



Social Work with Groups

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wswg20>

Beyond challenges: Opportunities for enhancing group work field education

Sari Skolnik & Louise Skolnik

To cite this article: Sari Skolnik & Louise Skolnik (2021): Beyond challenges: Opportunities for enhancing group work field education, *Social Work with Groups*, DOI: [10.1080/01609513.2021.1981515](https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2021.1981515)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2021.1981515>



Published online: 12 Dec 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Beyond challenges: Opportunities for enhancing group work field education

Sari Skolnik^a and Louise Skolnik^b

^aWurzweiler School of Social Work, Yeshiva University, New York, New York, USA; ^bAdelphi University, New York, New York, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on opportunities for enhancing field education for group work practice. Five challenges influencing effective learning are reviewed and problem-solving strategies to cope with each are proposed. The challenges addressed are the generalist curriculum, inadequate preparation of field educators, agency prescribed co-leadership assignments, proliferation of manual based practice, and expanding use of online groups. The authors discuss specific strategies for meeting these challenges and for providing students with a field experience that teaches them to understand, appreciate, and practice social work with groups

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 12 August 2021
Revised 2 September 2021
Accepted 13 September 2021

KEYWORDS

Group work; mutual aid; field education; generalist practice; manualized curricula groups. co-leadership; online groups

The guiding principles of group work, including democratic decision-making, the release and nurturance of mutual aid, creative problem-solving, and empowerment of members, are applicable to and inform many aspects of social work practice. Beyond the therapeutic realm, these include administration, community organization, program development, advocacy/social action, teaching and supervision (Kirst-Ashman & Hull, 2014; Papell & Rothman, 1966, 1980). Ensuring that students are exposed to and develop skills for social work with groups is an imperative that has significant implications for the profession. Despite this, limitations to the classroom preparation of social workers for group practice have been well documented (Birnbaum & Auerbach, 1994; Carey, 2016; Clements, 2008; Goodman et al., 2014; Knight, 2017; LaRocque, 2017; Simon et al., 2019; S. Skolnik, 2019; Sweifach, 2014).

Field experiences are a hallmark of social work education; students learn not only to apply the knowledge, values, and skills they are introduced to in the classroom (Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), 2015), but also to engage in the creative artistry involved in professional practice (Goldstein, 1988; Gitterman & Knight, 2016a; Papell & Skolnik, 1992). The primacy of an agency-based internship was underscored in the very first education standards for social work education issued in 1932 by the predecessor to CSWE (American Association of Schools of Social

Work, 1943). The contemporary competency-based approach central to social work education accreditation standards mandates that BSW and MSW students demonstrate the prescribed competencies, including those in group practice, not only in the class, but in the field (Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), 2015). However, serious deficits in both the quality and quantity of group field assignments have been documented and related to several contributing elements (Clements, 2008; Goodman et al., 2014; Knight, 2017; Simon et al., 2019; Sweifach, 2014). These include the impact of generalist practice, inadequacies in the preparation of field instructors, the proliferation of manualized curricula, co-leadership assignments, and the expanded use of online groups (Clements, 2008; Gitterman & Knight, 2016b; Knight, 2017; ; Simon & Kilbane, 2014; Sweifach, 2014; Weinberg, 2020).

Less consideration has been given to strategies for mitigating the impact of these identified impediments to learning group work skills in the field. This paper addresses this issue, offering problem-solving opportunities gleaned not only from the literature, but also from the authors' practice wisdom acquired in a combined 65 years as educators in the classroom and field. Our intent is to stimulate further discourse and exploration among group workers regarding approaches for ensuring that social work with groups continues to be effectively taught in the field.

The impact of generalist practice

The unique strength of social work is rooted in its complex mission to engender change not only at the micro level but in the mezzo and macro social environment. Closely related is social work's multisystemic approach to assessment and intervention. Social workers actualize their professional mission by utilizing whatever modality and skills are needed to meet their clients' needs (Shulman, 2016). After the formation of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in 1952 and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) in 1955, social work educators grappled with how to teach students this unique approach to helping, the foundation concepts uniting all social workers, and method-specific skills. The first CSWE standards (1953) emphasized the need to teach practice with individuals and practice with groups in the class and field (L. Skolnik, 1989). Nevertheless, it has been asserted that this curriculum has resulted in a diminution of group work content in the social work curriculum, fewer group work electives and the fact that only one school offers group work as a second-year concentration (Birnbaum & Auerbach, 1994; Carey, 2016; Clements, 2008; Simon & Kilbane, 2014; Sweifach, 2014).

Opportunities to meet the challenge of generalist practice

Group work continues to be a component of the generalist practice curriculum required of all BSW seniors and MSW first year students (Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), 2015). In view of this, the generalist practice curriculum can potentially provide a rich opportunity to expose all students to group work practice. In the classroom, group work content is facilitated by several elements including the fact that widely utilized textbooks were developed by those with group work backgrounds (e.g., Gitterman & Germain, 2008; Shulman, 2016). Relatedly, generalist practice concepts have been influenced by or been directly adapted from group work's tenets; among these are the concepts of strengths, resilience, and empowerment, the view that the client is partner with the worker in the helping relationship, mutuality in the assessment process, and the value of creativity and pleasurable activities (Lang, 2016; R.R. Middleman, 1983). Furthermore, as noted above, generalist does not preclude specific; students can be taught both the elements comprising "the common base" (Bartlett & Saunders, 1970) and method specific application of these elements. For example, curricula teach the NASW Code of Ethics as part of the professional foundation, but also explore the specifics of ethics applied to group practice (Dolgoft & Skolnik, 1993; L. R. Skolnik & Atkinson, 1978). Using experiential learning in the classroom and conceptualizing the class as a group can also help students "think group" (Carey, 2016; Shulman, 1987).

However, these classroom experiences are not a substitute for group skills development in the field; as noted before concerns have been raised about the adequacy of group field assignments (Carey, 2016; Clements, 2008; Cohen, 1998; Knight, 2017; LaPorte & Sweifach, 2011; S. Skolnik, 2019; Tully, 2015). In our teaching experiences, students often report that their generalist field assignments are comprised primarily of individual practice. When groups are included, they may involve a co-leadership and/or manual driven format that, as we discuss below, may limit student learning. How then do we ensure that students in generalist courses can put knowledge about group work practice into action in a supervised field placement?

Develop an active school-agency team for group assignment development

In almost every setting, there are options for group work assignments; even agencies that do not currently offer groups to clients can be supported in identifying group work opportunities that will benefit both students and clients. The active commitment of field placement offices and their faculty liaisons is critical in this process. As Tully (2015) notes "The faculty field liaison is one of the primary persons responsible for ensuring that theoretical concepts from the classroom are transferred to the internship setting" (p. 10).

Those liaisons who are not experienced group workers might need to be reacquainted with concepts related to social work with groups. Both liaisons and field educators should have access to generalist and group work course outlines and textbooks so that both are familiar with the concepts and theory their students are learning. Informed by the knowledge base to be actualized in the field, the school-agency team can explore the assignment of students to either existing or new group programs. This latter possibility will provide students with the very rich learning experience of group planning (Kurland & Salmon, 2006).

Liaisons can help agencies recognize how group work's approach to helping can be a powerful addition in even the most individually focused setting. Social group work elements such as mutual aid, democratic decision making, and pleasurable activities can help individual clients gain important social skills and enhance their sense of self-efficacy. The possibilities are limitless and need not drain agencies' resources. Group assignments can also emerge from the understanding that the power and purpose of group work is not limited to direct client service delivery. Papell and Rothman (1966) identified three models of group work including one labeled "social goals" focused on community and social change initiatives. To learn group work skills students can be assigned to facilitate a program planning group, an interagency council, an advocacy task force, a policy development committee, consumer group, and other social goals related groups.

In developing group assignments, the school-agency team can also consider partnering with one or more community agencies. Agencies without a professional social worker to supervise a student can provide the group itself and task supervision, while the primary placement's field instructor can teach the student social group work skills and insights. Another approach is for multi service agencies to assign students across programs; for example, one university-based social agency used multi program assignments and group task supervision to ensure that every one of its 40 students had a group work experience (L. Skolnik & Papell, 1994).

Field educators' preparation to teach group work

Group assignments, no matter how thoughtfully constructed, can only be meaningful vehicles for student learning if field instructors are prepared to supervise group practice. In view of the decline in group work content in the social work curriculum, it is likely that agency field instructors may have had little exposure to social work group practice in either the field or classroom. This educational gap constitutes a major challenge to the perpetuation of social work with groups. To address this challenge, schools will have to be genuinely committed to enhancing group work field education and to providing needed administrative support (Clements, 2008; Goodman et al., 2014; Simon et al., 2019).

Opportunities for preparing field instructors to teach group work

We suggest that the post-graduate preparatory course mandated by many schools for new field instructors should include a distinct module on teaching social work with groups. Schools have rich conceptual material to consider for inclusion in preparing field educators such as the following models: mainstream (Papell & Rothman, 1980); mediating (Schwartz, 1976); process phase (Garland et al., 1965; Schiller, 1997); and strengths/empowerment (Saleeby, 1993; Solomon, 1976; Gitterman & Knight, 2016a). The International Association for Social Work with Groups (IASWG) has developed group work standards that outline the knowledge and skills group workers need to run groups; these can be used to inform this module (Macgowan & Wong, 2017; Muskat, 2013), as can other resources that provided guidelines for teaching group work in the field placement (Glassman & Kates, 1988; C. S. Cohen & Wayne, 2009).

Another opportunity to prepare field educators to teach group practice is related to the continuing education credits required in most states for licensure renewal. Online and in person course offerings could be developed by individual schools, jointly by schools and agencies in a geographic area, or by the International Association for Social Work with Groups (IASWG) in collaboration with CSWE. In addition to CEUs, attendees could receive a certificate of completion attesting to their qualifications to supervise group work assignments. The course planning process itself could encourage practitioners and educators to focus on group work and to creatively consider the best approaches to support field educators in teaching group work.

The impact of manualized group curricula

In recent years students have increasingly been assigned to groups using the prescriptive standardized curricula which have become prevalent in mental health, substance abuse, and trauma-informed practice (Galinsky et al., 2006; Gitterman & Knight, 2016b). These manualized groups involve session by session defined format, content, and activities; they are designed to ensure consistency among practitioners and reassure public funders and managed care companies that reimbursement is merited. Some prescriptive manuals have also been deemed evidenced-based, further enhancing their appeal. Manualized sessions can offer guidance and support, and for agency administrators they provide the reassurance that practice is validated and reimbursable (Champe & Rubel, 2012, Gitterman & Knight, 2016b).

Despite these conjectured positives, manual-driven groups may not be compatible with learning social work's approach to group practice and, as Galinsky et al., assert may "ignore the historical roots of social group work practice" (Galinsky et al., 2006, p. 13). The impact on and response of students

in field placement to manualized groups raise questions requiring further exploration. For example, what are the benefits to students and clients assigned to these groups? Do students assigned a manual-driven group experience dissonance between what they have been taught in the classroom and what they are being exposed to in the field?

Opportunities for infusing manualized groups with social group work principles

Manualized practice is part of the contemporary service delivery landscape. Galinsky et al. (2006) discuss the importance of practitioners being flexible with the prescribed curriculum and mindful about choosing manualized programs that best meet the needs of their client populations. Gitterman and Knight (2016b) note that, while using a curriculum driven format, the practitioner should also develop an environment for mutual aid and group interaction. Below we suggest several approaches for promoting such an atmosphere.

Use the curricula as presented but augment it both prior to and after the prescribed session

At the very first session, the worker can clearly, openly, and honestly explain why the manualized format is being utilized. They can also discuss how the members' feedback can, if the format permits, help customize the content to best meet the group's needs. At the beginning of each session, brief warm up exercises can help facilitate group identity and connection. After each session, the group can process the process and discuss the mutual aid provided during the session. It is expected that key growth producing elements in social work group practice will emerge and strengthen as warm-ups and feedback continue with each successive prescribed session. Consequently, members may be more likely to actively engage in and achieve the goals of the manual-driven sessions.

Introduce creative group activities with the content and format of the prescribed curricula

Where appropriate, flexibility and creativity before, during, or after the delivery of the structured content can enhance participants' experiences. One student added a cooking activity to precede the manual's set "class" and the group ate together after the session; another student introduced music and art activities in conjunction with the assigned lesson. Other experiential learning approaches can be compatible with the structured session; for example, where case examples are utilized as part of the curriculum, instead of just reading a scenario, the worker can have participants role play the exemplar and then elicit feedback on the experience.

Co-leadership in group work field placements

Co-leadership, pairing a student with his/her field instructor, an agency professional, or another student, has become a common practice in field education. It appears to be motivated and justified by several considerations including ensuring quality service delivery, the opportunity for professionals to model skills, apprehension about malpractice, and reimbursement requirements (R. R. Middleman, 1981). As we consider this issue, we should note that we generally do not pair students when they interview individuals yet many of the same quality control issues pertain. Why then are more concerns raised when students are assigned a group? One reason might be that, unlike individual practice, co-leadership itself is not uncommon in group practice. Another influencing factor might be that the group assignment might seem overwhelming and intimidating, especially for administrators and field instructors with little group work experience. Pairing the student with a professional social worker might diminish the anxiety the group assignment elicits (M. B. Cohen & DeLois, 2002; Okech, 2008; R. R. Middleman, 1981; Wright, 2003).

Anecdotally, students report that, when they co-lead with their supervisor or an agency social worker, they contribute very little to the group process. They perceive their role as more of an observer and are unable to process or record their own interventions because they were mostly silent or inactive. They also report that retrospective learning and reflection in action (Papell & Skolnik, 1992) are compromised because they do not feel comfortable critiquing the practice of their field instructor or another professional social worker (Okech, 2008). As R. R. Middleman (1981) noted, "For social work students working with seasoned professionals or one's own supervisor, is a one down position fraught with anxiety and inadequacy" (p. 44).

The assumption that co-leadership makes the group assignment more feasible for students does not consider that co-leadership is a very challenging format, requiring interpersonal compatibility, advanced skills, and careful preparation (M. B. Cohen & DeLois, 2002; Galinsky & Schopler, 1981; Okech, 2008; R. R. Middleman, 1981; Wright, 2003). This raises the question of whether field instructors recognize the need for preparatory planning between co-leaders, and whether they help students recognize and grapple with co-leadership dynamics that emerge as the group proceeds.

Opportunities for meeting the co-leadership challenge

Students report they learn group practice best when facilitating independently (S. Skolnik, 2019). However, when co-leadership is an agency's practice model, careful consideration should be given to the pairing of student and partner. For example, Galinsky and Schopler (1981) highlight that a successful co-

leadership relationship includes a commitment to the group process, open and honest feedback, a shared vision for the group, as well as clear role expectations of each other. The supervisory process should be thoughtfully planned, especially when a student is co-leading with a field instructor. In this situation, another professional might be assigned to act as a supervisor and give feedback to both co-leaders.

To assist in grappling with the issue and practice of co-leadership in field education, further research is needed to assess the effectiveness of co-leadership as compared with sole leadership in students' learning group work skills. Additional consideration should be given to the impact on learning of different co-leadership pairings (e.g. student-student, student-professional, student-field instructor).

The proliferation of online groups

Since the 2020 onset of Covid 19, online group services have become prevalent. Prior to the pandemic, online technology had been utilized by some agencies and social work education programs (Perron & Powell, 2008; Simon & Stauber, 2011; Weinberg, 2020). It is likely that post-pandemic service delivery will continue to offer virtual programs. Time and travel convenience, increased familiarity with virtual experiences, and comfort with using technology will ensure their continuation.

Future field assignments are likely to include online group practice. Field instructors need to be prepared to help their students meet the challenges inherent in virtual group practice and process. These include: the absence of body language cues; technological barriers and glitches; the difficulty in the maintenance of group norms; the promotion of group cohesion and mutual aid; coping with monopolizing, silent, and non-involved members. Moreover, the challenges already discussed regarding co-leadership and manualized group practice are likely to intensify on the online platform.

Opportunities for preparing field educators and students for online group practice

The ongoing pandemic provides an opportunity for practitioners to develop practice wisdom regarding online group practice. Experience to date offers some guidance for field instructors and students.

The preparatory phase: establishing netiquette norms

Pre-group planning and the development of group norms are important aspects of all group practice (Kurland & Salmon, 2006). In online practice, students need to prepare for the establishment of norms unique to the virtual environment (i.e.

netiquette). They have to consider whether members have access to technology and to a quiet physical location for the virtual meeting. For clients without in-home technology, alternative arrangements need to be explored, and some clients may need technology training prior to the group's first meeting.

Netiquette norms should be shared prior to or at the first session. To alleviate distracting noise, clients should be asked to keep themselves on mute until they speak. To maintain confidentiality headphones might be suggested or provided. Students also need to help clients use other virtual functions such as "chat" and "raise hand," and to establish rules related to shutting off a camera or leaving the group while it is in process. In planning for the group, field educators should help their students understand the importance of being able to scan all members of the group; therefore, ideally membership should be limited to no more than the number comprising one screen in gallery mode.

Promoting mutual aid with online groups

Mutual aid is an essential element in the social work with groups paradigm (Shulman, 2016; Steinberg, 2010). An online format can impede the development of mutual aid; the screen can blunt meta communication and there is an absence of the perception of community engendered by shared physical space. However, there are opportunities in the virtual environment to engage in mutual aid promoting processes. All group members, including the group worker, are attempting to cope with navigating the new waters of online technology and this communicates an "all in the same boat" message (Shulman, 2016). Additionally, members can be encouraged to support each other in negotiating technological glitches, to offer feedback on how to work together to make the online platform amenable to the group, and to remind each other to mute and unmute.

Many of the same skills and techniques a group worker would employ in an in-person setting translate to the virtual format. The worker can still scan the group for facial expression and upper body posture. Furthermore, the technology on virtual platforms such as Zoom allows for activities that promote participation, cohesion, and mutual aid. Members, for example, can be invited to raise their hands and share something about themselves which can be related to the group purpose. Others can then connect to what is shared and the worker and group can identify connections, differences, and emerging mutual aid indicators. Here, and generally in online practice, members should be taught to use the raise hand feature on the screen; this will ensure that the group worker does not miss a physically raised hand and possibly make a member feel dismissed or ignored.

Spectrograms, a sociometric exercise, are another cohesion inducing activity. Group members are asked to move their hands to a designated location on their screen box that indicates "where they are" regarding a specific issue.

Mutual aid is elicited when those at the same location share their reasons for the choice of location and when commonalities and differences are discussed with the entire group (Giacomucci & Skolnik, 2021).

Breakout rooms are embedded in many virtual platforms and allow members to find safe connection in a subgroup configuration. This feature can be a powerful tool to enhance participation and effectively engage members in exercises and activities. Field educators and students must know the technical mechanism for placing members into these smaller groups. They also need to consider how best to divide the members into subgroups (e.g., selectively or randomly), how to ensure a safe environment in the breakout rooms, and how to provide clear objectives to be accomplished.

Summary

In this paper we have examined the challenges and opportunities related to the teaching and learning of social work with groups in the field. This is an issue critical to the perpetuation of this practice method, and one that affects students at both the BSW and MSW levels of study. Because group work skills are applicable across the spectrum of micro, mezzo, and macro practice, the acquisition of these skills becomes even more pressing. No matter how in depth the academic exposure to group work theory and practice principles, social work educators have long understood that learning the skills necessary to practice requires the experience of transforming knowledge into action under the supervision of a knowledgeable professional in an agency setting.

As we noted in the beginning of this paper, the intent of this article is to stimulate further exploration of approaches for schools, agencies, and field instructors to employ in reducing the impact of contemporary challenges to effective group work field education. We have initiated this exploration by highlighting potential opportunities for meeting these challenges and by raising questions for further study and professional dialogue. A national focus might yield further insights and opportunities to enhance group work field education. The current committee of representatives of CSWE and IASWG could provide the supervising structure and appoint the task force for conducting this study. The vibrancy of IASWG and the ongoing publication of *Social Work with Groups* attest to the recognition that group work is a powerful and fundamental modality of professional practice. It is the responsibility of contemporary social work educators to ensure that the power of group work be inherited by future generations of social work professionals.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- American Association of Schools of Social Work (1943). *Accreditation Manual*.
- Bartlett, H. M., & Saunders, B. N. (1970). *The common base of social work practice*. National Association of Social Workers Press.
- Birnbaum, M. L., & Auerbach, C. (1994). Group work in graduate social work education: The price of neglect. *Journal of Social Work Education, 30*(3), 325–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.1994.10672243>
- Carey, L. A. (2016). Group work education: A call for renewed commitment. *Social Work with Groups, 39*(1), 48–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2014.989627>
- Champe, J., & Rubel, D. J. (2012). Application of focal conflict theory to psychoeducational groups: Implications for process, content, and leadership. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 37*(1), 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01933922.2011.632811>
- Clements, J. A. (2008). Social work students' perceived knowledge of and preparation for group-work practice. *Social Work with Groups, 31*(3–4), 329–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609510801981391>
- Cohen, C. S. (1998). Building field instructors' skills in planning and supervising group assignments. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 16*(1–2), 99–114. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1300/J067v16n01_07
- Coehn, C. S., & Wayne, J. (2009). Field Instruction, In Gitterman A., & Salmon R. (Eds), *Encyclopedia of social work with groups* (pp.123–125). Routledge
- Cohen, M. B., & DeLois, K. (2002). Training in tandem: Co-facilitation and role modeling in a group work course. *Social Work with Groups, 24*(1), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v24n01_03
- Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). (2015). *Education policy and accreditation standards*. <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Standards-and-Policies/2015-EPAS>
- Dolgoff, R., & Skolnik, L. (1993). Ethical decision making, the NASW Code of Ethics and group work practice: Beginning explorations. *Social Work with Groups, 15*(4), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v15n04_08
- Galinsky, M. J., & Schopler, J. H. (1981). Structuring co-leadership in social work training. *Social Work with Groups, 3*(4), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v03n04_08
- Galinsky, M. J., Terzian, M. A., & Fraser, M. W. (2006). The art of group work practice with manualized curricula. *Social Work with Groups, 29*(1), 11–26. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v29n01_03
- Garland, J., Jones, H., & Kolodny, R. (1965). A model for stages of development in social work groups. In *Further Explorations in Group Work*, ed. S Bernstein, 17–71. Charles River Books.
- Giacomucci, S., & Skolnik, S. (2021). The experiential social work educator: Integrating sociometry into the classroom environment. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 41*(2), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2021.1886223>
- Gitterman, A., & Germain, C. B. (2008). *The life model of social work practice: Advances in the theory and practice*. Columbia University Press.
- Gitterman, A., & Knight, C. (2016a). Promoting resilience through social work practice with-groups: Implications for the practice and field curricula. *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(4), 448–461. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1198295>
- Gitterman, A., & Knight, C. (2016b). Curriculum and psychoeducational groups: Opportunities and challenges. *Social Work, 61*(2), 103–110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/sww007>
- Glassman, U., & Kates, L. (1988). Strategies for group work field instruction. *Social Work with Groups, 11*(1–2), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v11n01_09

- Goldstein, H. (1988). A cognitive-humanistic/social learning perspective on social group workpractice. *Social Work with Groups*, 11(1–2), 9–32. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1300/J009v11n01_02
- Goodman, H., Knight, C., & Khudododov, K. (2014). Graduate social work students' experiences with group work in the field and the classroom. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 34(1), 60–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2013.866615>
- Kirst-Ashman, K. K., & Hull, G. H., Jr. (2014). *Brooks/Cole empowerment series: Generalist practice with organizations and communities*. Cengage Learning.
- Knight, C. (2017). Social work students' experiences with group work in the field practicum. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 37(2), 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2017.1294130>
- Kurland, R., & Salmon, R. (2006). Purpose: A misunderstood and misused keystone of group work practice. *Social Work with Groups*, 29(2–3), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v29n02_08
- Lang, N. C. (2016). Nondeliberative forms of practice in social work: Artful, actional, analogic. *Social Work with Groups*, 39(2–3), 97–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2015.1047701>
- LaPorte, H. H., & Sweifach, J. (2011). MSW foundation students in the field: Reflections on the nature and quality of group work assignments and supervision. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 31(3), 239–249. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2011.580240>
- LaRocque, S. E. (2017). Group work education in social work: A review of the literature reveals possible solutions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 53(2), 276–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2016.1246270>
- Macgowan, M. J., & Wong, S. E. (2017). Improving student confidence in using group work standards: A controlled replication. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 27(4), 434–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731515587557>
- Middleman, R. R. (1981). Co-leadership and solo leadership in education for social work with groups. *Social Work with Groups*, 3(4), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v03n04_07
- Middleman, R. R. (1983). *Activities and action in groupwork*. Haworth Press.
- Muskat, B. (2013). The use of IASWG standards for social work practice with groups in supervision of group work practitioners. *Social Work with Groups*, 36(2–3), 208–221. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2012.753837>
- Okech, J. E. (2008). Reflective practice in group co-leadership. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 33(3), 236–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01933920802196138>
- Papell, C. P., & Rothman, B. (1966). Social group work models: Possession and heritage. *Journal of Education for Social Work*, 2(2), 66–77. <https://yulib002.mc.yu.edu:8443/login?url=https://www.jstor.org/stable/41350397>
- Papell, C. P., & Rothman, B. (1980). Relating the mainstream model of social work with groups to group psychotherapy and the structured group approach. *Social Work with Groups*, 3(2), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v03n02_02
- Papell, C. P., & Skolnik, L. (1992). The reflective practitioner: A contemporary paradigm's relevance for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28(1), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.1992.10778754>
- Perron, B., & Powell, T. (2008). *Online groups and social work practice*. Routledge.
- Saleeby, D. (1993). *The strengths perspective in social work practice*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Schiller, L. Y. (1997). Rethinking stages of development in women's groups: Implications for practice. *Social Work with Groups*, 20(3), 3–19. doi.10.1300/J009v20n03_02
- Schwartz, W. (1976). Between client and system: The mediating function. In Roberts R.W. & Northen H. (Eds.). *Theories of Social Work with Groups*, 171–197. Columbia University Press

- Shulman, L. (1987). The hidden group in the classroom: The use of group process in teaching group work practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 1*(2), 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1300/J067v01n02_02
- Shulman, L. (2016). *The skills of helping individuals, families, groups, and communities* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Simon, S. R., & Kilbane, T. (2014). The current state of group work education in US graduate schools of social work. *Social Work with Groups, 37*(3), 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2013.840821>
- Simon, S. R., Kilbane, T. L., & Stoltenberg, E. B. (2019). Underexplored aspects of group-work education in MSW programs. *Social Work with Groups, 42*(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2017.1393370>
- Simon, S. R., & Stauber, K. W. (2011). Technology and groupwork: A mandate and an opportunity. *Groupwork, 21*(3), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1921/095182411X636545>
- Skolnik, L. (1989). Field Instruction in the 1980s- Realities, Issues, and Problem-Solving Strategies. *The Clinical Supervisor, 6*(3–4), 47–75. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v06n03_05
- Skolnik, L., & Papell, C. P. (1994). Holistic designs for field instruction in the contemporary social work curriculum. *Journal of Social Work Education, 30*(1), 90–96. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/10437797.1994.10672216>
- Skolnik, L. R., & Atkinson, L. (1978). Confidentiality in group work practice. *Social Work with Groups, 1*(1), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v01n01_07
- Skolnik, S. (2019). Coming together: Factors that connect social workers to group work practice. *Social Work with Groups, 42*(1), 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2017.1384948>
- Solomon, B. B. (1976). *Black empowerment: Social work in oppressed communities*. Columbia University Press.
- Steinberg, D. M. (2010). Mutual aid: A contribution to best-practice social work. *Social Work with Groups, 33*(1), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609510903316389>
- Sweifach, J. (2014). Group work education today: A content analysis of MSW group work course syllabi. *Social Work with Groups, 37*(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2013.816920>
- Tully, G. (2015). The faculty field liaison: An essential role for advancing graduate and under graduate group work education. *Social Work with Groups, 38*(1), 6–20. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2014.931672>
- Weinberg, H. (2020). Online group psychotherapy: Challenges and possibilities during COVID-19—A practice review. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 24*(3), 201. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1037/gdn0000140>
- Wright, M. M. (2003). Co-facilitation: Fashion or function? *Social Work with Groups, 25*(3), 77–92. https://doi.org/10.1300/J009v25n03_06