## PROCESS RECORDING: IT'S MORE THAN YOU THINK

CLAY T. GRAYBEAL AND ELIZABETH RUFF

Process recording has been used in social work field education for many years. The traditional format for a process recording is a written verbatim report of the transaction between worker and client. This article argues that it may be useful to reconceptualize process recording as a continuum of techniques. The proposed continuum is outlined, strengths and weaknesses of the various methods are described, suggestions are made for incorporating a range of techniques into an enhanced learning experience for social work students, a model for training field instructors in these methods is described, and the article concludes with a recommendation for ongoing renewal of teaching methodologies.

The Phrase "process recording" is likely to elicit at least a few groans from an audience of social workers or social work students. Although many perceive it to be an effective teaching technology, and students often discover it to be a powerful learning tool, process recording carries a certain stigma. There may be a variety of explanations for this negative connotation, the primary one being that process recording has traditionally meant just one thing: a student's attempt to create from memory a verbatim transcription of a social work interview.

This article argues that process recording can and should be redefined as a continuum of teaching techniques and learning methods. This continuum ranges from the naturalistic process of cognitive recording and verbal reporting through written process recording, audiotape, videotape, and live observation.

## History of Process Recording

Social service recording was used in the early 19th century to document the distribution of resources to the needy, with no judgment or diagnosis attached to these descriptions (Kagle, 1987). By midcentury charity workers were being asked to justify to whom and why resources were distributed. It was at this time that the narrative, as opposed to the ledger type of record, was adopted.

In 1920 Sheffield published The Social Case History: Its Construction and Content, in which the record was described as a tool to determine the most effective

Journal of Social Work Education Vol. 31, No. 2 (Spring/Summer 1995).

© by the Council on Social Work Education, Inc.

CLAY T. GRAYBEAL is associate professor and ELIZABETH RUFF is associate professor, University of New England, Biddeford, ME.

treatment for a client and to provoke the case worker to think critically. Sheffield encouraged social workers to look at societal factors that might be influencing a client's problem, but did not define an individual problem as a deficit (Kagle, 1987).

Process recording has served as the basis for research, assessment, and case planning since the mid-1920s (Kagle, 1987). Perhaps its most important function has been to facilitate student learning in field instruction and supervision (Wilson, 1980, 1981). Students and supervisors use written transcripts to assess both the process and content of student-client interactions, an approach that enhances interventive assessment and planning skills, evaluation of practice, and student self-assessment.

A review of the literature suggests that various other techniques for examining process emerged some time ago. Early examples include live observation (Kadushin, 1956, 1957), audiotaping (Armstrong, Huffman, & Spain, 1959; Itzin, 1960), and videotaping (Chodoff, 1972; Gruenberg, Liston, & Wayne, 1969). The exploration and use of a variety of process techniques in the supervisory process has been recommended (Wilson, 1981; West, Bubenzer, Pinsoneault, & Holeman, 1993).

As a supervisory technique, traditional process recording continues to be used but appears to have fallen from favor: no data on specific frequency of its use in social work field settings were found. In the related field of marriage and family therapy, Nichols, Nichols, and Hardy (1993) refer to verbatim reports as "questionable drudgery" (p. 279). They found that while verbatim reports were employed by about half of the surveyed supervisors, the use of audio, video, and live observation was reported by almost two-thirds. Another survey of various graduate counseling programs (including psychology, social work, and related

fields) found that verbal reports were most frequently used (64.7%), with audiotape (15.6%), sitting in (14.4%), videotape (3.1%), and observation through one-way mirror or closed circuit TV (2.2%) used relatively infrequently (Hart & Falvey, 1987).

Is it time to be more creative in the use of these other methods? We suggest that, as a field, social work should be looking at those methods that expand the scope, depth, and utility of process recording.

# Why Expand the Definition? A Conceptual Overview

Three issues motivated this examination of techniques for process recording.

1. Learning styles—Adult learners generally have different needs than younger students. Adults are more likely to be interested in the practicality of knowledge, skills, and experience. They are "performance centered" (Knowles, 1980, p. 44) and are more responsive to experiential learning, including "discussion, problem-solving cases, simulation, [and] field experience" (Knowles, 1980, p. 44). In other ways, though, they are likely to have individualized learning styles and needs. Fox and Guild (1987) note:

The research in learning styles confirms that workers have differences in the ways they (a) perceive and gain knowledge, (b) process knowledge, (c) value, judge, and react to information and ideas, and finally (d) behave. (p. 72)

Using a variety of techniques in the examining process and receiving feedback increases the opportunity for students to discover their preferred learning and working style. Hearing or seeing oneself on tape is often a powerful learning experience, as is realizing how difficult it is to recall details from memory, or performing live before a field instructor.

2. Learning objectives—Ideally, objectives for student learning in the field experience are dependent on each student's needs. Instructors may want to focus on, for example, enhancing listening skills, integrating theory, improving observation, or increasing self-awareness. The objectives established for a particular student should influence the methods employed to achieve them; the field instructor's role is to clarify objectives with the student, and then to tailor methods appropriately.

For example, West et al. (1993) suggest that delayed reports, whether verbal, written, audio, or video, may be more helpful in enhancing students' perceptual-conceptual skills, while live observation and live supervision may improve students' executive or practical skills.

3. Reflective practice—Perhaps the most important issue related to the use of process recording techniques is the role they may play in students' development as reflective practitioners (Schon, 1983). Reflective practice recognizes the uniqueness of each individual, and the importance of moment-to-moment reflections that generate the knowledge base of the practitioner: "Competent practice . . . requires acceptance of the idea that, at every stage, the uniqueness of the individual social worker and that of the individual client shape the process of helping" (Pray, 1991, p. 83).

Recording and examining process using a variety of techniques provides students with a range of opportunities for reviewing their own reflection in action. Because interpersonal skill development is central to social work education, teaching students how to apply skills is as important as teaching them about theory (Papell & Skolnik, 1992). Recording and examining process stimulates inductive learning and generative theory building on the part of students.

## A Continuum of Techniques

The continuum of process recording techniques ranges from cognitive-verbal recording and formal written procedures, to electronic methods, to live observation and supervision. Table 1 provides a summary. This framework is neither definitive nor exhaustive, but is offered with the hope that it will stimulate discussion of this important area of social work education.

## Cognitive-Verbal Techniques

The most common form of process recording is basic observation and verbal reporting: students retell the story of their work (as they remember it) to the supervisor. As O'Hanlon (1986) describes, the worker takes the client's concerns and organizes the verbal information into a familiar cognitive framework. Depending on experience, values, and theoretical orientation, this framework may approximate the client's experience while reflecting the worker's personal perspective. Most typically the client's introductory problem becomes a new problem co-constructed by the worker. Witkin (1982) posits that this process is vulnerable to errors in attribution, and recommends review to avoid cognitive traps.

Observation and report are common human activities. In normal life, they rarely come under scrutiny until one is asked to take the stand in a legal proceeding. Lawyers know that witnesses can easily be influenced in how they remember past events. Social work students, as they are introduced to the process of supervision, often find that they need to be more methodical in their observation. Although liability can be an issue, it is not and should not be the primary motivation for this heightened awareness. Rather, the impetus to understand and accurately represent client problems de-

rives from core social work values of human dignity, diversity, and self-determination. Getting with the client (Wood & Middleman, 1992) or "starting where the client is" (Goldstein, 1983) requires methods that avoid subjugating the client's frame of reference to that of the worker. As Pray (1991) notes:

Although acknowledged as a primary source of information, some consider the clients' verbal reports to be suspect because of the "secondhand" and subjective nature of the information, as opposed to the social worker's "first-hand," objective, and therefore reliable observations. (p. 82)

Critical to value-based practice is an awareness of how one receives, sorts, and stores knowledge and information. When instructors help students identify the explicit ways they interpret and record in the cognitive-verbal mode, it height-

ens students' awareness of the critical nature of process recording. They become sensitized to the impact of words and cognitive schemas in their interactions with clients.

Although supervision has many forms and various goals, we believe that an examination of cognitive sorting is central to the knowledge development of the practicing student, and an activity that offers a bridge to classroom learning. In both field and classroom settings, students are urged to develop critical thinking skills in response to the variety of theoretical positions. As Scott (1989) notes:

The capacity of the practitioner to consider a number of sometimes incongruent schemata in relation to a particular case is what differentiates a reactive procedural classification from a pluralistic and self-reflective professional assessment. (p. 49)

Table 1. A Continuum for Process Recording

No. Jaliey	Description	Purpose
Modality	Verbal description of events	Immediate feedback
Cognitive-Verbal Cognitive-Physical	Role-playing, Sculpting, Drawing, Artwork	Reenactment Alter sensing of process
Written	Verbatim Genogram Ecomap Client involvement in progress notes	Recall of detail System relationships Enhancing collaboration
Audio	Audiotape	Detailed reflection of verbal process
Video	Videotape	Detailed reflection of verbal and visual processes
Live Observation	One-way Mirror	Immediate feedback from supervisor and/or peers Training and education
Live Observation	In session	Most immediate opportunity for in vivo modification Modeling for client

## Cognitive-Physical Techniques

Cognitive recording can also be reported through physical or sensory methods, including role-playing, sculpting, and other forms of artwork. Role-playing and simulations (Amatea, Munson, Anderson, & Rudner, 1980; Rich & Sampson, 1990) are commonly used in the classroom, although less so in the field. In role-play, students reenact a situation, taking either their own role, or that of the client. In the former instance, they have the opportunity to relive moments of their part in the process-exploring not only their use of skills but their affect-and to examine critical moments more closely. In the latter role, students have the opportunity to empathize with the client, and to discover affective or sensory dimensions of which they were previously unaware (Witkin, 1982).

Sculpting is most commonly used in family therapy training (Costa, 1991; Duhl, Duhl, & Kantor, 1973), but can also be used to help students physically portray any client's situation. This technique is more effective with a larger group and is thus recommended for group supervision, training, or the classroom.

Other forms of artwork—drawing, painting, computer-generated graphics—can also be effective tools for student or client self-exploration and self-expression. Though the authors have not yet used artwork as a method of process recording, one of their students spontaneously produced a series of drawings, paintings, and comic strips as a self-evaluation in a research course. The richness of qualitative data that emerged from this student's work suggested that this area is ripe for exploration.

#### Written Techniques

Written process recording, in various forms, has been used in social work for

many years. One method described by Dwyer and Urbanowski (1965) suggests the following format: The student (a) writes down the purpose of the interview as determined before the session, (b) narrates in writing her observations, (c) describes the content of the session as closely as possible, (d) describes her own feelings during the interview, and (e) records impressions and thoughts for ongoing plans for the client.

The process of reconstruction may elicit otherwise forgotten material, it may help the student to identify areas of strength or difficulty, and it may also draw the student's or the instructor's attention to details that may otherwise have seemed inconsequential.

Wilson (1980) developed a format that attends to different levels of process by using a three-column approach. In the first column is a reconstructed dialogue of the worker-client interaction. In the second, students describe their "gut-level reaction," the affective and intellectual response to the interaction. The third column is for supervisory comments; the supervisor reads the student's process recording and then, usually before the supervisory session, records his/her observations.

Cohen (1988) developed a five-step format for process recording with the following components: (1) Pre-engagement—the student records affective and cognitive preparation for the interview; (b) Narrative—the student describes the details of what transpired during the interview (not a verbatim reconstruction, but a summary of verbal interaction that will help the student recall the interview);

(c) Assessment—the student evaluates what transpired; (d) Plans—the student describes the agreed-upon next steps; and (e) Questions—the student records any questions about the content or process of the interaction. This last step can then serve as a focal point for supervision with the field instructor.

Another form of written recording is summary recording (Wilson, 1980), most commonly used by agencies to record the pertinent information that goes into a client's file. Although summary recording takes less time than a verbatim reconstruction, it requires careful thought to articulate the most important parts of the interaction, the plans that were made with the client, and other information

that agencies may require.

Whatever the model, written process recording relies on the ability to reconstruct events in a reliable and coherent fashion. Although often difficult for students, especially initially, it has potential to serve as a useful and challenging exercise. The process of reconstruction may elicit otherwise forgotten material, it may help the student to identify areas of strength or difficulty, and it may also draw the student's or the instructor's attention to details that may otherwise have seemed inconsequential. In future sessions, students may be more self-aware and sensitive, and in time may improve the quality and depth of their attention to

One problem with this process, however, is that students may feel it is too labor-intensive and frustrating. Although some students find recalling and writing the details of their interactions an interesting intellectual exercise, others have difficulty remembering and expressing their experiences, and feel disappointment with the supervisor who glances cursorily at their efforts and moves on.

Another limitation of a written reconstruction is its accuracy. The validity and

reliability of reconstructing events from memory are often subject to challenge (Wylie, 1993). As noted previously, process recording occurs naturally—information is gathered and organized in ways that make sense and are convenient to the observer. The very interpretive nature of this process, however, makes it vulnerable to inherent biases, cognitive limitations, and current mental state.

Although written process recordings are subject to innate limitations—they are time consuming, subject to distortion, and sometimes feared by students as evidence of their own weaknesses (Wilson, 1980)—they can provide a valuable self-reflective experience when used sparingly and in conjunction with other methods. One helpful technique is to have students focus their attempts on particular segments of sessions, such as the first or last five minutes, or on an interaction that went well.

We suggest that several additional methods be considered under the heading of written process recording. Genograms, for example, provide a visual representation of the structure of a family over generations. They can also provide a method for documenting the current quality of relationships in the family through their various symbols, lines, and colored markings (McGoldrick & Gerson, 1985). Ecomaps are used to represent the relationship of the family to its environment, and can be reworked continuously to reflect the changing nature of relationships to outside influences and resources (Hartman & Laird, 1983). In our experience, tools such as genograms and ecomaps are often underused. Viewing them as recording tools for records that can and should be periodically reassessed and modified may enhance their utility.

Client participation in progress notes is another area deserving greater attention (Badding, 1989). Perhaps if more records were co-written by worker and

client, there might be less confusion about the interactive process. Because client participation in progress notes brings up a range of ethical, philosophical, and theoretical issues, however, instructors should discuss with students the potential impact of this approach. This discussion should touch on issues of worker-client hierarchy, power, privileged professional knowledge, and the impact of assessment, diagnosis, and interventive planning. For example, are there diagnoses or other comments that students would not want to share with a client (Gantt & Green, 1986)?

Involving clients in an effort to create a mutual process recording also has the potential to be an empowering activity for the client and a learning one for the student. Although the usual objective of process recording is self-reflection, a worker-client collaboration would encourage mutual reflection, which may be less threatened by worker bias, theoretical distancing, and misinterpretation.

## Audiotaping

Audiotaping client sessions has a long history of use in psychiatry (Lamb & Mahl, 1956), psychology (Roberts & Renzaglia, 1965), counseling (English & Jelenevsky, 1971) and social work (Itzin, 1960). In brief, with the client's permission, the student audiotapes a session for later replay and analysis (Bogo & Vaydon, 1987). The obvious advantage of audiotaping is that it provides an accurate verbatim account of the interaction, which facilitates student self-assessment as well as instructor evaluation (Kohn, 1979; Wilson, 1981). Audiotapes provide evidence of how much or little students talk, the modulation, tenor, and emotion of voice, and the pace of interactions. Students and instructors can pick up on tones, attitudes, and subtleties not available in the written record.

Generally speaking, audiotapes are easy to use, readily available, and inexpensive. However, their use raises issues of consent, confidentiality, and liability (Wilson, 1981). In addition, audiotapes are limited in that they restrict process to one sense, that of hearing. All the richness of setting, including appearance, behavior, and subtle nuance of movement and expression are hidden from view. Consequently, these factors can be minimized.

Furthermore, having field instructors listen to entire tapes is time-consuming (Itzin, 1960). This problem can be reduced by having the student submit a limited number of taped examples. The student has the opportunity to review the process repeatedly, pick out critical incidents, and prepare for discussion with the instructor. A less common, but very useful technique is replay for or with the client (Bailey & Sowder, 1970). Using this strategy, the client and worker are able to examine their process together.

## Videotaping

Videotaping social work interviews has become a more accessible and thus more common technique in recent years-and one with obvious advantages. On videotape, students and instructors can hear the dialogue with all its inflections, observe movement in the room, and see the body language of the participants. Seeing and hearing oneself on video can be a powerful experience. Videotapes have been used for self-assessment, or "selfconfrontation" (Meltzer, 1977, Star, 1980), improving record-keeping skills (Kagle, 1991), evaluating the transition of interviewing skills from the classroom to the field (Kopp & Butterfield, 1985), educational assessment (Brownstein & McGill, 1984), skill development (Langhorst & Myers, 1983), and for clinical training with individuals (Kopp, 1990; Mayadas & Duehn, 1977), with families

(Amatea et al., 1980; Malon & Spencer, 1985), and with groups (Eagle & Newton, 1981; Rose & Finn, 1980).

In a sense, videotaping is the most accurate and detailed form of process recording. Because a videotape can be replayed, one's attention can be directed at different times to different aspects of the process (e.g., body language, seating arrangement, tone of voice, patterns of interaction, contextual themes, timing.) One of the authors attended a workshop in which Charles Fishman of the Philadelphia Child Guidance Center reviewed a five-minute clip of a family interaction. The analysis took almost two hours, and provided a fascinating look into how some sequences escape conscious awareness.

Another advantage of videotaping is that segments can be replayed for the client. It can be a very informative experience for clients to see themselves through the unfiltered eye of the camera. When used in a nonconfrontive manner, videotapes may "elicit curiosity within the therapeutic system" (Ray & Saxon, 1992). Rhim (1976) also found that observing the video playback with the clients increased a sense of collaboration and trust. In addition, the client has the opportunity to provide feedback to the student on the interventions and their impact.

One concern of students is that their clients will not want to be videotaped. Experience suggests that students are typically much more uncomfortable than clients with being seen through the camera. We live in a video-oriented culture and, with some exceptions, clients do not usually mind being taped.

## Live Observation: Behind the One-Way Mirror

One-way mirror observation of client interviews or family interactions is a technique that typically has been used by family therapists and family therapy supervisors (Madanes, 1986). However, one recent study (Lewis & Rohrbaugh, 1989) found that only one-third of the surveyed therapists were using one-way mirror live observation. The authors lamented:

The apparent paucity of live supervision in the field may be another indication that "family therapy" increasingly means "seeing families" with no necessary allegiance to the epistemological shift envisioned by the founders. If this, indeed, represents a trend, the family therapist's one-way mirror may soon be of primarily historical interest, used by only a handful of purists, like the analyst's couch. (p. 326)

The one-way mirror is thus associated with a specific model of family practice. It appears that the use of one-way mirrors in other agencies is far less common; many either lack the facilities or the interest to use this method.

Use of the one-way mirror can take many forms. There may or may not be live supervision, including interruptions and instructions that may be called in or delivered to the door (Montalvo, 1973). Behind the mirror may be a supervisor, a team, and/or other observers. In another intriguing option, the team and client/worker system may periodically change places. This approach relies on a "reflecting team" (Anderson, 1991) whose role is to generate a variety of possibilities for the client/worker system.

One might argue that the one-way mirror is a family therapy supervision technique, not a method of recording process—but we suggest that it can be both. It reflects a cognitive-verbal process, albeit one with several more participants. Some methods, such as the reflecting team, pay particular attention to this dimension, and train the team in ways that should reduce the limitations of theory ritualism (Anderson, 1991).

#### Live Observation: In Session

In some settings, a supervisor may directly observe the process between worker and client. This changes the nature of the supervisory perspective, and thus the potential understanding of the client/worker process. It is important to define roles prior to in-session observation; in particular, live observation needs

to be distinguished from shared interviewing. During live observation, the field instructor may be tempted to intervene, either to demonstrate technique, act in the client's interest, or ward off impatience. Some recommend that field instructors use in-session observation only after the relationship with the student is well developed (Wilson, 1981).

Table 2. Attributes of Various Methods of Process Recording

Method	Strengths	Limitations
Cognitive—Verbal	Increases focus Happens naturally	Subject to distortion through habit, bias
Cognitive—Physical	Uses other senses, modes of expression Helpful for focusing on single event or process	Limited utility Tends to obscure detail Space or supply limitations
Written	Increases attention and focus Draws focus to detail Multiple levels—process, reaction, and supervisor comment Convenient	Subject to significant distortion—selective attention Time-consuming for both student and field instructor
Audio	Ease of use Low cost Accuracy Focus on sound Can be replayed, stored for future	No visual Time-consuming to review
Video	Accuracy for both audio and video Can be replayed, used for later review, training	Expensive Can be difficult to use or arrange Field instructor resistance Provokes anxiety
Live Observation— One-way Mirror	Allows for immediate feedback, correction Helpful training to observe peers Allows comparison of observer perceptions cognitive awareness	Difficult to develop individual role skills Labor and time intensive Provokes anxiety Intrusive
Live Observation— In Session	Allows for direct, less distorted observation and modification	May inhibit natural process Threatening Field instructor takeover

Planned co-leading or co-therapy is a distinct model, and necessitates clarifying roles, responsibilities, and the model for intervention. This method has the advantage of providing role modeling for the student, and for them to observe first-hand an experienced practitioner.

# Combining and Contrasting Methods

Because each of these recording techniques has strengths and limitations (see Table 2), instructors may want to use several in combination. In an early study, Itzin (1960) had students complete both written process recordings and audiotapes. When compared, it was noted that "more than half of the 'observations' that were identified as significant appeared only on the tapes" (p. 198). West et al. (1993) suggest that augmenting videotaping with role playing "can be used to increase the development of executive skills" (p. 133). Although references to the use of multiple methods are infrequent, it is surprising that this concept has not been used more widely. The greatest barrier is probably that using several approaches is often labor intensive and time consuming.

On the positive side, the main learning points for comparative methods are likely to be generalizable; just one experience can help sensitize students to the subtle differences in feedback provided by the contrasting methods. Techniques for combining methods are limited only by the imagination of the users and the availability of resources and facilities. Listening to audiotapes can be contrasted with watching videotapes without sound, or a verbatim transcript compared to an audiotape, to discover patterns of attention. This has the potential to increase awareness of cognitive processes and how they affect practice decisions (Witkin, 1982).

# Training in the Classroom

Classroom teaching requires bridging the experiences and observations of individual participants with the learning objectives of the larger group. In the classroom, the relationship between deductive and inductive reasoning should be explored, and themes should be extracted for application to practice situations. Instructors can introduce students to the usefulness of multimedia teaching and learning techniques by using them in the classroom. Audiotapes, videotapes, simulations, and role-playing can all be used effectively.

Rich and Sampson (1990) describe one model that bridges classroom learning and practicum experience. Intensive family simulation involves the entire class in role-playing, process observation, and evaluation; live supervision plays an integral part.

A model used by the authors similarly involves a simulation of an interaction involving family members, a social worker, a supervisor, a reflecting team, and observers. The social worker is free to seek consultation from the supervisor at any time, and the supervisor can similarly consult with the reflecting team. The instructor facilitates, periodically "freezing" the action and soliciting observations from the players. This usually results in a lively discussion about differing perceptions of the process, roles of the various players, and the integration of theoretical concepts into the practice example.

# Training and Support for Field Instructors

An important caveat about any teaching technology is that if field instructors are not comfortable with it, they are unlikely to support students in using it. The suggestion that they use a variety of

methods for process recording may strike them as either an additional burden or an exciting new idea. To maximize the latter possibility, it is critical to provide the necessary training and support for field instructors.

At their training seminars, field instructors should be exposed to the variety of available recording methods, they should be given descriptions of the different techniques, and they should take part in experiential exercises in an attempt to parallel the learning of their students.

One exercise the authors have developed introduces field instructors to comparative techniques. It begins with a simulation of an emotionally charged session between a client and social worker in the front of the group, which is audiotaped and videotaped for later use. Next, participants are asked to complete a written, verbatim process recording of the interview. As field instructors have often become distanced from this type of detailed recording, this exercise may prove laborious.

Upon completion, field instructors are asked to form small discussion groups. Faculty facilitators help participants to focus on key themes: content and process issues, comparative perceptions, the difficulty of recalling complex interchanges, anxiety in the observer, and other emerging issues. Participants are then encouraged to discuss their emotional responses to the interaction and the process with group members.

Next, the audiotape is played to allow participants to review their own cognitions and process recordings. Finally, group members view the videotape and discuss comparisons among the three methods. This exercise sensitizes field instructors to the experience of their students, and reminds them of the complexities of remembering, recording, and understanding process. It also allows them

to experience and contrast three types of recording.

Following a brief didactic overview of learning styles and needs, field instructors are encouraged to work with their students in a mutual learning process to discover the best combination of training methods.

Cohen and Ruff (in press), who investigated the effectiveness of role-playing in field instruction training, noted that some field instructors appeared reluctant when asked to role-play or participate in an exercise that required them to remove themselves from their teaching role. In follow-up evaluations, however, field instructors reported finding the technique to be helpful in relating to student anxiety, and recognizing the need to use processes that benefit both student and instructor.

#### Conclusion

Social work education, like social work practice, is challenged by the rapid changes in both technique and technology. Process recording, which seems to be stigmatized by its inability to keep up with the changing times, can be reconceptualized as a continuum of methods using a variety of technologies.

The educational goal of teaching students these methods of process recording should be threefold. First, students should be able to use these methods to reflect on their role and skills in interacting with clients. These recordings can enhance the supervision provided by the field instructor and serve as tools for ongoing evaluation of students' learning. Second, students learn the importance of accurate information. The ability to summarize and articulate key points in an interchange, to make assessments, and to perform case planning and follow-up is essential to a worker's success in agencybased practice.

Third, learning is a lifelong process. Having a variety of methods for recording and exploring process provides the student and the future professional with methodological and conceptual frameworks to continue in self-exploration and to make better use of clinical supervision.

As educators involved in continuous curriculum review and renewal, we have found it useful to conceptualize these many methods of process recording as a continuum to be explored and developed. It is hoped that this article will stimulate others to experiment with these ideas in both the classroom and the field.

#### REFERENCES

Amatea, E., Munson, P., Anderson, L., & Rudner, R. (1980). A short-term training program for caseworkers in family counseling. Social Casework, 61, 205-214.

Anderson, T. (Ed.). (1991). The reflecting team: Dialogues and dialogues about the dialogues.

New York: W.W. Norton.

Armstrong, M., Huffman, M., & Spain, M. (1959). The use of process and tape recordings as tools in learning casework. Master's thesis, State University of Iowa.

Badding, N. C. (1989). Client involvement in case recording. Social Casework, 68, 539-548.

Bailey, K., & Sowder, W. (1970). Audiotape and videotape self-confrontation in psychotherapy. Psychological Bulletin, 74, 127-137.

Bogo, M., & Vaydon, E. (1987). The practice of field instruction in social work. Toronto: Univer-

sity of Toronto Press.

Brownstein, C., & McGill, S. (1984). Practice workshops: A model for teaching basic social work practice. Arete, 9(1), 48-53.

Chodoff, P. (1972). Supervision of psychotherapy with videotape: Pros and cons. American Journal of Psychiatry, 128, 819-823

Cohen, M. (1988). Suggested outline for process recordings. Unpublished manuscript.

Cohen, M., & Ruff, E. (in press). Role play: Its use in training field instructors. Journal of Teaching in Social Work.

Costa, L. (1991). Family sculpting in the training of marriage and family counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 31(2), 121-131.

Duhl, F., Duhl, B., & Kantor, D. (1973). Learning. space, and action in family therapy: A primer of sculpture (pp. 47-63). In D. Bloch, Techniques of Family Psychotherapy. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Dwyer, M., & Urbanowski, M. (1965). Student process recording: A plea for structure. Social Casework, 46, 283.

Eagle, J., & Newton, P. (1981). Scapegoating in small groups: An organizational approach. Human Relations, 34, 283-301.

English, R., & Jelenevsky, S. (1971). Counselor behavior as judged under audio, visual, and audiovisual communications conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18, 509-513.

Fox, R., & Guild, P. (1987). The relationship of learning styles to supervisory practice, The Clini-

cal Supervisor, 5(3), 65-77.

Gantt, A. B., & Green, R. S. (1986). Telling the diagnosis: Implications for social work practice. Social Work in Health Care, 11(2), 101-110.

Goldstein, H. (1983). Starting where the client is. Social Casework, 64, 267-275.

Gruenberg, P., Liston, E., & Wayne, G. (1969). Intensive supervision of psychotherapy with videotape recording. American Journal of Psycho-

therapy, 23, 95-105.

Hart, G., & Falvey, E. (1987). Field supervision of counselors in training: A survey of the North Atlantic region. Counselor Education and Supervision, 26, 204-211.

Hartman, A., & Laird, J. (1983). Family-centered social work practice. New York: Free Press.

Itzin, F. (1960). The use of tape recording in field work. Social Casework, 41, 197-202.

Kadushin, A. (1956). Interview observation as a teaching device. Social Casework, 37, 334-341.

Kadushin, A. (1957). The effect on the client of interview observation at intake. Social Service Review, 31, 22-38.

Kagle, J. (1987). Recording in direct practice. Encyclopedia of Social Work (18th ed.). Silver Spring, MD: NASW Press.

Kagle, J. (1991). Essential recording: A new approach to teaching practice and recording. Arete, *16*(2), 28-33.

Knowles, M. (1980). The Modern Practice of Adult

Education. Chicago: Follett.

Kohn, R. (1979). Field instruction techniques. In J. J. Conklin (Ed.), Field Education Reader: Selected Articles (pp. 162-170). Hebron, CT: Practitioner's Press.

Kopp, J. (1990). The transfer of interviewing skills to practicum by students with high and low pretraining skill levels. Journal of Teaching in Social

Work, 4(1), 31-52.

Kopp, J., & Butterfield, W. (1985). Changes in graduate students' use of interviewing skills from the classroom to the field. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 9(1), 65-88.

Lamb, R., & Mahl, G. (1956). Manifest reactions of patients and interviewers to the use of sound recording in the psychiatric interview. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 112, 733-735.

Langhorst, D., & Myers, R. (1983). Skill-building using sequenced videotaping in the undergraduate curriculum. *Arete*, 8(1), 22-31.

Leader, A. (1968). Supervision and consultation through observed interviewing. *Social Casework*, 49, 288-293.

Lewis, W., & Rohrbaugh, M. (1989). Live supervision by family therapists: A Virginia survey. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 15, 323-326.

Madanes, C. (1986). Behind the one-way mirror: Advances in the practice of strategic therapy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Malon, D., & Spencer, D. (1985). Continuity and discontinuity in family therapy training. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 21(3), 66-73.

Mayadas, N., & Duehn, W. (1977). The effects of training formats and interpersonal discriminations in education for clinical social work practice. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 1(2), 147-161.

McGoldrick, M., & Gerson, R. (1985). Genograms in family assessment. New York: W. W. Norton.

Meltzer, R. (1977). School and agency cooperation in using videotape in social work education. Journal of Education for Social Work, 13(1), 90-95.

Montalvo, B. (1973). Aspects of live supervision. Family Process, 12, 343-359.

Nichols, W., Nichols, D., & Hardy, K. (1993). Supervision in family therapy: A decade restudy. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 16, 275-285.

O'Hanlon, W. H. (1986). Shifting contexts: The generation of effective psychotherapy. New York: W.W. Norton.

Papell, C., & Skolnik, L. (1992). The reflective practitioner: A contemporary paradigm's relevance for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28, 18-26.

Pray, J. (1991). Reflecting the uniqueness of the individual: Social work practice within a reflective model. Social Work, 36, 80-85.

Ray, W., & Saxon, W. (1992). Nonconfrontive use of video playback to promote change in brief family therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 18(1), 63-69.

Rhim, B. (1976). The use of videotapes in social work agencies. *Social Casework*, 57, 644-650.

Rich, R., & Sampson, D. (1990). Building intensive simulations in family-therapy training. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 29, 187-196.

Roberts, R., & Renzaglia, G. (1965). The influence of tape recording on counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 12, 10-15.

Rose, S., & Finn, J. (1980). Videotape laboratory approach to group work training for undergraduates. *Social Work with Groups*, 16(4), 23-30.

Schon, D. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Star, B. (1980). Exploring the boundaries of videotape self-confrontation. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 15(1), 87-94.

West, J., Bubenzer, D., Pinsoneault, T., & Holeman, V. (1993). Three supervision modalities for training marital and family counselors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 33, 127-138

Wilson, S. (1980). Recording guidelines for social workers. New York: Free Press.

Wilson, S. (1981). Field instruction: Techniques for supervisors. New York: Free Press.

Witkin, S. (1982). Cognitive processes in clinical practice. *Social Work*, 27, 389-396.

Wood, G. G., & Middleman, R.R. (1992). The structural approach to direct practice in social work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wylie, M. (1993). The shadow of a doubt. Family Therapy Networker, 17(5), 18-29.

#### Accepted 5/94.

Address correspondence to: Clay T. Graybeal, University of New England, School of Social Work, Hills Beach Road, Biddeford, ME 04005-9599.