraction, and removing the duplicates, researchers found that 18 articles were relevant to our study and created four charts pertaining to terms used for NTFW, student outcomes, client outcomes and supervision structure and setting.
  - Of our 18 included articles, 14 used a **specific term or multiple terms** to refer to NTFW. The remaining four articles met the inclusion criteria, but they did not specify other specific terms relating to NTFW. Of the 14 articles that used a specific term to refer to nontraditional, the two most frequently used terms were “role-emerging fieldwork” (n=5, 27.77%) and “nontraditional fieldwork” (n=5, 27.77%).
  - Of the 18 articles analyzed, 72.22% (n=13) provided a definition of NTFW, or a similar term they used to imply NTFW. The 13 definitions were analyzed for commonalities. Of the 13 analyzed, the most common definition found in 53.85% (n=7) articles defined NTFW as a placement where OT is not currently established but will be introduced.
  - The most prevalent **beneficial student outcome** reported was an increase in student’s personal growth skills (n= 9, 50%), including but not limited to more creativity, initiative, time-management, responsibility, flexibility, autonomy, and clinical reasoning.
  - The most prevalent **challenging student outcomes** (n=2, 11.11%), identified were that students found it challenging to manage the amount of pressure, responsibility, and uneven work distribution along with a lack of structure and support from supervisors and/or therapists.
  - Only four of the 18 included articles mentioned **client outcomes** (22.22%).
    - The client outcomes included: more access to care, reduced recurrence of criminal behaviors (recidivism) by resuming productive life roles, increased job retention, increased life-readiness skills, increased new cultural perspectives, and improved client self-efficacy.

- There were 21 **different settings** mentioned within the 18 articles. Of the 18 sources, the most common settings were in mental health/psychosocial centers.
- For **structure**, indirect supervision and undefined supervision were the most reported methods of supervision.

## Implications:

### Clinical Implications for **Students**:

- NTFW experience led to more positive outcomes promoting personal and professional skills along with a better understanding of the OT profession
- Further research is needed for more challenging student outcome

### Clinical Implications for **Profession**:

- Better understanding of services, structure, and settings for NTFW along with education on how to provide services to promote better holistic care

### Clinical Implications for **Clients**:

- Limited client outcomes other than increased access to care, increased job retention, reduced recurrence of criminal behaviors, and increased self-efficacy
- Further quantitative research is needed for client outcomes

### Clinical Implications for **Educators in Academia**:

- Educate on NTFW as well as traditional fieldwork, compare the benefits and challenges for all stakeholders, and be aware of frameworks and theories used in NTFW settings
- Understand the background and importance of nontraditional fieldwork

### Clinical Implications for **Educators in the Field**:

- Prepare their incoming students with the challenges that may arise in NTFW. These challenges may include a lack of structure and supervision, more responsibility, a potentially uneven work distribution, and varying roles of OT interventions

## References

- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Atwater, A. W., & Davis, C. G. (1990). The value of psychosocial level II fieldwork. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 44(9), 792-795. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.44.9.792>
- Dillon, M. B., Dillon, T. H., King, R. M., & Chamberlain, J. L. (2007). Interfacing with community mental health services: Opportunities for occupational therapy level II fieldwork education. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 21(1-2), 91-104. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003c21n01\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003c21n01_07)
- Fleming, J. D., Christenson, J., Franz, D., & Letourneau, L. (1996). A fieldwork model for non-traditional community practice. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 10(2), 15-35. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v10n02\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v10n02_03)
- Hartmann, K. D., Nadeau, B., & Tufano, R. (2013). Clinical experiences to promote student education of psychological and social aspects of mental health: A case report. *Work*, 44(3), 329-335. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-121509>
- Lau, M., & Ravenek, M. (2019). The student perspective on role-emerging fieldwork placements in occupational therapy: A review of the literature. *Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 7(3), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1544>
- Matilla, A. (2017). Perceptions of occupational therapy students participating in role emerging fieldwork at community agencies: An explanatory case study. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 7(4), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1612>
- Miller, K. S., & Johnson, C. (2005). New doors: A community program development model. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 19(1-2), 135-43. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v19n01\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v19n01_10)
- Mohler, A., & Brown, A. (2020). Using fieldwork to emphasize emerging practice. *SIS Quarterly Practice Connections*, 5(3), 14-16.
- Mulholland, S., & Derdall, M. (2005). A strategy for supervising occupational therapy students at community sites. *Occupational Therapy International*, 12(1), 28-43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/oti.13>
- Overton, A., Clark, M., & Thomas, Y. (2009). A review of nontraditional occupational therapy practice placement education: A focus on role-emerging and project placements. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 72(7), 294-301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030802260907200704>
- Precin, P. (2009). An aggregate fieldwork model: Cooperative learning, research, and clinical project publication components. *Occupational Therapy in Mental Health*, 25(1), 62-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01642120802647691>
- Provident, I. M., & Joyce-Gaguzis, K. (2005). Creating an occupational therapy Level II fieldwork experience in a county jail setting. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 59(1), 101–106. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.59.1.101>
- Rodger, S., Thomas, Y., Holley, S., Springfield, E., Edwards, A., Broadbridge, J., Greber, C., McBryde, C., Banks, R., & Hawkins, R. (2009). Increasing the occupational therapy mental health workforce through innovative practice education: A pilot project. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 56(6), 409-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1630.2009.00806.x>
- Shields, M., Quilty, J., Dharamsi, S., & Drynan, D. (2016). International fieldwork placements in low-income countries: Exploring community perspectives. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 63(5), 321-328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12291>
- Shordike, A., & Howell, D. (2002). The reindeer of hope: An occupational therapy program in a homeless shelter. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 15(1-2), 57-68. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v15n01\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v15n01_07)
- Smith, Y. J., Cornella, E., & Williams, N. (2014). Working with populationals from a refugee background: An opportunity to enhance the occupational therapy educational experience. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 61(1), 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12037>
- Tewfik, D. (2002). Collaboration in the community: A capstone experience. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 16(2-3), 111-117. [https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v16n02\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1080/J003v16n02_10)
- Tippie, M., Bauer, E., & Dillon, M. B. (2016, April). Level II fieldwork at community-based mental health centers. *OT Practice*, 21(6), 21-23.

Any Questions? Contact Brette Moore at [bremore@augusta.edu](mailto:bremore@augusta.edu)