2008

Perspectives on the Post-Degree Supervision Needs of Ontario Social Workers

Heather Jane Hair
Wilfrid Laurier University

Canada

PERSPECTIVES ON THE POST-DEGREE SUPERVISION NEEDS OF ONTARIO SOCIAL WORKERS

BY

Heather Jane Hair

Bachelor of Arts Honours, Concordia University, 1986
Master of Arts, Wilfrid Laurier University, 1989
Master of Science, University of Guelph, 1991

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of Social Work

In partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Doctor of Philosophy degree

Wilfrid Laurier University
2008

ABSTRACT

The dominant contemporary post-degree supervision literature reflects a long held belief that social workers employed in various practice settings need a combination of further education, support, and administrative guidance from someone more expert than themselves. In spite of these claims, a noticeable gap in knowledge is learning what, if anything, social workers *need* from supervision to help them provide effective services.

My particular interest is post-degree supervision within the social work landscape of Canada. I chose to focus this research project on the supervision needs of social workers in Ontario, the province where I have spent many years working as a practitioner and supervisor. My mixed model research project was designed to discern, analyse, and interpret what social work research participants identify as the post-degree supervision needs of Ontario social workers. There were four sources of information that helped to focus my research questions and design: (1) evidence from research which demonstrates post-degree supervision can benefit social workers and their clients; (2) evidence from research that the domination of administrative needs of organizations are crippling the potential effectiveness of post-degree supervision; (3) information from accumulating literature that offers conceptualizations of social work knowledge and practices that appear to encourage social justice and social change; and (4) the significant reduction of available post-degree social work supervision throughout Canada. For my research, 636 social workers throughout Ontario submitted their responses to my original web-survey. The focus of the quantitative and qualitative questions inquired about social worker's needs concerning the purpose and process of supervision, as well as the place in supervision for the social work mission of social justice and social change.

The results of this investigation clearly indicate that supervision is a needed and valued relationship for social workers, but current or recent quantity is slim and quality is thin. Participants identified a considerable number of supervision needs; needs that reiterate many previously raised concerns about social work supervision in Canada. For example, respondents need supervision to intentionally promote professional development and the social work mission of social justice and change. From these needs, I created a portrait of preferred supervision according to the participants. This integration of the quantitative data along with the thick qualitative descriptions informed my subsequent reflections, as well as my proposed implications for Ontario supervision practices and future research.

Transferability of the results suggest that information from this research could be used by (a) Ontario social workers to promote effective practice in the workplace, and (b) social work organizations and university social work programs to develop supervision knowledge and practice. Importantly, the successful emergence and establishment of effective, available post-degree supervision cannot rely on these findings alone. Social work practitioners and academics are strongly encouraged to actively advocate for, and creatively engage in, the development of education, training, and research opportunities concerning post-degree social work supervision.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION:

CREATING A CONTEXT FOR MY RESEARCH

The dominant contemporary post-degree supervision literature reflects a long held

belief that social workers employed in various practice settings need a combination of

further education, support, and administrative guidance from someone more expert than

themselves (Gibbs, 2001; Gibelman & Schervish, 1997; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002).

Nevertheless, throughout the world, social workers and social work supervisors have

been expressing growing concerns about the diminishing availability and decreased

quality of supervision and the potentially negative effects for service delivery (Berger and

Mizrahi, 2001; Collins-Carmargo & Groeber, 2003; Gibbs, 2001; Giddings, Cleveland, &

Smith, 2006; Gibelman & Schervish, 1997; Erera & Lazar, 1994; Itzhaky, & Aviad-

Hiebloom, 1998; Jones, 2004; Kadushin, 1992a; Laufer, 2003; Nelson, 2000; Schroffel,

1999; Spence, Wilson, Kavanagh, Strong, & Worrall, 2001; Tsui, 2004).

Across the North American landscape, two significant shifts in the socio-

economic arena have been transforming the work settings of social workers and the shape

of supervision. First of all, the growing dominance of business management approaches

in human service organizations has meant that the primary tasks of the supervision

relationship have shifted to administrative needs rather than the practice needs of the

social workers serving their clients[1] (Aronson & Sammon, 2000). Second, since the

1980s, the reduction of government funding and organizational downsizing has

---

[1] I use the word, *client*, for the following reasons: The word is used in the Canadian Code of Ethics
(CASW) (2005a) and the Ontario Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice (OCSWSSW, 2000), and has
been identified as the designation most common to social work (Heinonen & Spearman, 2006). The word,
client, acknowledges the power differential that exists between giver and receiver of service. For my
purposes, client can include a "person, family, group of persons, incorporated body, association or
community on whose behalf a social worker provides or agrees to provide a service or to whom the social
worker is legally obligated to provide service" (CASW, 2005a, p. 10).

significantly reduced the number of social workers who are supervisors in a variety of practice settings (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 2000; Stephenson, Rondeau, Michaud, & Fiddler, 2000). These indicators strongly suggest that the future of social work supervision is uncertain (Garrett & Barretta-Herman, 1995; Giddings et al. 2006; Morrison, 1997; Wuenschel, 2006). If the quality of and the provision made for supervision are considered key indicators of organizational health in human services (Eisikovits, Meier, Guttmann, Shurka, & Levinstein, 1985), then the situation could be considered grave indeed (Clulow, 1994; Giddings et al., 2006; Jones, 2004).

In spite of these significant changes, and the claims that supervision is needed for social workers, supervision continues to receive only marginal attention and critique from North American social work academics, social work associations, and regulatory bodies. Research focused on post-degree supervision practice has been described as sparse, conceptually narrow, and methodologically flawed (Spence et al., 2001; Tsui, 2004). Studies have helped to describe past or current supervision practices but have done little to explore what supervision *could offer* social workers and their client relationships (Tsui, 2004). A noticeable gap in knowledge about post-degree supervision is learning what, if anything, social workers *need* from supervision to help them provide effective services (Spence et al., 2001). It appears, therefore, that the time is ripe for social workers to actively consider the future of social work supervision.

My particular interest is post-degree supervision within the social work landscape of Canada. As a beginning point, I chose to focus this research project on the supervision needs of social workers in Ontario, the province where I have spent many years working as a practitioner and supervisor. The development of my conceptual framework and the

actualization of my research design were influenced by information I consolidated from the literature. Specifically, I (a) determined the difference between social work supervision and consultation; (b) developed criteria to select relevant literature and research; (c) identified challenges for contemporary social work practice; (d) discerned a relationship between supervision and social work; and (e) analysed the current status of social work supervision in Canada, particularly in Ontario. These strands of knowledge, along with my social location, have woven together into a context for my inquiry, and form the introduction to my dissertation. The following is a presentation of each of these areas, beginning with pertinent aspects of myself in relation to social work supervision. I conclude this introduction chapter with an outline of my research, and an overview of the subsequent chapters of my dissertation.

Locating Myself in Relation to Social Work Supervision

Whenever a recounting or interpretation of ideas or events is given, certain information becomes privileged by the act of inclusion. The process of signifying what to include or not is within the domain of the individual documenting the account. Therefore, I acknowledge that these words are mine situated in a particular time and place.

First, what I have chosen to read, write, and explore about social work supervision has been guided by many experiences and relationships. Notably, during my life, I have been silenced because I am a woman and privileged because I am White, English speaking, and Canadian born. Therefore, during my dissertation journey I endeavoured to be mindful about the intersections of my marginalizing experiences and my ever-present and unearned social power. I believe this helped me to critique supervision knowledge and practices according to how well different people could be liberated or oppressed.

My interest in social work supervision has surfaced out of three particular aspects of my life. Since 1979, I have worked in various social service settings and in different roles, primarily in children's mental health. During those years, I participated in various supervision relationships that offered a wide range of experiences from professionally enriching to frustrating and ineffectual. Secondly, the process of becoming and being an Approved Supervisor with the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) has significantly influenced my interest in social work supervision knowledge and practices. In order to become an AAMFT Approved Supervisor there are documented expectations of written assignments, a minimum number of client contact hours, the completion of a 30 hour course in supervision fundamentals, and receiving 36 hours of supervision from an experienced AAMFT supervisor while providing 180 hours of supervision for supervisees within a two year period (AAMFT, 2007b). This is in contrast to the complete lack of social work supervisor expectations in Ontario. Finally, working my way through a PhD in Social Work has provided many opportunities to consider how post-degree supervision could be a potential avenue towards effective social work.

A Comparison between Social Work Supervision and Consultation

The following description contains the qualities of social work supervision that continue to dominate the literature (Jones, 2004). These characteristics clarify important distinctions between supervision and consultation, which influenced the focus of my inquiry and my understanding of the research findings.

Supervision in social work has been uniquely shaped by the practice context. This means that an organizational position usually identified by the designation "supervisor" or "manager" gives one person an essential quality of authority over social workers'

practice with clients. Hence, social work supervision is a conversational[2] activity that

takes place in a hierarchical relationship within an organization. The actual conversation

typically involves two people: the social work supervisor and the social work supervisee

(Ganzer & Ornstein, 2004; Kadushin, 1992a; Tsui, 2005b). However, the expectations of

the practice focus for conversation are the clients of the social worker, which suggests

that supervision is a three-way process (Clulow, 1994; Harkness & Hensley, 1991).

Although power is present in all relationships (Foucault, 1980d), the position of

authority accentuates the power supervisors can use to control or influence supervisees

(Behan, 2003; Fine & Turner, 1997). Correspondingly, the supervisor is considered

accountable for the supervisee's practice and can give directives that the supervisee is

expected to follow (Barretta-Herman, 2001; Middleman & Rhodes, 1985). Notably, this

conceptualization of supervision renders the term "peer supervision" an oxymoron since

work place colleagues do not have authority or superiority over each other's practice

(Garrett & Barretta-Herman, 1995).

Some assumptions about the person in the supervisor position can include (a)

years of experience as a practitioner, (b) knowledge about the profession, and (c)

familiarity with the work setting's policies and procedures (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002).

The customary responsibilities of a supervisor (Kadushin, 1976; Kadushin & Harkness,

2002) have been to (a) provide supportive learning opportunities for knowledge and skill

development (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002), (b) attend to administrative tasks, including a

focus on agency expectations, and, in many settings, (c) provide performance evaluations

that can influence job retention and promotion.

---

[2] I have chosen the term *conversation* to acknowledge the active process of talking and listening that occurs between people. The uniqueness of the supervision conversation is identified by the specific qualities and expectations of the participants and the larger contexts of the relationship (Fine & Turner, 1997).

In contrast, consultation is a voluntary relationship for the consultee and the consultant. Authority is not held by or designated to one participant over another. This means that the person providing consultation is not responsible for the consultee's practice decisions (Garrett & Barretta-Herman, 1995). Therefore, peers within an organization can provide consultation to each other. A consultation relationship can also occur with a person outside of an organization for a designated period of time. In those circumstances, a consultant (a) is sought out because of knowledge or skill in a particular area; and (b) is contracted to encourage knowledge and skill development, and/or provide opinions and suggestions for consideration around specific issues or learning needs (Barretta-Herman, 2001; Middleman & Rhodes; 1985; Munson, 2002; Payne, 1994).

Although some authors blend the terms supervision and consultation, or use the terms interchangeably (for example, Brown & Bourne, 1996 and Shulman, 1993), I take the point of view that positional differences in authority mark supervision and consultation as qualitatively different relationships.

Literature and Research on Social Work Supervision

For my investigation, relevant published literature and research between the 1880s and 2007 were sought out using the following databases: ERIC (Educational Resources Information Centre), PsycINFO, Social Sciences Abstracts, Social Sciences Citation Index, Social Services Abstracts, Social Work Abstracts, and Sociological Abstracts. I also used ProQuest Digital Dissertations to find dissertations between 1975 and 2007. Pertinent publications from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) were accessed from the University of Michigan Digital Library Production Service (DLPS) (please see: http://quod.lib.umich.edu/n/ncosw/).

Articles or books about supervision knowledge, practice, or issues were selected according to three conditions. First, the title or content of the book or article clearly had a social work focus. Secondly, at least one of the authors has an identified academic degree or association with social work education or social work practice. Finally, I only selected supervision literature that clearly identified a post-degree focus.

Selecting Social Work Supervision Research

There have been five published reviews of social work supervision research. Daniel Harkness and John Poertner (1989) include five dissertations and 21 published studies from 1955 to 1985. Ming-Sum Tsui has produced three reviews (1997a, 2004, 2005b), of which his 2005 book chapter is the most comprehensive collection to date containing 34 refereed articles published between 1950 and 2002. The research review by Marion Bogo and Kathryn McKnight (2005) reports on 13 published articles of 11 studies conducted on clinical social work supervision in the United States between 1994 and 2004. Taking into account research studies that overlap between the three reviews by Harkness and Poertner, Tsui (2005b), and Bogo and McKnight, there is a combined total of 55 articles and 5 dissertations.

For my investigation, published research and dissertations were identified and selected according to a cluster of specific criteria. These were:

◆ Published peer-reviewed research: 1970 – 2007

◆ Dissertation research not yet published: 1970 – 2007

◆ Document language: English

◆ The title or abstract of the research clearly identified a post-degree social work supervision focus. Fieldwork or practicum supervision research was not included.

◆ At least one of the authors has an identified academic degree and association with

social work education or social work practice.

◆ Social workers were identified as research participants.

◆ Research focus was relevant to my research.

Although writing about and practicing social work supervision has a long history,

research is still in its infancy. Given my criteria, I selected and obtained 59 publications

and 7 dissertations for a total of 66 documents (Please see Appendix A). From my

selection, 35 have been previously reviewed by Harkness and Poertner (1989), Tsui

(2005b), or Bogo and McKnight (2005). For all the research, participants were social

workers or supervisors in mental health, child welfare, health, social services, or

corrections settings. As I understood the intent of the research I selected, no one had

investigated the post-degree supervision needs of social workers.

The quantitative research includes 40 published articles and 3 dissertations. Areas

of interest were investigated through questionnaires. The majority of researchers used

mail-out surveys; for a small percentage of studies, the administration method was not

indicated. Supervision characteristics or functions, process, and practices were explored

in relationship to a variety of factors, such as (a) social worker expectations, risk of burn-

out, and/or job satisfaction; (b) gender differences; (c) ethical judgements; and (d) social

worker satisfaction with supervision and/or supervisors.

Mixed methods were used in three published studies and one dissertation

(Collins-Carmargo & Groeber, 2003; Fukuyama, 1998; Poertner & Rapp, 1983; Strand &

Badger, 2005). Common to the publications was a focus on child welfare services.

Poertner and Rapp were interested in what casework supervisors do in a large, US

statewide child welfare system. Collins-Carmargo and Groeber responded to the need for

systemic reform of the child welfare system in the rural south of the USA. They

discovered that enhancing casework supervision was the most significant need region-

wide. In New York City, a new consultation program for child welfare supervisors was

piloted and evaluated by Strand and Badger (2005). Their research suggests that links

between MSW-level supervisors and faculty from schools of social work shows promise

for professional development. Finally, in his dissertation, Fukuyama (1998) used mixed

methods to explore characteristics of supervision and the work performance of social

workers in Japan.

Qualitative research designs were used by researchers in 13 publications and 3

dissertations. Investigations explored supervision characteristics or functions, process,

and practices along with areas such as (a) the benefits of supervision, (b) the

organizational context, (c) the experiences of racially and/or ethnically identified social

workers, and (d) the influence of the supervision process.

The three publications by Harkness (1995, 1997; Harkness & Hensley, 1991)

highlighted different aspects of his study that used a quasi-experimental panel design.

Harness developed his research to examine the skills of supervisors, the supervision

relationship, and the outcomes of supervised practice. His quantitative data was gathered

from four workers and their clients over time at a community mental health centre. The

workers were initially provided eight weeks of supervision that focused on clinical

training, and administrative supervision. Then for eight more weeks the supervisor

intentionally focused discussion on the problems of the client and the staff interventions

in the context of client outcomes. The findings demonstrated that compared to mixed

focus supervision, when supervision was focused on client issues and associated knowledge and skills, practitioners appeared to increase their use of clinical skills, and clients reported improved outcomes. These three publications appear to be the only research that has considered data from clients as an indicator of helpful supervision.

In order to better understand the suitability of the research for the Canadian context, I endeavoured to discover the geographic location of the authors and the participants (Please see Appendix B). For the 59 published articles, all authors identified university appointments, of which the majority were in the United States. However, there was a representation of academics from Israel, Hong Kong, Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand, and Canada. The majority of the research took place in the United States (31 publications, 4 dissertations). As well a number of studies have been conducted in Israel (8 publications), Australia (6 publications), Canada (4 publications, 1 dissertation), Hong Kong (4 publications, 1 dissertation), the United Kingdom (3 publications), Aotearoa New Zealand (2 publications), Norway (1 publication), and Japan (1dissertation). Among these countries, social work practice and supervision have many developmental and conceptual similarities, reflecting the ongoing influence of Western ideas (Itzhaky & Rudich, 2003/2004; McDonald, 1999; O'Donoghue, 2002; Pathak, 1975). Thus, I have determined the selected research is applicable to the Canadian context.

The Challenges of Contemporary Social Work Practice

Relationships are indispensable to all social work practice (Beresford & Croft, 2001; Heinonen & Spearman, 2006; Healy, 2001; Hugman, 2003; Lundy, 2004; Pease, 2002; Parton, 2000; Reid, 2002; Rossiter, 2001; Skerrett, 2000). The construction of relationships between social workers and clients primarily occurs through the medium of

verbal, nonverbal, and documented communication (Jessup & Rogerson, 1999; Parton, 2003). Written and oral dialogs shape social work activities such as knowledge creation, negotiation, advocacy, counselling, and community development (Jessup & Rogerson, 1999; Parton & O'Byrne, 2000; Skerrett, 2000). Simply, it is through relational encounters that social work is practised.

A central intention of social work – to seek out the voices that have been silenced – marks the discipline as value-driven not value-neutral (Bisman, 2004; Payne, 1999; Reamer, 1994; Saleebey, 1994). The ability of social workers to cultivate relationships that can effectively facilitate the social work mission of social justice and social change corresponds to their level of knowledge, critical reflection, and reflexive practice of the ethics and principles, and theories and skills associated with social work (Bisman, 2004; Fook, 2000; Heinonen & Spearman, 2006; Healy, 2001; Hugman, 2003; Lundy, 2004; Narhi, 2002; Parton, 2003). In Canada, degree granting academic programs provide courses and practicum experiences that ideally give students opportunities to discover, explore, and critique the rich diversity of viewpoints, information, and practice foci of social work (Carniol, 2005; Payne, 2001; Parton, 2000; Razack, 2002; Rossiter, 2001, 2005). Moreover, during their university experience, students can discover that social work practice is a complicated kindness: The desire and pursuit of change – be it with individuals, families, groups, or communities – and of "the liberation of the dispossessed and vulnerable" (Saleebey, 1994, p. 359) occurs in a multi-layered regulatory context of organizations, policies, and societal expectations that set parameters of acceptability. In sum, working as a social work practitioner – no matter the context or whether the relationship is with individuals, families, groups, or communities – means finding ways

to ethically navigate being an agent of social care *and* social control (Fook, 1999; Healy, 2001; Rossiter, 2001).

Developing a conceptualization and practice of social work, that can successfully use the privilege and power of professional position to maximize opportunities for justice and change, is only one of many challenges that face social workers. In addition, research specific to Canada (Aronson & Sammon, 2000; CASW, 2004; Stephenson et al., 2000) has identified that complex and growing societal needs, difficult working conditions, increased workloads, inadequate training and preparation, and lack of work place support have significant implications for the effectiveness of services provided by social workers. Moreover, the expectations for new employees remain high. Stephenson and colleagues (2000, p. 200) note that employers

> want employees to have the ability to take initiative, to work in teams, to have excellent communication skills, and to have specific task-related skills. In the social services specifically they also want workers who can respond effectively to the target groups that are being served.

As an entry point into employment, academic education and practicum experiences cannot adequately prepare students for the rigors of the workplace nor provide them with sufficient knowledge, practice skills, or opportunities to integrate knowledge into effective relationships with clients (Giddings et al., 2006). Also, for many new, as well as seasoned social workers, actualizing social justice, while trying to comply with organizational, societal, and legal expectations can be daunting in contemporary work environments (Mizrahi, 2001). As an alternative to work place isolation and burnout, peer support and continuing education opportunities are two possible buffers.

But are they enough given the complexities of social work practice? Alternatively, social work supervision can be a valued relationship for social workers as they navigate through the many challenges, stresses, and demands of practice (Carniol, 2005; Gibbs, 2001; Giddings et al., 2006; MacDougall, 2001; Rossiter, Walsh-Bowers, & Prilleltensky, 1996).

<center>Supervision and Social Work: A Potentially Beneficial Relationship</center>

Social work supervision began in the 1800s with the inception of *casework* and has continued to be associated with individual, family, and group social work practice in publicly funded settings (Grauel, 2002; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kauffman, 1938; Middleman & Rhodes, 1985; Munson, 2002; Stiles, 1963/1979; Tsui, 2005b). In contrast, supervision had little if any relationship with social work practice focused on community development and social reform (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kutzik, 1977). This is not to say that social workers in community practice could not benefit from a supervisory relationship. Rather, as an explanation of the relative absence of supervision, Kadushin and Harkness (2002) suggest that the non-standardized work situations in the community plus the more open process of community work encourage "on-the-job-autonomy" (p. 16) and public accountability, as opposed to the traditionally private relationships with clients in human service settings.

Since the supervision of social workers began, education, support, and administration have been three identified elements of the supervision relationship (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002). The educational aspect, also known as clinical supervision (Tsui, 2005b), focuses on knowledge and practice skill development. The support feature addresses the emotional wellbeing, motivation, and satisfaction of supervisees. For many

supervisors and supervisees, the educational and supportive aspects of supervision are closely intertwined and identified as practice supervision. Administrative supervision considers how best to meet organizational policies and procedures, including work assignments and staff evaluations. This facet of supervision also includes those actions by the supervisor to help manage stresses related to the work setting. For example, helping social workers prioritize work tasks, permitting flexible scheduling of staff, and sharing with social workers the responsibility for difficult decisions about clients (Rauktis & Koeske, 1994).

Educative and supportive supervision have been identified by social workers and social work supervisors as important factors for knowledge formation and the development of competent, effective services (Bibus, 1993; Brown & Bourne, 1996; Cearley, 2004; Collins-Camargo & Groeber, 2003; Hensley, 2002; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 2000, 2002; Nelson, 2000; Shulman, 1993; Spence et al., 2001). These elements of supervision, along with a focus on social work ethics and values, encourage the professional development of social workers (Berger and Mizrahi, 2001; Cohen & Laufer, 1999; Eisikovits et al., 1985; Hensley, 2002; Landau, 1999; Laufer, 2003; Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004; Smith, 2000; Tsui, 2005a; Wuenschel, 2006). Research has demonstrated that supervision of social work practice can improve service delivery, develop social work skills, enhance an understanding of social work ethics and values, increase job satisfaction, and provide a valued defence against emotional exhaustion and staff burnout (Bibus, 1993; Brown & Bourne, 1996; Cearley, 2004; Harkness, & Hensley, 1991; Hensley, 2002; Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Landau, 1999; Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002; Martin & Schinke, 1998; Millstein,

2000; Munson, 2000, 2002; Poulin, 1994; Rossiter et al., 1996; Stalker, Mandell,

Frensch, Harvey, & Wright, 2007).

Given the potential learning and skill development opportunities possible through

post-degree supervision, the supervisor-supervisee relationship could be very beneficial

for contemporary social workers in Canada (Canadian Association of Social Workers

(CASW), 2001; Lundy, 2004; MacDougall, 2001; Rossiter et al., 1996; Stephenson et al.,

2000). However, as I discuss in the next sections, practice-focused, post-degree social

work supervision has been disappearing across the country.

The Status of Post-Degree Social Work Supervision in Canada

In Canada, supervision is often inadequately provided in the workplace,

particularly in rural or sparsely populated areas of the country (CASW, 2001;

MacDougall, 2001; Ministry of Children and Family Development of British Columbia,

2004; Stephenson et al., 2000). When supervision does occur, a common experience is

the domination of administrative tasks and performance expectations (Aronson &

Sammon, 2000; Carniol, 2005; Melichercik, 1984; Rossiter, et al., 1996; Walsh-Bowers,

Rossiter, & Prilleltensky, 1996). I submit that the status of post-degree supervision in

Canada has been a consequence of two significant factors: (1) the persistent reduction of

government funding, and (2) the long-standing lack of attention from Canadian social

work academics, colleges, and associations.

The Impact of Reduced Government Funding and the

Prioritizing of Organizational Needs

Since the 1980s, the ongoing reduction of government funding for social services

across Canada has meant a significant loss of available post-degree social work

supervision throughout the country (Guest, 1999; Stephenson et al., 2000). In response, the strategic action plan of the national social work sector study (Stephenson et al., 2000) recommended that employers need to create policies and practices so that social workers would be provided supervision in the workplace.

Although the workplace seems to be the likely site to focus attention for the development of policies and practices for social work supervision, I propose that budget constraints, waiting lists, and managerial constraints over social work practice (Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004) mean that supervision for learning and skill development is not likely to be the priority of organizations. For many settings, particularly child welfare, corrections, and hospitals, the supervision of social workers is often practised with "unthinking adherence to politically and bureaucratically defined roles, implemented procedurally rather than through professional discretion and creativity, and enforced by managerial sanctions and crude quality assurance mechanisms" (Payne, 1994, p. 55). When left up to organizations, supervision can too easily be a means of administrative surveillance rather than an opportunity for knowledge and skill development and support.

Therefore, I believe the expectation that work settings should invest in changes to supervision practices is unrealistic and misdirected. Instead, the future of supervision practice is best addressed by social workers. This position is familiar to other helping professions, such as counselling and clinical psychology, couple and family therapy, and psychoanalysis, which have viewed professional and practice skill development and associated supervision as the responsibility of the profession and not at the discretion of the employer (AAMFT, 2007a, 2007b; Edwards, 2000; Grinberg, 1990).

Universities, Colleges, and Associations: So What about Supervision?

Social work academic programs, colleges, and associations are the collective

bodies of social workers potentially in the best position to determine post-degree

supervision expectations (Australian Association of Social Workers, 2000; Beddoe, 1997;

Munson, 1980, 2000; O'Donoghue, 2001; Tsui, 2005a). Nevertheless, in Canada these

groups have shown little interest in post-degree supervision until the early 2000s. In

2001, the national social work sector study was published (Stephenson et al., 2000). The

results of this comprehensive research project, which brought together representatives

from the academic, professional, and organizational communities, indicated that

supervision was an important component for effective practice. Later in 2001, the

outcome of the "historic" Social Work Forum in Montreal concluded that, in response to

the "deterioration of the workplace" (CASW, 2001, p. 9), new supervision practises

needed to be created in Canada. Unfortunately, these documents were silent on what

changes to supervision were needed, who would decide, and who would be responsible to

initiate those changes. Other national documentation is equally vague about supervision

practice expectations. The recently available *Canadian Guidelines for Ethical Practice*

(CASW, 2005b) has included a section entitled, "Responsibilities in Supervision and

Consultation" but there are no parameters offered to define what knowledge and skill is

preferred for those who supervise or consult.

In Canada, academic interest in supervision continues to be sorely lacking. To

date, research about post-degree social work supervision in Canada totals four

publications, the most recent being 1991 (Melichercik, 1984; Rodway, 1991; Shulman,

1991; Shulman, Robinson, & Luckyji, 1981), and one dissertation (Matheson, 1999)[3].

Educational opportunities about social work supervision practice are offered sporadically

across the country. Following a web-site review of Canadian university social work

programs for 2007-2008, I discovered the following MSW elective courses listed but not

offered every year: (1) *Current Issues and Trends in Social Work Supervision*, Dalhousie

University; (2) *Supervision for Generalist Social Work Practice*, Lakehead University;

(3) *Social Work Supervision, Consultation, and Team-Building*, McMaster University; (4)

Supervision in Professional and Clinical Practice, Memorial University, and (5) *Social*

Work Supervision, a module offered as part of a larger course, University of Calgary.

University Continuing Education Programs can also offer workshops or short

courses on social work supervision. Through a web-site review of available training and

workshops for 2007-2008, I learned about two on-line courses for social workers: (a)

Supervision: Principles and Practices, Centre for Social Work Research & Professional

Development, University of Calgary; and (b) *Becoming a Social Work Supervisor,*

Faculty of Social Work Continuing Education Program, University of Toronto.

The attention to supervision by social work associations and colleges has been

marginally better, compared to the academic community. To understand the influence

these groups could have over the role of supervision for social workers, it is important to

acknowledge the impact of social work legislation and regulation in Canada. Across the

country, the title protection of the designation "social worker," the corresponding

qualifications, and the establishment of standards of practice to "protect the public" have

become the responsibility of provincial and territorial legislation (CASW, 2003; Lundy,

---

[3] Two other dissertations on supervision have been completed through Canadian social work programs but research participants were from other countries: Tsui (2001) – Hong Kong and McCarthy (2003) – the United States.

2004; MacDonald & Adachi, 2001).[4] Of the ten provinces, seven have a regulatory

college that is connected with the social work association. In Ontario, British Columbia,

and Prince Edward Island, the college and association are independent of each other

(CASW, 2003; MacDonald & Adachi, 2001).

The regulatory bodies have been critiqued as vehicles of government control over

social work knowledge and scope of practice, and as another wedge privileging micro or

clinical practice over social action and structural change (Lundy, 2004). The addressment

of these concerns does not minimize the potential for registered college members to

collectively provide substantial influence over the development of social work knowledge

and practice, particularly if a shared vision on an issue occurred (MacKenzie, 1999).

Furthermore, associations that are independent of the regulatory umbrella have as a

mandate to represent and advocate for changes desired by social workers. Thus, social

workers have structures that can be used to advocate for changes to supervision in

response to social workers' needs.

Currently regulatory boards and associations present a variety of positions

concerning post-degree supervision expectations for registration and/or to gain and

maintain social work skills. On the one hand, Alberta and Nova Scotia have developed

specific instructions about the duration of post-degree supervision for general social work

practice. For example, first time applicants to the Alberta College of Social Workers

(ACSW) (2007b) are provisionally registered until 1,500 hours of practice have been

completed that are supervised by a registered social worker. The Nova Scotia Association

---

[4] The three Territories are currently the only jurisdictions that do not have some form of social work
regulation. Social workers of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon are in the process of developing
professional regulation, whereas Nunavut is not doing so at this time (Association of Social Workers in
Northern Canada, 2008).

of Social Workers (NSASW) (n.d.) requires a candidacy period of post-degree supervised

practice in a paid social work position for all registrants. For a person with a BSW the

length of time is three years, whereas for a person with a PhD or masters degree the

period is two years. According to the NSASW, "the purpose for the candidacy period of

supervised practice is to provide a means for the profession to ensure that social workers

are competent to practice and the public to be assured of quality service and protection"

(para. 4).

Although time frames are not stipulated for general social work practice, the

Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Social Workers (NLASW) (2003) and the

Board of Registration for Social Workers in British Columbia (BRSWBC) (2005b), have

created documents that provide "standards" for clinical or educative supervision. The

Standards for Clinical Supervision for Social Workers ((NLASW, 2003) outlines and

elaborates on five standards that supervisors are expected to follow. In summary these

are: (1) to hold to an ethical stance as outlined in the CASW *Code of Ethics (2005a)* and

the *Guidelines for Ethical Practice* (2005b), (2) to develop specialized knowledge, (3) to

be able to offer supervision individually and in groups, (4) to be able to provide social

workers with "timely access" to supervision, and (5) to provide supervision that

addresses the developmental needs of social workers. The BRSWBC document (2005b)

highlights different aspects within six standards for supervision practice. A supervisor is

expected to: (1) promote "ethical and competent practice," (2) promote "policies and

rules which safeguard the rights of clients and supervisees," (3) promote clear relational

boundaries and expectations between supervisor and supervisee, (4) promote role clarity

and "not enter into a therapeutic relationship with supervisees," (p. 2), (5) promote ethical

behaviour and not enter into any sexual contact with supervisees, and (6) promote their own maintenance of "specialized knowledge and understanding relevant to his/her own are(s) of practice" (p. 3). Both provincial Colleges identified that these documents were developed in response to social workers who are "looking to regulatory bodies and professional associations to provide these standards" ((NLASW, 2003, p. 2), and out of their regulatory "mandate of protecting the public interest" (BRSWBC, 2005b, p. 1).

In contrast, according to the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (OCSWSSW) (2000) *Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice*, after graduation with a BSW, MSW, or PhD there are no supervision requirements to be a member of the college. Once registered, a social worker can provide "the assessment, diagnosis, treatment and evaluation of individual, interpersonal, and societal problems" (p. 1). Principle II, which concerns "competence and integrity," does identify that members are expected to demonstrate their commitment to ongoing professional development through their participation in "any continuing education and continuing competence measures required by the College" (p. 4). Although there was a pilot project of a Continuing Competence Program (OCSWSSW, 2004), to date professional development requirements have not been articulated for members. Thus, there appears to be considerable latitude and reliance on personal judgement to decide individual practice limits for registered social workers.

Along with the various positions by provincial colleges – required supervision, documented standards of supervision practice, or no requirements at all – there is no indication by any of the regulatory bodies across Canada that the decisions made about supervision guidelines and expectations were done in collaboration with social work

practitioners and/or the academic community where potential research, learning, and development of supervision could occur. Although the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Social Workers identify literature references, acknowledge five contributors, and "thank the many individuals and professional practice councils for their review and input" (p. 9), it is not stated if and how members had an opportunity to provide input during the development of the supervision standards document. The apparent lack of input by the social work community across Canada raises the question: If it is desirable that clients have input into the decisions that affect their lives, is it not equally important that the needs of social workers be considered when their "standards" are being developed? In other words, how can regulatory bodies have the "best interest" of the public in mind when the providers of the services have no input into the construction of their own practice? Furthermore, the potential that social workers did not contribute to the documentation of supervision reinforces how supervision continues to be the property of organizations.

Perhaps the possible lack of participation by social workers in the construction of supervision expectations is a way to avoid potential tensions that are currently present amongst social workers? In Canada, along with the international community, the notions of a social work identity, professionalization, regulation, and standards of competent practice are contested amongst scholars, and between scholars and practitioners (Bisman, 2004; CASW, 2001; Carniol, 2005; Fook, 2000, 2001; Franklin, 2001; Healy, 2001; Holosko & Leslie, 2001; Hugman, 1996, 2003; Lundy, 2004; Payne, 1999, 2001; Rondeau, 2001; Rossiter, 2001; Webb, 1996). These topics share questions about power and privilege that are germane to the social work supervision relationship. In particular,

"What is the authentic use of power in social work and how do we distinguish this from domination?" (Rossiter, 2001, p. 5-6). How can knowledge construction be shared within a hierarchical relationship? Finally, what can be signs of social justice and social change in daily relational practice? These questions are relevant towards understanding supervision and the future of supervision practice.

In my subsequent review of the literature, I present and critique documented ideas that have had a profound impact on contemporary supervision. As well, I introduce some emerging alternative notions that suggest effective practice development and that the social justice mission of social work can be part of the supervision relationship.

An Outline of My Research

My mixed model research project was designed to discern, analyse, and interpret what social work research participants identify as the post-degree supervision needs of Ontario social workers. There were four sources of information that helped to focus my research questions and design: (1) evidence from research which demonstrates post-degree supervision can benefit social workers and their clients; (2) evidence from research that the domination of administrative needs of organizations are crippling the potential effectiveness of post-degree supervision; (3) information from accumulating literature that offers conceptualizations of social work knowledge and practices that appear to encourage social justice and social change; and (4) the significant reduction of available post-degree social work supervision throughout Canada.

For my research, 636 social workers throughout Ontario submitted their responses to my original web-survey. The focus of the quantitative and qualitative questions inquired about social worker's needs concerning the purpose and process of supervision,

as well as the place in supervision for the social work mission of social justice and social change.

As the results of this investigation suggest, there is a strong, unified social work voice that supervision is valued but quantity is slim and quality is thin. Furthermore, responses suggest a variety of preferences and desired changes to supervision based on the identified needs of participants. Thus, the quantitative data along with the thick qualitative descriptions offer valuable information for social work advocacy and change for Ontario social workers. Transferability of the results suggest that information from this research could be used by (a) Ontario social workers to promote effective practice in the workplace, and (b) social work organizations and university social work programs to develop supervision knowledge and practice.

An Overview of Subsequent Chapters

In the following chapter, I critically review the supervision literature and identify those areas that have been long-standing points of contention in social work supervision. In Chapter Three, I describe my conceptual framework for my research design. Chapter Four details the research design up to data collection procedures, whereas Chapter Five is my description of the various data analyses that I used to organize and interpret the web-survey results. Chapter Six is devoted to the quantitative survey findings, while the emergent themes of the qualitative data are the focus for Chapter Seven. In Chapter eight, my final chapter, I provide an integrated configuration of supervision according to participants, my reflections of this narrative, as well as the implications of this research for Ontario supervision practices and future research.

CHAPTER TWO: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are five issues concerning social work supervision practice that I believe

are relevant to my research. As a first issue, I have already identified that authority and

power are part of the supervision relationship. Significant, however, is *how* power

relations are constructed (Fine & Turner, 1997). Secondly, I have alluded that customary

supervision practice has done little to encourage social justice and social change. These

areas have received minimal attention in the supervision literature even though it is an

integral part of the social work discipline. Three other areas have been investigated

repeatedly in the supervision literature but without resolution (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001).

These are: (a) the purpose of supervision, (b) the duration of supervision in a social

worker's career, and (c) the training and professional affiliation of the supervisor. While

each of these five areas has some associated research, there remains an absence of

investigations focused on the post-degree supervision needs of social workers.

Authority, Power, and the Supervision Relationship

The relationship between supervisors and supervisees is a site of complex power

relations isomorphic to the relationship between social workers and clients. Although the

use of power has become contested terrain for social work practice, supervision continues

to languish under ideas and practises that have been in place for over a century. The

following highlights the thread of power and authority through the development of social

work supervision.

According to documented accounts (Brown, 1938; Grauel, 2002; Kutzik, 1977;

Munson, 2002; Stiles, 1963/1979; Tsui, 1997b, 2005b), social work supervision was first

utilized in the 1800s in the U.S.A. and Britain "as a broad institutional process which

involved providing surveillance of all charitable and correctional institutions" (Munson, 1979d, p. 2). The overseeing of individuals began in the latter 1800s when volunteers working for charity organization societies were organized and monitored by paid "agents" of charity committees (Robinson, 1949; Smith, 1884). These agents or supervisors were "persons of experience, who have learned how to focus with reasonable accuracy the objects before them, who really know somewhat of the needs and resources of the needy, or ill, or delinquent, or defective individuals for whom they care" (Brackett, 1903/1979, p. 6). The use of words such as *objects, needy, delinquent, and defective* became a means, perhaps unwittingly, to objectify and pathologize persons living in poverty, thus "turning some people into clients and others into their judges" (Margolin, 1997, p. 105).

By the early 20th century in North America, supervision became a means to educate, support, and direct full-time "case workers" (Brackett, 1903/1979; Hollis, 1936; Kauffman, 1938; Lowry, 1936; Robinson, 1936, 1949). Just as social work was historically influenced, so too supervision absorbed scientific and medical notions of predictable truth, expert authority, and internalized pathology through Freudian psychoanalytic thought and/or the psychology of Otto Rank (later known as functional social casework) (Austin, 1952/1979; Hutchinson, 1935/1979; Robinson, 1936; Zetzel, 1953/1979). Psychoanalytic ideas encouraged the development of confidential, one-on-one supervisory relationships (Grauel, 2002). As such, the supervisor "in a quasi-parental position" (Hollis, 1936, p.167) was responsible "for the worker's growth" (Hutchinson, 1935/1979, p. 37) and the contribution of "knowledge and expertness which the worker [did] not have" (Lowry, 1936, p.113). Using psychodynamic metaphors, Elizabeth Zetzel

(1953/1979) documented how power and knowledge were disseminated from supervisor

to caseworker:

> Just as the wise parent or teacher, who provides a framework of security and
>
> affection, must recognize when a child's anxiety becomes excessive or
>
> pathological, so must the wise supervisor provide a similar framework and also
>
> recognize anxieties or other pathological reactions. (p. 45)

By the late 1950s, the teaching and supportive elements of supervision were

joined by the tasks of administration (Scherz, 1958/1979; Stiles, 1963/1979). Supervisors

were expected to use a combination of concepts and methods of social work, along with

ideas and practices from public and business administration (Wolfe, 1958). The focus on

administration became quickly entrenched and reinforced the supervisor's alignment with

the bureaucracy of agency life (Levy, 1973; Wasserman, 1971/1979). In such a position

of power, the supervisor easily became judge, critic, and controller (Hawthorne,

1975/1979; Wasserman, 1971/1979). Levy (1973) pointed out that "the supervisor's

stance of possessing superior knowledge –whether his knowledge is actual or the

supervisee merely believes it is – becomes a 'manipulative controlling device'" (p. 17).

Wasserman (1971/1979) has highlighted how new social workers perceived that social

work supervisors were unwilling to advocate for either workers or clients about critical

issues, and that supervisors did little to represent or encourage social work knowledge,

principles, or skills. Thus by the late 1970s, much of social work supervision appeared to

be a mechanism for system maintenance and conformity with few if any regulations of

restraint (Levy, 1973).

In spite of administrative dominance, pockets of resistance began to percolate as early as the 1950s. Scherz (1958/1979), Wax (1963/1979) and Wolfe (1958) documented objections that the agency supervisor had too much authority and power that silenced the knowledge and skill of the social worker. Charles Levy (1973) single-handedly appealed to the social work community that the many avenues of supervisory power pointed to the need for a supervisor code of ethics. Ben-Zion Cohen (1987) subsequently reinforced the idea that the responsibilities of supervisors are first to the principles of social work and then to the agency.

Supervisor Authority and Power: Through Knowledge or Position or Both?

The 1980s marked a transition time in the social work supervision literature and subsequent practice. Up to this point, articles had been scattered amongst different journals and conference proceedings. Then the book publication in 1976 of Alfred Kadushin's *Supervision in Social Work*, and its subsequent editions (Kadushin, 1985, 1992b; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002), consolidated knowledge that would significantly shape social work supervision into the 21st century (Bruce & Austin, 2000). In addition, the three editions of the supervision text by Carlton Munson (1983b, 1993, 2002) have been influential.

During the 1980s, there were other textbook publications (Austin, 1981; Bunker & Wijnberg, 1988; Holloway & Brager, 1989; Middleman & Rhodes, 1985) that, although associated with social work, shared a primary focus on the managerial role of supervision in human services organizations that could be applied to various disciplines. A decade later, following the initial publications of Kadushin and Munson, Lawrence Shulman (1993) would become the third name that has remained associated with social

work supervision. Even though Shulman developed an alternative interactional approach, his understanding of supervision was predicated on the definition of supervision developed by Kadushin.

The profound influence of the definition of supervision initially coined by Kadushin has been repeatedly acknowledged in subsequent publications on social work supervision (for example, Brown & Bourne, 1996; Bruce & Austin, 2000; Cohen, 1999; Cooper, 2001, 2002; Erera & Lazar, 1993, 1994; Hensley, 2002; Itzhaky & Hertzanu-Laty, 1999; Jones, 2004; Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999; Kutzik, 1977; O'Donoghue, 2003; Payne, 1994; Tsui, 1997b, 2005b; Williams, 1997). The tenacity of the 1976 definition is evident in Kadushin's latest edition of his supervision text (italics highlight the only change in this quotation since Kadushin wrote his first text in 1976):

> :a social work supervisor is an agency administrative-staff member to whom authority is delegated to direct, coordinate, enhance, and evaluate the on-the-job performance of the supervisees for whose work he *or she* [italics added] is held accountable. In implementing this responsibility, the supervisor performs administrative, educational, and supportive functions in interaction with the supervisee in the context of a positive relationship. The supervisor's ultimate objective is to deliver to agency clients the best possible service, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in accordance with agency policies and procedures. Supervisors do not directly offer service to the client, but they do indirectly affect the level of services offered through their impact on the direct service supervisees. (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002, p. 23)

As Kadushin and Harkness (2002) further elaborate in their text, this well-referenced 32 year old definition of social work supervision speaks to authority and power through position as well as a unidirectional use of supervisor "expertise and superior skill" (p. 269). This understanding resonates with the psychodynamic tradition of social work supervision (Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004). According to Tosone (1997 and Williams (1997) the supervisor's "superior status, knowledge, and training" (Williams, p. 429) serve to enhance the psychoanalytic concepts of transference/countertransference that are considered a significant part of the parallel process between the supervisory relationship and the relationship between social worker and clients.

In other words, supervisors are encouraged to view themselves as expert knowers and overseers of social workers. As supervision is configured according to these ideas, the supervisor can become the knowledge source for staff, and responsible to focus the supervision content and interaction. The idea that the supervisor has privileged knowledge encourages support for "an old adage…that the role of supervisor is to be symbolically present looking over the shoulder of the practitioner as the intervention occurs" (Munson, 2000, p. 619). In such a relationship, social workers can be discouraged from having accountability and autonomy of their practice (Clulow, 1994; Hurlbert, 1992).

A national USA survey with 885 respondents (Kadushin, 1974, 1992a) provides support that approximately 95% of supervisors identified their practice knowledge and expertise as the principle reason for supervisee to comply with their directives or advice. This perception was also endorsed by participating supervisees (65%), although approximately 20% of supervisees also granted supervisors positional power. In contrast,

the results of a smaller survey by Munson (1981) found that approximately 66% of the 64

participating supervisors identified greater feelings of adequacy because of their

positional power. Even so, in the same study, Munson (1979b, 1980, 1981) found that

63% of the 65 supervisees perceived supervisors' authority to be due to their expertise

and competence. Thus, both survey investigations found that the majority of supervisees

accept that supervisors' authority come from the supervisors' expert knowledge and

skills, whereas there are some supervisees who also grant authority according to position.

Correspondingly, social workers have reportedly sought out supervisors "who are smarter

than we are" (Munson, 1979b, p. 294), since they can consider their own knowledge as

subordinate.

The belief that supervisors have privileged knowledge can influence how

supervisees' ideas and practices are interpreted and named. The texts of Munson (2002)

and Kadushin and Harness (2002) suggest how social work staff can become objectified

through various means of repression and discrimination that can manifest through

pathological descriptors (Foucault, 1969/1972). Munson (2002) has noted that social

workers' reactions to supervision can be positive or problematic. He explained that the

difficulties occur because the interactional styles of the supervisees create obstacles for

their learning in supervision. Needless to say, only the supervisor is able to recognize,

identify, and name the forms of "resistances" that the social worker is manifesting.

Kadushin and Harkness (2002) suggest, that supervisees react to stress during

supervision by trying to actively "psych out" the supervisor. Apparently, the intention of

supervisees is to discover what kinds of behaviour will gain their acceptance or will elicit

disapproval from their supervisors. The translation of social workers' resistance into

psychoanalytic descriptors has actually been achieved by Kadushin. His 2002 text

contains much of the article he wrote in 1968 called *Games People Play in Supervision*.

Kadushin has identified these so-called identifiable and well-established games played by

social workers as "defensive adjustments" to the anxieties and threats of the supervisory

situation (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002, p.226). For example, questioning agency

procedures is being subversive and manipulative, suggesting democratic participation is a

way to lower supervisor expectations, and having an opportunity to share knowledge with

the supervisor is a challenge for power over the supervisor. Furthermore, the supervisory

relationship "becomes infused with transference elements….transforming the supervisor

into a "potential parent surrogate" (p. 230). Thus, elevating supervisors' knowledge and

expertise can shape social workers into the exclusive Object of supervisors, who would

have the right to specify and name what is normal and deviant within the supervision

relationship.

In spite of these possible consequences, the perception of practitioners that

supervisors' authority and power is through their knowledge more so than position is a

persistent thread in the social work supervision literature. On the other hand, the

combination and balance of supervisor expertise and work place position has also been

the focus of sporadic protest since the 1950s.

An Alternative Configuration of Authority and Power

If the authority and power of the supervisor were established according to *position*

through the organizational framework (Cooper, 2002), then an alternative to the

unidirectional expert knowing of traditional power relations is possible. Positional

authority could mean that supervisors do not assume they hold superior knowledge in

relation to social work practitioners, but rather acknowledge their expertise. Moreover, when power is positional, supervisors are free to encourage mutual critique and reflection, as well provide challenges and support for social work supervisees (Barretta-Herman, 1993). When supervisors assume a critically reflective perspective (Darlington, Osmond, & Peile, 2002; Gibbs, 2001; Jones, 2004; Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004; Morrison, 1997; Scott & Farrow, 1993), they can encourage inquiry about and the valuing of the ideas, stories, and narratives that identify individuals and communities. Moreover, there is an understanding that meaning and knowledge are flexible, relational, and co-constructed using multiple viewpoints and different voices (Foucault, 1969/1972; Rorty, 1979). Reflective practices also resonate with individuals and communities who value relationships and the relational creation of knowledge and meaning (Gray, Coates, & Hetherington, 2007). For example, a qualitative exploration of supervisory authority in a Chinese cultural context (Tsui, Ho, & Lam, 2005) found that the supervision discussions of participants were a process of consensus through consultation and agreement, except for administrative matters, which were understood to be given as directives from the positional authority of the supervisor.

Although critical reflectivity has been encouraged by advocates of an anti-oppressive, culturally sensitive, strengths-based social work practice (for example, Baldwin, 2004b; Dewees, 2001; Fook, 1999; Ife, 1999; Laird, 1998; O'Donoghue, 2003; Pease & Fook, 1999; Saleebey, 1990, 1994), the perspective and practice have only been explored intermittently in the social work supervision literature. In the first edition of the Clinical Supervisor journal, Eisikovits and Guttman (1983) identified that an opportunity for critical analysis and reflection was an essential component of their proposed

experiential learning model for supervision. More recently, the role of the supervisor to encourage critically reflective conversations has been echoed by Gibbs (2001). Her qualitative research with rural child welfare workers highlighted the need for learning through reflective practice, where the aim of the supervisor is to invite social workers to think critically about their perceptions and practice. Likewise, the qualitative research of Darlington and colleagues (2002) provides support that child welfare workers can benefit from supervision opportunities to critically reflect about their practice. Such a process deconstructs how practitioners perceive and understand client situations, which helps them make more informed decisions.

Although the term anti-oppressive practice is not a familiar designation in the psychodynamic literature, there appears to be a growing interest in alternatives to a one-down, unidirectional, approach to knowledge and practice (for example, Cait, 2005; Ganzer & Ornstein, 2004; Itzhaky & Hertzanu-Laty, 1999; Ringel, 2001; Walsh, 1999). Instead of "traditional one-person approaches in which power, authority, and knowledge lies with the supervisor" (Ganzer & Ornstein, 2004, p. 432) the intersubjective sharing of knowledge is identified to be co-constructed and the contributions of social workers and clients are valued and affirmed (Cait, 2005; Ganzer & Ornstein, 2004; Ringel, 2001; Walsh, 1999).

A wider vision of a critically reflective supervision process has been proposed that could involve not only supervisors and social workers, but clients, organizational management, and community members who would be valued contributors to knowledge creation and the development of effective practices (Jones, 2004; Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004; O'Donoghue, 2002, 2003). The expansion of participants supports an acceptance of

the complexity and uncertainty of knowledge creation. The expectation would be that local knowledge from participants' personal wisdom and cultural experiences would be valued along side the training, education, and research of social worker supervisors, practitioners and academics (Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004; O'Donoghue, 2002, 2003). Such a configuration of supervision would focus on the development of knowledge and skills to offset the effects of social oppression, so that clients are provided effective, essential services (Brashears, 1995; Brown & Bourne, 1996; Cohen, 1999; O'Donoghue, 2003). Most importantly, an open and ongoing analysis of power and knowledge would be critical to the effective working relationship between organizational members, social work supervisors, and social workers (Fook, 1999; Jones, 2004).

Not surprisingly, a critically reflective configuration of supervision practice is not without resistance (Baldwin, 2004b; Fook, 2004; Jones, 2004). Identified has been the challenge of limited available time and how to balance between learning needs and the administrative expectations for quality control (Fook, 2004; Jones, 2004; Kadushin, 1992c). As well, inviting multiple ideas heralds messy conversational outcomes that can offend bureaucratic sensibilities. More pointedly, the traditional formation of supervision privileges the knowledge and power of the supervisor. The very practice of private one-on-one supervision encourages supervisors to maintain control (Munson, 1979a, 1981).

Although Kadushin's (1974, 1992a) research suggests that supervisors view their authority because of their expertise, Munson's study (1981) suggests that supervisors can identify their authority as due to their organizational position. Nevertheless, the research of Kadushin and Munson (1979b, 1980, 1981) provide evidence that supervisees strongly identify that supervisors have superior knowledge and skill. Thus, a question remains: If

a supervision relationship were to invite the sharing of knowledge, what will that mean to social workers perception of supervisor authority? Will social workers still want supervisors' authority to be based on so-called privileged knowledge or position or both?

<div align="center">Supervision, Social Justice, and Social Change</div>

The International Federation of Social Workers and the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IFSW & IASSW) (2004) document, *Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles*, notes that the promotion of social justice by social workers is "in relation to the people with whom they work" (par.4.2). Provincially, the OCSWSSW (2000) identifies that the scope of practice includes "the provision of professional supervision to a social worker, social work student or other supervisee" (p.1). Together these statements suggest that supervisors, as well as social workers, are expected to "promote the full involvement and participation of people using their services in ways that enable them to be empowered in all aspects of decisions and actions affecting their lives" (IFSW & IASSW, 2004, par. 4.1.2). Social justice and social change are meant to be woven into the supervision relationship and conversations.

<div align="center">*Recognition of Diversity by the Founding Fathers of Supervision*</div>

In their most recent supervision texts, Kadushin and Harkness (2002), Munson (2002), and Shulman (1993) have demonstrated that experiences of cultural diversity, specifically gender, ethnicity, and race, can influence the supervisory relationship. The question, however, is how well do the authors demonstrate a commitment to the integration of social justice with supervision?

In their relatively brief discussion about gender, Kadushin and Harkness (2002) propose that good supervision is "gender-neutral" (p. 305), since "for most supervisory

dyads, gender differences may be of very little or no significance" (p. 307). In fact, the authors suggest, "the most desirable approach to supervision is likely to be androgynous" (p. 304). This means that the supervisor is able to "manifest flexibly and adaptively either masculine traits or feminine traits as the situation requires" (p. 304). However, it seems that for women to successfully manage the hierarchical differences with social work supervisees, they must "transcend" (p. 305) their socialization as women. Notably, there is no similar recommendation for men.

The text section on race by Kadushin and Harkness (2002) is limited to three examples of possible White-African American supervision relationships. The authors acknowledge that "other kinds of interracial interactions" (p. 302) occur but note that the literature is sparse. I am encouraged that Kadushin and Harkness recommend that "a white supervisor supervising an African American worker should consciously make explicit to themselves their attitudes, feelings, prejudices, and bias relative to racial differences. They should clarify for themselves the nature of their own white identities" (p. 297). Nevertheless, Kadushin and Harkness potentially encourage an essentialist perspective (Grillo, 1995) when they suggest that the White supervisor needs to "understand the African American experience" (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002, p. 298).

In spite of their acknowledgement that gender and racial identities can influence the supervision relationship, Kadushin and Harkness state that "successfully working together results in people seeing one another as fellow professionals in a neutral race-ethnicity-gender context" (p. 308). I propose that the authors' minimization of the social and political constructions of gender, race, or any other identifiers used to marginalize

and oppress people unwittingly sanctions the maintenance of White, male, Euro-Western

privilege.

Munson (2002) proposes that during supervision conversations, supervisors can

encourage an "understanding of larger societal issues" (p. 466). Specifically, his

discussion of gender relations is notably detailed and includes a proposed "partnership

model of feminist supervision" (p. 463) (see also Munson, 1979c, 1997, and Hipp &

Munson, 1995). Social work supervision from a partnership perspective emphasizes

caring, support, knowledge sharing and discussions about contextual issues.

Alternatively, the "prevailing philosophy of the dominator [or authority] model is product

oriented" (Munson, 2002, p. 468). Munson (2002) acknowledges that a partnership model

informed by a feminist perspective is "more compatible with the values and goals of the

psychotherapy professions [including social work] than the dominator model" (p. 469).

However, he appears to acquiesce that the authority model dominates social work

supervision and suggests that at times "avoidance of feminist issues is preferable" (p.

456) in order to avoid supervisory conflict.

Similar to his presentation on gender relations, Munson's (2002) discussion about

"culturally sensitive practice" (p. 414) also provides a mix of ideas. On the one hand,

Munson acknowledges that during "assessment and diagnosis of clients from different

cultural and ethnic backgrounds" (p. 416) the supervisor and social worker need to be

open and nondefensive about their own cultural identity and possible bias, and be aware

of research on cultural differences. Moreover, supervisors "should be alert to uniqueness,

diversity, and difference in clients, practitioners, and themselves as supervisors" (p. 415).

On the other hand, these insightful comments appear overshadowed by the endorsement

of an assessment template used by social workers for the "systematic evaluation of cultural factors that may influence a person's functioning" (p. 417). To illustrate, Munson provides an assessment and cultural formulation of a young Mexican woman who recently immigrated with her husband and children to the United States (see p. 418-420). Throughout the narrative there appears to be no consideration of the potential marginalization that can be experienced by "racialized immigrant women" (Javed, 1995, p. 13) due to structural inequities of gender, language, race, and ethnicity. Moreover, lack of any specific guidance for supervisors suggests agreement with the apparent expert position taken by the social worker during the diagnostic evaluation. Thus, Munson seems to challenge as well as condone the assumptions of medical and psychiatric diagnoses and their oppressive potential.

Shulman's (1993) interactional practice theory of supervision assumes an isomorphic process with social work practice. Throughout his text, Shulman consistently supports an ecological awareness and a flexible, collaborative relationship between supervisor and social worker. Sexism and racism are addressed in a brief section titled, "Affirmative Action in Promotion and Hiring: Issues for the Supervisor." In addition, later in the book there is an example of an agency challenged by a "conspiracy of silence" (p. 268) concerning racial beliefs and practices. Notably, Shulman makes a perceptive statement that White practitioners and supervisors are influenced by "the deeply hidden racism, or sexism, or homophobia that all of us in the majority populations [carry] with us" (p. 268). Although I am encouraged by Shulman's insights, these and similar comments appear specific to supervisor dilemmas with staff rather than presented as important social justice principles that need to be integrated into supervision knowledge

and practice. Unlike his 1992 practice text, Shulman's analysis of supervisory issues does not appear to acknowledge the depth and breadth of marginalization and oppression that is in the very fabric of institutional structures and social relationships.

In sum, the texts of the "fathers" of social work supervision offer little to inform or encourage supervisors "to pursue goals of social justice as an integral part of supervision and enact just processes to allow this commitment to be fulfilled" (Cooper, 2002, p. 185). This absence is actually an example of how dominant discourse can influence knowledge production. Each text was initially developed from studies undertaken by their respective authors during the 1970s and 1980s (Kadushin, 1974, 1992a, 1992b; Munson 1979b, 1979c, 1980, 1981; Shulman, Robinson & Luckyj, 1981). In general, these research projects responded to interests of social workers at the time, focusing on the functions of supervision, the use of structural, authority and teaching models, and the interactional skills and processes of supervision. Although ideas about diverse relationships were included in their texts, the knowledge was filtered through the lens of the dominant perspective. Thus, for social work supervision to honour the social justice tradition of the discipline, there needs to be alternatives to the underlying empiricist notions of knowledge and reality (Baldwin, 2004b). As Saleebey (1990) has stated so pointedly, "we must spit out the positivist bit, and continue to search for a more thorough-going and humane inquiry" (p. 34).

Alternative Pursuits of Social Justice and Social Change

Somewhat parallel to the practice literature, a small but growing number of international publications are beginning to explore alternative conceptualizations of social work supervision that affirm and encourage the social work mission for social

justice and social change (for example, Brashears, 1995; Brown & Bourne, 1996; Cooper, 2001, 2002; Ganzer & Ornstein, 2004; O'Donoghue, 2003; Tsui, 2005b; White, 1997). Recent reviews of the post-degree social work supervision literature and research (Bruce & Austin, 2000; Gibelman & Schervish, 1997; Tsui, 1997a, 2004, 2005b) have indicated that culture has become a relevant factor in supervision. Emily Bruce and Michael Austin (2000) identify that supervisory practice in the future needs to adequately address the cultural diversity of supervisees and clients. Alternatively, Ming-sum Tsui and Wui-shing Ho (1997) argue for a comprehensive model of social work supervision that incorporates culture as the primary context for supervision.

As an example, valuing local, community based narratives is evident in the documented presentation on supervision for Pacific people by Mary Autagavaia (2001), a self-proclaimed Samoan-born woman "from the village of Siumu, the centre of the universe" (p. 45). Her research provides evidence that Pacific Islands' cultural ideas and beliefs, such as spirituality, kinship, and interdependence, significantly shape the purpose and meaning of supervision for social work supervisors and social work supervisees. In contrast to the "Anglo-American values of secularism, individuality, independence and consumer rights" (p. 46), Autagavaia suggests a supervision process that weaves together culture, person, and profession. Autagavaia has identified that a particularly significant quality of Pacific Islands supervisory conversations is dialogue with humility that means "no one knows everything, but no one know nothing either" (p. 51). Thus, preferred knowledge is a construction of multi-stories generated between social work supervisor and social work supervisee.

The research of Haya Itzhaky and Vered Rudich (2003/2004) and Ming-Sum Tsui (2003) highlight how the intersection of ethnicity, faith, race, and geographical location socially construct a unique cultural context for the supervisory relationship. Itzhaky and Rudich (2003/2004) investigated the practice of social work supervision in their country of Israel. Specifically they were interested in the cross-cultural relationship between Israeli-born social work supervisors, who appeared to have assimilated the dominant Western worldview emphasizing the future and innovative, technological knowledge, and Ethiopian-born social work supervisees who seemed to value metaphor, extended family, and viewed the world through a lens on the past. The researchers concluded that it was the responsibility of supervisors to explore differences and local understandings of knowledge and values in order to have effective supervision relationships.

Tsui's (2003) research highlighted how spiritual and ethnic assumptions weave into the Chinese supervisory relationship. One of the conclusions of his qualitative study pointed out that the supervisor's conceptualizations of the supervision relationship need to include the multiple layers of culture that inform and shape the supervisory conversation. In his study, culture included the organizational setting, the participants understanding of social work relationship, and the values held by the Chinese participants. Tsui identified that the supervisor's openness, curiosity, and willingness to explore with supervisees the various facets of culture was essential for effective social work practice. As Jayaratne and colleagues (1992) have pointed out, supervisors are in the position of responsibility to uncover beliefs and assumptions that can silently erode the supervision relationship, and consequently, can have deleterious effects on the practitioner-client relationship.

The acknowledgement of privilege and power in relation to social justice has also been explored in the supervision relationship by self-identified White persons living on opposite sides of the world. From the United Kingdom, Allan Brown and Iain Bourne (1996) are "white, middle-class males" (p.38) who integrate and advocate throughout their social work supervision text the value "that in supervision – as throughout social work and community care practice – all participants need to work actively to counteract the destructive effects of social oppression" (p.14). In order to develop an anti-oppressive perspective, supervisors are expected to strive for authenticity, which means actively working towards the internalization and integration of feelings, understanding, behaviour, and attitude about self and others. Brown and Bourne use race and gender to deconstruct the "social-structural" power differences in the supervisory relationship. Not only do they consider cross-gender and cross-racial combinations but they introduce how a same sex White supervisor and White supervisee can – quite unknowingly – develop and/or encourage racial collusion. Brown and Bourne recommend that supervisors begin every supervision relationship genuinely demonstrating "their own awareness of different oppressions and discrimination" (p.59) as a means to encourage transparency in the supervisory relationship.

As a final example, Kieran O'Donoghue (2003), a Pakeha (White) man from New Zealand, has undertaken in his published text to re-story social work supervision from within the Aotearoa New Zealand social and cultural context. O'Donoghue used a social constructionist perspective to effectively argue how Euro-North American colonial knowledge and practices have influenced social work and social work supervision into a means of reinforcing dominance and compliance, particularly of the Maori people and

other Polynesian cultures. The ways of domination include the hegemonic practices of

economic capitalism, the technological tools of surveillance, the politics of wealth and

military power, the socio-cultural influence of globalization, and the ecological voice of

environmental compromise and demise. In response to these dominant discourses,

O'Donoghue has proposed a conceptual framework for social work supervision that

advocates for social, political, economic, and ecological justice through the examination

and deconstruction of the multiple supervision stories.

Power & Knowledge, Social Justice and Change: Questions for Ontario

Conventional knowledge has been challenged. Nevertheless, have these

alternative ideas about power relations and the pursuit of social justice filtered through to

Ontario social work supervision practices? And, if so, what aspects, if any, of traditional

and alternative conceptualizations will be identified by research participants as needs for

effective social work supervision?

Considering the Purposes of Supervision

Supervision has long been valued as a relational forum where social workers can

experience support, learn and enhance knowledge, practice skills, and develop

professional values, so that they may provide effective client services (Berger & Mizrahi,

2001; Bibus, 1993; Bogo & McKnight, 2005; Eisikovits et al., 1985; Erera & Lazar,

1993, 1994; Fukuyama, 1998; Garrett & Barretta-Herman, 1995; Harkness, 1997;

Hensley, 2002; Jeffreys, 2001; Kadushin, 1974, 1992a; Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004;

Laufer, 2003; Strong et al., 2003; Tsui, 2005a). However, as Middleman and Rhodes

(1985) have pointed out, while the supervision literature continues to extol the benefits of

supervision, "there is a gap between this and the realities of today's service delivery world" (p. 27).

Since the 1950s, supervision has been caught between the practice focus of social workers and the needs of the organization (Jones, 2004). Research has shown that knowledge and skill development, combined with organizational/administrative tasks, creates unsatisfactory and potentially damaging consequences for supervisors and social workers (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Erera & Lazar, 1994; Fukuyama, 1998; Gibbs, 2001; Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998; Jeffreys, 2001; Kadushin, 1992a; Ko, 1987; Laufer, 2003; Melichercik, 1984; Poertner & Rapp, 1983; Schroffel, 1999; Shulman et al., 1981; York & Denton, 1990).

For example, Erera and Lazar (1994) surveyed nearly all social work supervisors in Israel to discover the compatibility of the educational and administrative functions of supervision. Their results demonstrated that increased administration tasks, combined with practice development responsibilities, generated role conflict, ambiguity, and potentially divided loyalties for supervisors. The researchers concluded that the administrative and educative functions are incompatible. Similarly, Itzhaky and Aviad-Hiebloom (1998) identified that the more supervision time spent on administrative functions the more social work supervisees experienced role ambiguity and role conflict, and consequently, more severe burnout.

For supervisors and supervisees, the co-existence of different agendas can create other divergent demands. For example, supervisors and supervisees can become caught between upholding the principle of social work to challenge "unjust policies and practices" (IFSW & IASSW, 2004, Section 4.2.4) or choosing to adhere to agency

demands that preclude advocacy or political participation. Supervisors can be expected to use any information from supervision conversations for performance appraisals that influence potential job security or dismissal. For the social worker the presence of the evaluative agenda based on organizational criteria can encourage fear and reluctance to disclose difficulties that could lead to questions about competence, and/or ideas about practice that conflict with organizational protocols (Rossiter et al., 1996; Walsh-Bowers et al., 1996). As Levy (1973) has noted, a supervisor's administrative responsibilities can be used to maintain "behavioral control over.... the relative powerlessness of supervisees who [find] themselves haunted and victimized by written judgements [i.e., evaluations]" (p. 18).

In spite of the concerns surrounding an administrative purpose, supervision focused on task performance and compliance to organizational expectations has been squeezing out the educational and supportive aspects of supervision (Jones, 2004). As long as administrative functions overshadow knowledge and skill development, supervision becomes "a monitoring mechanism for administrative accountability" (Tsui, 1997b, p. 197) and quality assurance (Gibelman & Schervish, 1997). The ongoing emphasis given to administrative and/or managerial responsibilities promotes "hierarchical, competitive, power-based relationships" (Brashears, 1995, p. 695), which discounts the knowledge of the social worker and ignores the larger socio-cultural, political contexts integral to social work practice.

The consequences for social work practice are reportedly quite concerning. For example, Baldwin (2004a) points out that the less time available in supervision to reflect on social work ethics and values, the greater likelihood that social workers will have little

opportunity to deliberate and wonder about their practice. The potentially significant influence of supervision conversations was supported by the findings of Rossiter and colleagues (1996). They discovered that for social workers at a general family counselling agency in southern Ontario, supervision was the only organized forum to talk about ethical issues. The survey research of Miller and Robb (1997) also found that social work supervisors were in a position to influence the theoretical orientation and values of social workers. The survey research of Landau (1999) and Millstein (2000) also demonstrated that supervision, not the social work code of ethics, was the primary source for ethical decision-making for social workers. The value of supervision as a needed setting for ethical conversations was also finding through a national quantitative study of social workers in New Zealand (O'Donoghue, Munford, & Trlin, 2005). The results of these studies suggest that reduction in supervision sessions, fears of negative performance evaluations, and administrative demands can result in ethically questionable and ineffective services (Baldwin, 2004b).

In summary, the dichotomous purposes of traditionally applied social work supervision do not appear to be easily reconciled. The dominant expectation of organizations is that administrative functions are the responsibility of the social work supervisor but the cost too often is the loss of valued professional/practice development, as well as role ambiguity and role conflict.

Alternatives for the Dichotomous Purposes of Supervision

One suggestion to help social work supervision focus on practice development but still have the administrative agenda met has been repeatedly made but seldom applied. As an alternative to the dichotomous supervision agenda, over 50 years ago Austin (1956)

initially proposed that supervisors keep the teaching responsibilities and assign the administrative tasks to another person in agency management. At the time, the proposal was refuted (Wolfe, 1958) but the idea has continued to receive ongoing support (Cohen, 1987, 1999; Erera & Lazar, 1994; Harkness, 1997; Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998; Landau, 1999; Munson, 1979a; O'Donoghue, 2001; Payne, 1994, 1996).

A qualitative evaluation of three social service settings in England provides provocative evidence of the potential challenges involved with separating supervision purposes between two people (Syrett, Jones, & Sercombe, 1996). The Devon County Department of Health created the position of practice supervisor for each of the 12 county agencies. The intent was that the practice supervisor, who was responsible for all clinical supervision and practice development, would work alongside the agency team manager who took care of administrative tasks. This was considered a unique response to encroaching managerialism and thus worthy of investigation.

Syrett and colleagues (1996) discovered that the success of the practice position was compromised by important systemic factors. In comparison to the team manager, the practice supervisor received less salary and limited authority; as well, the loss of previous contact with other agency practice supervisors was an obstacle to the successful integration of the position. The researchers proposed that the success of dual positions relies on equal positional power and organizational support, for without these measures in place the position can appear as nothing more than a move to placate staff, while control and power continues to remain focused on operational concerns. Even so, Syrett and colleagues were encouraged by the potential of a practice or clinical focused supervisory position.

Another configuration suggests that supervision for knowledge and skill development be provided by external social work supervisors (Cooper, 2001; Hirst & Lynch, 2005; Morrell, 2001). Such an arrangement has unique challenges such as confidentiality issues and the need to be clear about relational responsibilities. Even so, Hirst and Lynch (2005) argue that external supervision can be beneficial for social workers, clients, and the organization's effectiveness.

Considering the Length of Supervision during a Social Worker's Career

Intimately connected to purpose is the expected duration that supervision will continue over a social worker's career. Beginning in the 1950s, a tension surfaced and has persisted about how long supervision should last (Scherz, 1958/1979; Stiles, 1963/1979; Wax, 1963/1979; Wolfe, 1958). On the one hand, there remains the enduring belief that the educative and supportive purposes of supervision are needed throughout the career of the social worker for the development and safeguarding of effective, skilled practitioners (Barretta-Herman, 1993, 2001; Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Brashears, 1995; Bruce & Austin, 2000; Cohen & Laufer, 1999; Engel, 1939; Hensley, 2002; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999; Landau, 1999; Laufer, 2003; Munson, 2002; Ross, 1992; Schroffel, 1999; Spence et al., 2001; Thomlison, 1999). Alternatively, there is the opinion that on-going supervision for the purpose of knowledge and skill development may be interpreted to mean that, throughout their careers, social workers need someone else to be accountable for their work with clients (Austin, 1961; Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Epstein, 1973; Kutzik, 1977; Mandell, 1973; Munson, 1976/1979e; Pathak, 1975; Shulman 1993; Stiles, 1963/1979; Veeder, 1990; Wax, 1963/1979).

Finally, there is the position that administrative supervision is needed for the duration of employment with social services organizations (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kutzik, 1977). Although this purpose for supervision is most disliked by social workers, it has become what most social workers receive during their years of employment (Jones, 2004). Thus, if supervision focused on the knowledge, skills, and support of social workers, is to have a place in the contemporary organizational life of Ontario social workers, then it is important to consider how long the clinical and supportive aspect of supervision can be beneficial.

The duration of supervision for the purpose of knowledge and skill enhancement reflects a broader debate about authority, power, and privileged knowledge (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 1976/1979e; Pathak, 1975). If the authority and power of the supervisor is granted because of the dominant belief in the supervisor's *expert knowledge* as well as position, then supervision could be on going until the social worker learns and integrates that knowledge to the satisfaction of the supervisor. For supervisors, the privileging of their knowledge is a tempting motivator to find ways to advocate for interminable supervision.

For social worker supervisees, the consequences of on-going supervision that maintains a traditional hierarchical teaching and supportive purpose can be significant. First, if the so-called expertise of the supervisor is privileged, then the ideas of the social worker could be particularly vulnerable to marginalization. Even so, as social workers can gain experience and confidence in their own knowledge, they could challenge or reject the knowledge of the supervisor (Laufer, 2003). A concern, however, would be the potential effect on their employment or professional status. Munson (1976/1979e) has

noted that innovative actions or clinical disagreements by experienced social workers can be "judged as resistance, hostility, a problem with authority, lack of maturity, overly aggressive behavior, or whatever fits for the supervisor's style" (p. 229).

Second, on-going supervision can reinforce the belief that the knowledge and skills of organizational social workers need continual assistance, support and monitoring (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001). Ekstein and Wallerstein (1958) observed that other helping professionals viewed social workers as "being unduly and even permanently dependent on their supervisors" (p. 74). This concern has been echoed by Mandell (1973) and Kutzik (1977), whereas Veeder (1990) also highlighted that on-going, close supervision discourages professional accountability and creativity.

In sum, career-long supervision that maintains a traditional hierarchical teaching and supportive purpose can discourage innovation, professional confidence and responsibility on the part of the social worker while reinforcing a position of subordination (Kutzik, 1977; Mandell, 1973). As Wax (1963/1979) pointedly stated, "if the profession wants to keep its professionals, it must treat them as professionals. Lifelong supervision is a vestige of the subprofessional past" (p. 120).

Alternatively, if the supervisor's authority is understood to be granted by *position*, then knowledge can more freely be a shared discovery through reflective, co-creative dialog. This stance means that supervisors question the existence of expert knowledge and seek out alternative views through collaborative conversation with supervisees. According to Fine and Turner (1997) "taking a 'critical' or power analytic position with respect to knowledge increases the choice of those in less powerful positions by making the politics transparent" (p. 231). This configuration of supervisory power still

acknowledges that positional responsibilities exist for the supervisor. For example, to (1) be mindful that the social worker gathers knowledge and skills needed for effective client services, within a particular organizational culture, and the larger ever shifting socio-political landscape; and (2) be supportive, and if necessary provide directives, during those times when ethical or safety issues appear to mean that social work becomes a deliberate act of social control (for example, calling police when a client is armed and is threatening to hurt someone).

From this perspective of supervisor authority and power by position, Angeline Barretta-Herman (1993, 2001) advocates for on-going supervision, because the relationship, unlike consultation, "offers a unique and, hence, irreplaceable contribution to the continued growth and development of a practitioner" (2001 p. 2). According to Barretta-Herman (2001)

Supervisors have the obligation to contextualize the practice of their supervisees as part of the mandate of the social work profession to link the personal and the political. It is their responsibility to challenge their supervisees to consider the policy implications of their work and to support supervisee's social action initiatives. Consultants do not necessarily operate under such a mandate. (p. 6)

Barretta-Herman's (1993, 2001) argument concludes that on-going supervision provides all social workers, no matter how many years of practise, an intense, transformative learning experience that is essential for the continued provision of effective services to clients.

Research findings suggest that experienced social workers want supervision to continue. To discover the experience of supervision for veteran social workers, Laufer

(2003) surveyed 269 social workers, who averaged 10 years of experience at their current work setting (that included welfare, corrections, health, and academic work settings). The results indicated a low interest in administrative supervision, but a continued desire for supervision that was supportive and provided opportunities for knowledge and skill refinement. In order to facilitate the knowledge and skill enrichment of experienced social workers, Laufer pointed out that supervision ought to be modified to accommodate the developmental changes throughout the social workers' career. Given her findings, Laufer suggested that a co-creative process to determine supervision needs was relevant for experienced practitioners. This conclusion echoed the recommendation of Greenspan, Hanfling, Parker, Primm, and Waldfogel (1991), who discovered through their questionnaire that supervision was more beneficial for experienced social workers when it was provided at their request. Both studies strongly endorsed that supervision for experienced workers requires advanced supervisory skills of the supervisor.

It is notable that supporters of career-long supervision appear to find ways to try to soften or blur the positional power imbalance and associated expectations inherent in the relationship (Kutzik, 1997). For example, the suggestion of providing supervision by request, when in fact, that is an option reserved for consultation. Terms to describe the relationship, such as supervision-consultation, peer supervision, mentoring supervision, or using the terms supervision and consultation interchangeably (Barretta-Herman, 2001; Shulman, 1993; White, 1997) minimize and mask the authorative responsibilities unique to the supervisor (Behan, 2003). Even if the power difference in the relationship is clearly understood and consistently approached as a consequence of position not knowledge, the authority of the supervisor remains. When the titles, and/or descriptors, and/or process of

supervision attempt to ignore the authorative power of the supervisor and embrace the more egalitarian characteristics of consultation, then the lack of clarity about role responsibilities can extend to the relationship, creating uncertainty, distrust, and frustration for participants.

Alternatives to On-Going Career Supervision

For advocates who see interminable educative and supportive supervision as a threat to a social worker's competency, the expectation is for a time-limited period of supervision that would give social workers sufficient experience to make well-informed choices about the well-being and safety of their clients. Furthermore, a designated time period or a specified number of supervision hours can be a deterrent to continual supervision that relies on the satisfaction of the supervisor. Of course, determining when "competent" and "sufficient experience" occurs is an integral part of current debates internationally and in Ontario about the substance of social work competencies and how to best achieve them (Clark, 1995; Gambrill, 2001; Hugman, 1996). Moreover, there is no research evidence that suggests what the most effective time period is for supervision in order to most benefit the knowledge and skill development of social workers. Nevertheless, the need for some designated period of social work supervision for new graduates or inexperienced practitioners has been supported by social workers (Hensley, 2002; Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kutzik, 1977; Lloyd et al., 2002; Middleman & Rhodes, 1995; Munson, 2000, 2002; Pilcher, 1984).

The idea of a set number of hours of supervision, often over a minimum number of months or years, has become recommended or has become a licensing requirement for various social work regulatory bodies and associations. In Canada, Alberta (1,500 hours

of supervised practice) (ACSW, 2007b) and Nova Scotia (2-3 years depending on the

university degree) (NSASW, n.d.) are the only two provinces that have established a

duration period for supervision for social work registration. The regulatory body of

Newfoundland and Labrador (NLASW, 2003) has developed a standard that new

graduates have regularly scheduled supervision for their first year of clinical social work

practice. Alberta has also identified that registered social workers applying to be listed on

the optional Clinical Social Work Registry must complete a minimum of 100 hours of

supervision by a College approved supervisor (ACSW, 2006). Similarly, the Board of

Registration for Social Workers in British Columbia (2004) has established a voluntary

registration category for clinical social work. As part of the requirements, social workers

must complete a minimum of 3000 hours of supervised practice (BRSWBC, 2005a).

Internationally, supervision criteria have also been established. All 50 states and

the District of Columbia of the United States have time-limited supervision requirements

for advanced generalist and clinical social work practice (Association of Social Work

Boards, 2000-2008). The Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (1998)

has decided that supervision is required for the first five years of practice for all

association members. The Australian Association of Social Workers (2000) has identified

that social workers with "less than three years full-time experience" (p. 4) (considered

new graduates) have a "particularly high need for supervision in order to: consolidate the

knowledge and skills attained in their social work course [and] successfully manage the

stress related to assuming the responsibilities of a social work position" (p. 4). Therefore,

members are expected to participate in the equivalent of one hour of supervision per

week. After three years of full-time experience social workers "should have the equivalent of fortnightly individual supervision of at least one uninterrupted hour" (p. 5).

A minimal duration of supervision endorsed by social work colleges and associations around the world confirms the belief that supervision for new graduates is a valued element for professional and practice development as well as organizational orientation and learning. This criterion is particularly important, given that practice content has decreased in university social work programs (Munson, 2002).

For experienced workers who want to continue to have effective conversations that will further professional development and maximize service for clients (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Cohen & Laufer, 1999; Hensley, 2002; Landau, 1999; Laufer, 2003; Schroffel, 1999; Tsui, 2005b), there can be other options rather than supervision. For these social workers the option of individual or group consultation with peers only or with an invited consultant could be a viable alternative to ongoing supervision (Grauel, 2002; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kutzik, 1977; Munson, 1979b, 1979c). Importantly, in such a relationship all decisions are the responsibility of each participant since no one person has designated expert or positional power over others.

Considering the Training of Supervisors and Their Professional Affiliation

Supervision Training: Benefits and Opportunities

In comparison to other recognized areas of social work, the learning and development opportunities from universities or professional associations has been profoundly limited for supervisors (Tsui, 2005b). Even so, repeated recommendations have been made that supervision training is necessary to provide effective services (Austin, 1952/1979; Cearley, 2004; Erera & Lazar, 1993; Gibbs, 2001; Granvold, 1977,

1978; Gray, 1990; Hensley, 2002; Himle, Jayaratne, & Thyness, 1989; Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999; Kavanagh et al., 2003; Matheson, 1999; Munson, 1983a, 2000, 2002; Nathanson, 1992; Nelson, 2000; Pilcher, 1984; Robinson, 1936; Rodway, 1991; Rushton & Nathan, 1996; Scott & Farrow, 1993; Spence et al., 2001; Strong et al., 2003; Tuttle, 2000).

The qualitative research of Strong and colleagues (2003) identified that training was an important feature of supervision for social workers and allied helping professionals. Research participants were very clear that having experience as a practitioner was not adequate for supervisors. To date, however, the content and responsibility of training for social work supervisors remains unresolved. As a result, there appears to be few training protocols for social work supervisors anywhere in the world (Brown & Bourne, 1996; Bruce & Austin, 2000; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 2000, 2002). When social workers become supervisors, the knowledge that most often informs supervisory practice comes from their previous experiences as supervisees and their experiences working with clients (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002). For social workers who identify that more or different knowledge could be needed, there are very limited resources available. The most easily accessible source of learning is the supervision literature that presents a variety of models and training protocols (for example, the texts of Brown & Bourne, 1996; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 2002; O'Donoghue, 2003; Shulman, 1993), particularly since training workshops or conferences are rare.

There have been, however, approaches to supervision training that provide points for consideration. Israel has come closest to establishing countrywide training

expectations for supervisors. According to Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom (1998), the supervision of newly hired as well as experienced post-degree social workers is a national expectation. As of the early 1990s, Erera and Lazar's (1993, 1994) research identified that supervisors or "team leaders" of social service departments had to complete a mandatory two-year training program that included courses in supervision and administration. On the other hand, education appeared optional for supervisors in mental health settings, although the vast majority had participated in some form of supervision training.

Social workers in other countries have tried a variety of ways to address training. The Aotearoa New Zealand Policy Statement on Supervision (ANZASW, 1998) states that supervisors are expected to have supervision training. Aotearoa New Zealand university social work departments (for example, Massey University and the University of Auckland) offer yearly graduate and postgraduate courses, as well as certificates and diplomas in supervision (O'Donoghue, 2003). The Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW, 2000) national practice standards for supervision include the need for post-degree training. Such training is possible through Australian university courses and certificate programs such as the University of Sydney's (2008), *Graduate Certificate in Professional Practice Supervision*, offered through the Faculty of Education and Social Work.

In the United States, very few social work supervisors have ever had education or training opportunities specific to supervision (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999; Munson, 2002; Shulman, 1993) even though supervision is an expected requirement for advanced and specialty licensure (Association of Social Work

Boards, 2000-2008). Throughout the country there continues to be only limited training

opportunities for supervisors. Some state chapters of the NASW and occasionally

universities offer courses on supervision. As well, the Supervision Institute of the

University of St. Thomas/College of St. Catherine (Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999)

provides a generic post-masters level training course for potential or current supervisors

of social service practitioners. The American Board of Examiners in Clinical Social

Work (2004) has published a position statement about the supervision of clinical social

work practice. As part of their recommendations, the paper has stated that graduate

schools and the social work profession need to endorse the development and

implementation of national supervision training, particularly "since it has always been

expected that new graduates would learn most of their practice skills and much of their

knowledge while in supervised practice" (p. 18).

Research is beginning to demonstrate that a lack of supervisor training is

associated with the absence of desirable educative and supportive supervision. As part of

a larger project to help reform New York City's complex child welfare system known as

the Administration for Children's Services (ACS), an advisory panel was set up to

investigate and make recommendations. As author of the advisory report on practice and

supervision, Douglas Nelson (2000) identified that supervision "too often focused on task

management and ensuring compliance with regulatory or contractual mandates, to the

exclusion of coaching, developing, and supporting a largely young and inexperienced

workforce" (p. 7). The panel concluded that the wide range of supervisory skill and the

inconsistent practice of supervision were due to the lack of available training provided by

the ACS. Consequently, during the course of the investigation, the ACS implemented the

first training program for supervisors in its history. At the time the report was completed, more than 1,900 supervisors and managers had completed a ten-week in-service that included such topics as providing positive feedback, delegating, and evaluating staff. Nelson cautions however, that although this "is a very important first step, [it] needs to be expanded and enhanced, to include training that will help supervisors take up their multiple leadership roles, deepen their own child welfare knowledge, and coach staff on practice skills" (p. 26).

A number of states now provide mandatory standardized management training for newly hired child welfare supervisors (Preston, 2004). However, contrary to the cautions raised by the New York's Advisory Panel (Nelson, 2000), the focus of training is often for the enhancement of organizational performance, a valued quality in the current climate of managerialism and privatization. Excluded, however, are knowledge and skills that consider the complexities of social contexts or structural inequities, which are values common to social work practice (Perry, 2006; Preston, 2004; Strand & Badger, 2005). Moreover, Preston points out that a lack of sensitivity and awareness for larger system influences, such as poverty, unemployment, and racism, could inhibit service effectiveness. Alternatives, however, are possible, such as the three-year consultation project developed and evaluated by Strand and Badger (2005). They describe how the opportunity for child welfare supervisors to consult with social work faculty appeared to be a successful endeavour that informed classroom teaching and encouraged the development of social work knowledge and skills.

In Canada, the recognition of training needs for supervision has been noted by one research publication (Rodway, 1991) and one social work College. In Alberta, the

College requires that applicants for their Approved Clinical Social Work Supervisor designation (ACSW, 2007a) complete "at least one course/training in social work supervision (with some focus on clinical supervision)" (p.1). Getting the training, however, is quite a challenge. In Canada, social work supervision courses are occasionally offered as electives through university social work departments, or through continuing education programs (see Chapter One, pages 17-18). As well, training-workshops on social work supervision have been offered in Alberta through the ACSW yearly conference. More generic workshops for human services professionals can be offered through training organizations such as Leading Edge Seminars, Inc, and the Hincks-Dellcrest Centre, both of which are based in Toronto.

The Professional Affiliation of the Supervisor

Along with training is the question of how important is the professional affiliation of the supervisor. As social work departments and supervisor positions are eliminated, there are growing reports that supervision of social workers is being co-opted by other professions (Wuenschel, 2006). For example, in hospital settings it is becoming commonplace for nurse administrators to be the supervisors of social workers (Berger & Mizrahi, 2001; Strong et al., 2003). Similarly, the field of child welfare, historically the domain of social work, has become a work place where supervisors can be from a variety of disciplines. Perry's (2006) research actually determined that the educational background of supervisors did not make a significant difference on performance evaluations. Importantly, these evaluations only addressed measures of organizational productivity and efficiency and did not assess knowledge or skills pertinent to child welfare families and practices common to social work education.

When social workers are unable to receive supervision from social workers there can be concerning consequences. Kavanagh and colleagues (2003) investigated the supervision experiences of comparable health staff working in mental health services across Queensland, Australia. Participants included psychologists, social workers (36% of the respondents), occupational therapists, and speech pathologists. According to the structured phone interviews with 272 practitioners, frequency of contact, and how much supervision time focused on discipline-specific skills[5] with a same discipline supervisor, was associated with a positive impact on practice. The results were not significant on the same variables with cross-discipline supervisors. Unfortunately, the researchers did not specify what was meant by discipline-specific skills; however, speculation suggests that the individual focus of psychology, occupational therapy, and speech pathology would not encourage a social work perspective.

Focus groups from the same four allied health disciplines provided some clarity about discipline differences. Participants agreed that cross-discipline supervision, particularly for new graduates, would jeopardize resolutions to ethical dilemmas, and contribute to the devaluing of the skills unique to social work, psychology, occupational therapy, and speech pathology. (Strong et al., 2003). Alternatively, when social workers are receiving supervision from social workers, and expectations and parameters are clear, concurrent cross-disciplinary supervision can be a welcomed source of new ideas (O'Donoghue, 2004; Strong et al., 2003).

Purpose, Duration, Training, and Discipline Affiliation: Questions for Ontario

---

[5] Identified on a Likert scale according to respondent's perception of time spend in supervision discussing "discipline specific competencies in mental health practice (diagnosis, assessment & treatment)" (Supervisee questionnaire)

Conventional knowledge about the purpose and duration of supervision, as well as the training and discipline affiliation of supervisors, have been contested since the formation of supervision. Given this documented knowledge, what areas could be significant for Ontario social workers? What aspects of the traditional and possible alternative conceptualizations will be considered important for effective social work practice according to research participants?

CHAPTER THREE: MY CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In order to find out research participants' perspectives concerning the supervision needs of Ontario social workers, I wanted to acknowledge the variability of responses and multiple meanings of "need." As well, I believed it was important to address the relationship of knowledge and power and the influence of this dynamic on social workers' supervision needs. Finally, I needed to have a perspective on my research that permitted me to freely use the most useful data collection methods and analysis.

Therefore, I required a conceptual framework that could (a) recognize meanings are constructed, (b) critique knowledge-power relations, (c) value multiple sources of knowledge, and (d) permit data collection methods that can best gather and analyse participant responses. My conceptual framework also needed to (e) encourage an "open play of reflection across various levels of interpretation" (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000, p. 248). These levels included my interpretation of the empirical data, as well as my reflections on how I claimed knowledge and represented participant voices. As Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) have described, through my research project, my primary focus was to acquire knowledge about a phenomenon through the construction of findings and the cautious interpretation of empirical information.

Constructing Meanings out of Multiple Knowledges in Relation to Power

My chosen conceptual framework broadly views knowledge as the integration or the weaving together of "a nature that we have not made and a society that we are free to change" (Latour, 1991/1993, p. 140). From this viewpoint, society is conceived as a gathering of interrelated and simultaneously existing stories we tell ourselves. Out of these stories grand narratives can surface and become social structures or ideological

collectives (Foucault, 1969/1972; Kuhn, 1996; Latour, 1991/1993). I accept the social

construction of local and dominant narratives and the existence of some sort of reality

"out there" (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000, p. 289).

To clarify, I assume that the ideas, stories, and narratives that identify individuals

and communities are flexible, relational, and co-constructed through all mediums of

communication: verbal, nonverbal, and the written word (Foucault, 1969/1972; Lyotard,

1979/1984; Rorty, 1979, 1999). Although multiple views are present, certain beliefs or

statements gain various levels of social eminence or social preference (Foucault,

1969/1972; Hacking, 1998; Kuhn, 1996; Lyotard, 1979/1984; Rorty, 1979). For example,

in the realm of social work supervision, privileged knowledge has come from published

articles and books written by university professors. Most research has been developed

without challenging the accepted knowledge about supervision practice created by the

descriptive, theoretical, and empirical academic literature.

In order to understand how certain narratives about supervision acquire influence

over others I draw on the ideas of Michel Foucault and the metaphor of a paradigm

proposed by Thomas Kuhn. While both philosophers have identified that relationships

between people and their ideas means there are relations of power, they also provide

unique concepts that were useful for my research.

Discourse Formation, Power and Knowledge

Foucault (1969/1972) identified discourse to refer to a particular group of

statements and social (i.e. discursive) practices or specific sets of actions that belong

together. His interest was to examine questions such as: "Who is the author? Who is

speaking? In what circumstances and in what context? With what intentions, what project

in mind?" (p. 171-172). Furthermore, Foucault (1984e) identified that there are "founders of discursivity" (p. 114), those persons who produce the hypotheses, concepts, and texts of the discourse, such as what Dr. Alfred Kadushin, Dr. Carlton Munson, and Dr. Lawrence Shulman have done for social work supervision. Thus, discourse refers to what can be said and thought, who can speak and practice, and with what authority (Law & Madigan, 1998) within a given place and time.

Discourse forms when there is an apparent regularity, cohesiveness, or interrelatedness between statements that have gathered into a system of understanding and behaviours (Foucault; 1980a). In other words, Foucault (1984c) carried forward Nietzsche's arguments of multiple truths and posited that we are captured by certain knowledges and practices that become solidified unities of truth (Irving, 1999). Through personal and societal interactions particular knowledge comes to dominate socio-cultural understandings and practices. The outcome can be social constructions that validate and liberate as well as subjugate and oppress (Foucault, 1984d; Ife, 1999; Pease, 2002; Pease & Fook, 1999; Rosenau, 1992). Scientific procedures and psychiatric diagnoses, and the status granted to the people who claim expertise in these areas, are examples of dominant discourses or paradigms with long-standing influence worldwide. Privileging the supervisor's knowledge as expert is another example. In response to dominant discourse creations, Foucault (1969/1972) has stated "we must question those ready-made syntheses, those groupings that we normally accept before any examination….they must be driven out from the darkness in which they reign" (p. 22).

To examine the formation of discourse is to acknowledge the operation of social power (Gordon, 1980). According to Foucault, power exists in relation to knowledge,

which is defined by the framework of elements that form into discourse. The exercise of

power creates and causes new knowledge and information to emerge which, in turn,

stimulates the effects of power (Foucault, 1980d). Dominant knowledge and power

cannot exist without each other. A specific effect of power is the emergence of dominant

discourses that can be both constraining and liberating. Too often, however, those who

are limited by discourse are "judged, condemned, classified, determined in our

undertakings, destined to a certain mode of living or dying" (Foucault, 1980f, p. 94).

Discourses, therefore, are social constructions that can bring forth a "regime of truth"

(Foucault, 1980e, p. 131) that separates true from false and provides the procedures of

how to acquire sanctioned truth and what to do with those who commit falsehoods. As

such, the tactics and strategies of power in relation to emerging knowledge are integral to

the formation of discourses.

The picture to this point is of a disciplinary power that can become oppressive and

inescapable. Power, however, is not exclusive to the domain of privileged persons or

ideas. Foucault (1980c) has pointed out "there are no relations of power without

resistances" (p. 142). Resistance to dominance in the form of persistent, local narratives

are exercises of power (Foucault, 1969/1972; 1980a; 1980e), such as the alternative

supervision ideas I have discussed. In this way, knowledge and power can relationally

generate new possibilities as well as new constraints (Chambon, 1999). This suggests that

dominant or preferred discourses rise and recede in continuous motion according to what

knowledge becomes associated with culturally defined power at a particular moment in

time (Rorty, 1999). In other words, an alternative narrative can eventually become a

dominant discourse and then, in turn, become critiqued by voices of protest and

difference.

Power, therefore, is more than the negative effects of repression, censorship,

concealment and exclusion (Foucault, 1984b). According to Foucault (1980d) a "wholly

negative, narrow, skeletal conception of power" (p. 119) denies the potential productivity

of power to induce pleasure, form knowledge, and create discourse. Foucault (1980c,

1980d, 1984d) has stressed that power goes beyond the simplistic dichotomy of

domination and repression and "needs to be considered as a productive network which

runs through the whole social body" (1980d, p. 119). Therefore, utilizing power for

collaborative arrangements rather than relations of supremacy and subjugation can be

possible (Foucault, 1984d). Although Foucault (1984d) did not agree that consensus

about discourse was possible or even desirable he did encourage each of us "to ask

oneself what proportion of nonconsensuality is implied in such a power relation, and

whether that degree of nonconsensuality is necessary or not" (p. 379). Thus, as

supervisors and social workers, questioning our individual and collective positional or

socially sanctioned power helps to detach us "from the forms of hegemony" (Foucault,

1980d, p.133) with which we could be complicit.

Paradigms and Revolutions

Although discourse formation is a valuable metaphor for examining the

construction of social work supervision, I believe that another means of conceptualizing

my topic will help to determine possible constructions of supervision according to

Ontario social workers. Thomas Kuhn's (1996) notion of paradigm and his corresponding

description of scientific revolutions bring forth views for my research that are unique as

well as similar to discourse formation. Of course, the applicability of Kuhn's ideas to

social work initially appears to present a challenge, given that his ideas about paradigms

were first written for and about the scientific community during the 1950s. Kuhn

however acknowledged that his main theses can have wide applicability, since they were

"borrowed from other fields" (p. 208) such as the arts, literature, and politics. Therefore, I

have concluded that compatibility is appropriate.

In the postscript of the third edition of his influential book *The Structure of*

Scientific Revolutions, Kuhn (1996) admits that in his original 1962 text his construction

and use of the term *paradigm* was obscure and inconsistent. Given his variety of nuanced

meanings and applications of paradigm (Masterman,1970, identified 21 ways that the

term is used by Kuhn), I selected a particular rendering gathered from Kuhn's writings

that I believe best provides a descriptive framework for the conceptualization of social

work supervision.

A paradigm is a pattern or a "relatively inflexible box" (Kuhn, 1996, p. 24) that

contains the taken-for-granted particulars that define an achievement according to a

particular group of professional individuals. Initially, paradigm appeared to be

synonymous for *theory*, but Kuhn (1996) in his *1969 Postscript* subsequently rejected

this since theory can refer to "a structure far more limited in nature and scope" (p. 182)

than he intended. Instead, to further clarify the taken-for-granted features of a paradigm,

Kuhn (1970) proposed and later developed an alternative descriptor: the *disciplinary*

matrix. He suggested "'disciplinary' because it refers to the common possession of the

practioners of a particular discipline, 'matrix' because it is composed of ordered elements

of various sorts, each requiring further specification" (Kuhn, 1996, p. 182). Kuhn

identified four elements that make up his disciplinary matrix: (1) symbolic

generalizations: "those expressions, deployed without question or dissent by group

members" (p. 182); (2) shared beliefs in analytical or metaphorical models; (3) shared

values; and (4) exemplars, which are concrete examples. In accordance with Kuhn, for

my research I organized and identified the four elements for supervision to be: (1) shared

generalizations about supervision; (2) shared ideas about the purpose and process of

supervision; (3) shared value about the place in supervision for the social work mission of

social justice and social change; and (4) shared agreement about the knowledge and skills

of supervisors.

To initially qualify as a paradigm or a disciplinary matrix, an achievement

demonstrates two unique qualities. First, the identified achievement replaces any

alternative conceptualizations as the foundation for future practice, but is still open-ended

enough to leave a number of related problems to resolve (Kuhn, 1996). Thus, a paradigm

is the description of "normal," having become the expected and accepted standard of

knowledge and practice. For social work supervision, the literature suggests that

"normal" would be Kadushin's tri-purpose (educative, supportive, administrative)

concept of supervision that he initially proposed in 1976.

The second quality of a paradigm has already been alluded to: the achievement is

significant enough to attract a loyal group of followers and students. Kuhn points out that

an important part of the attraction to the achievement can actually be the "idiosyncrasies

of autobiography and personality. Even the nationality or the prior reputation of the

innovator and his teachers sometimes play a significant role" (p.153). Notably, Kadushin,

Munson, and Shulman are White men who have been PhD professors working full-time

for a number of decades in social work departments of American universities. According to contemporary socio-political and cultural discourses, their gender, race, academic qualifications, employment history and geographic location powerfully sanction the statements they have enunciated and endorsed.

The allegiance to a paradigm transforms a collection of individuals who share similar interests into a cohesive discipline, if not a professional community. The size of the community can be relatively small (less than 25) or members could be a professional subspecialty. Rather than numbers it is the dedication of adherents to the paradigm that generates "the formation of specialized journals, the foundation of specialist's societies, and the claim for a special place in the curriculum" (Kuhn, 1996, p. 19). Although supervision has remained relatively peripheral to other topics of social work, there is a speciality peer-reviewed journal, *The Clinical Supervisor*, established in 1983 by Munson, and an apparent growing interest in international conferences devoted to the supervision of helping professionals.[6] Moreover, the community of adherents to the ideas of the "founding fathers" and the subject of social work supervision are evident in subsequent publications from around the world (for example, Brown & Bourne, 1996; Bruce & Austin, 2000; Cohen, 1999; Cooper, 2001, 2002; Erera & Lazar, 1993, 1994; Hensley, 2002; Itzhaky & Hertzanu-Laty, 1999; Jones, 2004; Kaiser & Barretta-Herman, 1999; Kutzik, 1977; O'Donoghue, 2003; Payne, 1994; Tsui, 1997b, 2005b; Williams, 1997).

The success of a paradigm is maintained and the professional community is insulated against difference as long as the elements remain clear and unchallenged by

---

[6] In 2000 and 2004, the Centre for Social Work of the University of Auckland in Aotearoa New Zealand hosted two international supervision conferences, and then in 2005, 2006, and 2007 an international supervision conference was hosted by the social work department of the University of Buffalo, New York.

alternative ideas (Kuhn, 1996). To secure the exclusive domain of the paradigm, shared

knowledge is assumed, language becomes specialized and inaccessible to non-adherents,

and the dissemination of research findings and practice is tailored to "the articulation of

those phenomena and theories that the paradigm already supplies" (p. 24). Any anomalies

and the persons who voice them, that could potentially subvert the traditional ways of

thinking and practice, are discouraged, ignored, or silenced. However, it is these very

constraints on inquiry and the existence of persistent novelties that encourage seeds of

discontent.

As inquirers find anomalies or puzzles that persistently cannot be explained or

assimilated by the existing paradigm, a crisis can begin as elements of potentially

alternative paradigms emerge. While members' perceptions shift and new ideas

germinate, a revolution of thought and practice gains momentum that can eventually

become transformative for the group of adherents. However, the rumblings of discontent

and change are often rewarded by resistance from many community members who

staunchly hold to the belief that the old paradigm will eventually solve all related

problems. Thus, persuasion takes time and can depend on the unique qualities of the

revolutionaries and the socio-political climate, as well as the ability of the new paradigm

to provide solutions to chronic problems. As Kuhn (1996) points out, "the transfer of

allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced"

(p. 151). Moreover, for the participants "when paradigms change, the world itself

changes with them" (Kuhn, 1996, p. 111). Eventually, the process of disciplinary

revolution can extend to broader professional communities. Thus, truth and reality are

only fixed for but a moment while a criterion for an eventual new "normal" continues to

change (Rorty, 1979, p. 180).

Discourse, Paradigms and Power: Meanings for Social Work Supervision

Foucault and Kuhn developed their respective concepts of discourse and paradigm

from a shared belief that preferred knowledge and truth are social constructions that

perpetually rise and recede in relationship with power and resistance. These assumptions

suggest truth is contextual, fluid, subjective, and best approached tentatively.

Nevertheless, certain ideas become socially sanctioned dominant knowledge and practice

according to what can be said, which voices are heard, by what authority, in what time

and context.

Both philosophers have described how privileged ideas are shaped by the power

granted to the social status of the founders and advocates. Constructs such as race, class,

employment status, gender, and age, as well as the method of knowledge acquisition and

dissemination, collectively influence what characteristics come to describe an

achievement. For Ontario social workers, the "founders" or voices of authority of

supervision could conceivably be recognized at a number of levels. I suspect that not

many practitioners would know that the dominant paradigm of supervision has come out

of a history of adherence to logical positivist ideas and the scientific method that have

been solidified by Alfred Kadushin and Carlton Munson (for example, see Munson,

2004). Alternatively, social workers might consider work settings or regulatory bodies as

the progenitors and sustainers of contemporary supervision practices. This speculation is

relevant to the following question: In the light of the various authority-power relations,

how might Ontario social workers envision the potential roles of the College or work

settings in constructing supervisory relations that can best meet the needs of

practitioners?

A second and final point relevant to my research is that Kuhn and Foucault have

acknowledged that discourses or paradigms are sustained or changed according to how

power is exercised and practised. I am curious, therefore, to find out if identified

supervision needs support or provide resistance to accepted supervision relationships and

practices. Will participants exercise their power to bring forth a cohesive alternative

narrative and what will it contain?

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH PURPOSE TO DATA COLLECTION

Purpose of this Research

Establishing a clear purpose is essential for the development of research questions

and the selection of appropriate investigative methods (Newman, Ridenour, Newman, &

DeMarco, 2003). My purpose for this investigation was two fold. First, I was interested to

find out how Ontario social workers' supervision needs were different or similar

according to (a) current or recently experienced supervision, (b) demographic and work

setting differences, and (c) descriptions offered in the social work supervision literature.

As an outcome of this research, I hoped to suggest a preferred configuration of

supervision based on the identified needs of the participants.

Secondly, my intent is to use the outcomes of this research to (a) promote

effective social work practice, and (b) develop effective social work supervision

knowledge and practice. As such, the aim of my research is intended to have "a personal,

social, institutional, and/or organizational impact" (Newman et al., 2003, p.178).

Conceptual Definitions of Terms

Defining "Needs"

For a number of decades the notion of needs for research inquiries has been

viewed as socially constructed, culturally contextualized, and constantly changing (Aoun,

Pennebaker, & Wood, 2004; Bradshaw, 1972; Cohen & Eastman, 1997; Cowley, Bergen,

Young, & Kavanagh, 2000; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Rubin & Babbie, 2001; Witkin,

1984). Not surprisingly, a number of conceptualizations of needs have been developed

(Abbey-Livingston & Abbey, 1982; Altschuld & Witkin, 2000; Aoun et al., 2004;

Bradshaw, 1972; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Witkin, 1984; Witkin & Altschuld, 1995).

Taking these various constructions into consideration, I have developed the following

category of needs for my research:

- Social worker needs: Refers to what participants think is necessary, essential, or

    required of and from social work supervision.

This conceptualization of need is distinct from "wants" which refer to expectations,

wishes, hopes, or desires of and from supervision that goes beyond what participants

think is essential, necessary, or required.

Defining the Type of Research: Needs Assessment or Perspectives on Supervision Needs

The research literature typically refers to an inquiry about needs as a "needs

assessment" (Abbey-Livingston & Abbey, 1982; Altschuld & Witkin, 2000; Aoun et al.,

2004; Bradshaw, 1972; Cohen & Eastman, 1997; Cowley et al., 2000; Guba & Lincoln,

1982; Rubin & Babbie, 2001; Witkin, 1984). A needs assessment is identified by the

focus, the purpose, the participants, and suggested methodologies associated with this

type of social research.

The Focus

A needs assessment refers to a methodological process used to identify the needs

of particular individuals, groups, communities, or organizations. The significance of

accepting the relative worth or subjective value of the identified needs has been

repeatedly stressed (Cohen & Eastman, 1997; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Witkin, 1984).

As such, I understood that respondents were influenced by their individual experiences

and ideas, as well as the time and place when they chose to participate. Furthermore, my

role as researcher added another element of subjectivity exercised through my choices

and design of data collection and analysis. Thus, not all needs could be identified and no

assessment approach could address all the issues of importance (Cohen & Eastman, 1997; Guba & Lincoln, 1982).

Accordingly, I concur with Cohen and Eastman (1997), that "perspectives on need," as an alternative for the term needs assessment, helps to "reflect the lack of a single 'truth' about need and emphasize the role of subjective political judgement in designing and interpreting research on 'need'" (p. 415). Consequently, I use the word "perspectives" interchangeably with "assessment."

The Purpose

Essential for needs focused research is to be mindful that the study "should not stand alone, but be followed by the phrase 'for what?'" (Cowley et al., 2000, p. 127). The expectation is that the identified needs will be used to influence and inform the development and allocation of resources and/or policy creation (Altschuld & Witkin, 2000; Witkin, 1984). Therefore, a needs assessment becomes a step towards social action and social change. To facilitate such changes, Witkin (1984) has pointed out that some sort of comparison helps to find discrepancies between existing conditions and required conditions. This means that participants in my research would have the opportunity to identify what they believe is necessary, essential, or required of and from supervision compared to what they currently or recently experienced.

The potential for structural and systemic changes suggests that needs assessment research is a process in which feasible opportunities and undesirable outcomes are carefully considered according to what is valued by the participants (Capoccia & Googins, 1982). As I already pointed out, my intent with this research is to argue for changes to social work supervision practice.

The Participants

The primary participants of an investigation about needs are those individuals who would be direct recipients of the intended or targeted service (Altschuld & Witkin, 2000). For this study, the recipients of supervision were Ontario social workers.

Suggested Methodologies

Depending on the research questions and targeted group, needs assessments use a variety of strategies including questionnaires, and group processes such as focus groups (Abbey-Livingston & Abbey, 1982; Altschuld & Witkin, 2000; Nickens, Purga, & Noriega, 1980; Witkin, 1984).

From Conceptual Framework to Research Design

My research design was particularly influenced by the ideas of Mats Alvesson and Kaj Skoldberg (2000), and Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie (1998, 2003). Their respective works advocate, that ontology and epistemology, rather than methodology, are what determine worthwhile research. In other words, the design options for the research depend on the conceptual framework of the researcher.

My conceptual framework gave me the freedom to allow quantitative and qualitative orientations to influence my research questions, my choice of data collection methods, as well as the analysis and interpretations of the findings. Quantitative methods and results, however, are often considered a means of achieving facts that mirror "reality." On the other hand, corresponding to my conceptual framework, I understand that quantitative data are subject to an interpretive process just like qualitative results, so that any claims to an objective reality are replaced with tentative speculation about

possible meanings and inferences (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003).

<div align="center">*Choosing a Mixed Model Research Design*</div>

Mixed methods designs combine qualitative and quantitative elements, methods, and analyses so that strengths are enhanced and weaknesses of each orientation do not overlap (Johnson & Turner, 2003; Rubin & Babbie, 2001). To complement this integration of ideas and processes, Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) have taken the concepts of legitimization and the transferability of quantitative and qualitative data and proposed that *inference quality* and *inference transferability* better characterize the union of the two research perspectives.

Inference quality represents two notions: *design quality* and *interpretative rigor*. The first notion, *design quality*, refers to how well the research procedures have complied with quantitative and qualitative "best practices." In other words: How well do data collection methods bring forth a shared understanding of knowledge that would resonate with meanings intended by the participants? Included in design quality is the notion of internal validity that was initially developed for quantitative research by Campbell and Stanley (1963) and the qualitative concept of credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The second aspect of inference quality is *interpretive rigor*, which considers the consistency, compatibility, and differences of the findings and interpretations according to internal comparisons and in relationship to external knowledge. Finally, *inference transferability* weaves together the quantitative concept of external validity and the qualitative concept of generalizability or transferability of the research findings (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003).

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2003) have identified two types of mixed methods designs: mixed *method* research and mixed *model* research. A mixed *method* study is identified by concurrent or sequential qualitative and/or quantitative data collection methods and analysis (Creswell et al., 2003; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). In contrast, a mixed *model* design provides the investigator a number of decision-making points throughout the development of the research design. Quantitative and qualitative elements can be applied and combined across the four stages of a study, informing (1) the purpose and multiple types of research questions; (2) the data collection methods; (3) the statistical and qualitative analysis, and (4) the multiple inferences (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). The notion of mixed model design is echoed in Creswell and colleagues' (2003) concept of *integration*, defined as

> the combination of quantitative and qualitative research within a given stage of inquiry. For example, integration might occur within the research questions (e.g., both quantitative and qualitative questions are presented), within data collection (e.g., open-ended questions on a structured instrument), within data analysis (e.g., transforming qualitative themes into quantitative items or scales), or in interpretation (e.g., examining the quantitative and qualitative results for convergence of findings). (p. 220)

In Figure 1, I present a visual representation of my research – a concurrent mixed model nested design – developed from the ideas and elements of Creswell and colleagues (2003) and Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003). My crafting of a suitable mixed model design began with my research questions (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Creswell et al., 2003; Maxcy, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, 2003). Associated with my main research

question, I created exploratory and confirmatory questions. Secondly, the purpose of my

research – to investigate the supervision needs of Ontario social workers – suggested to

me that a quantitative data collection measure could accommodate a large sample of

participants so that findings could be inferred to the population of Ontario social workers.

Nevertheless, I believed that the rich tapestry provided by individual narratives would

also make a valuable contribution. To accommodate both aspects I decided to construct a

survey that included quantitative and qualitative questions (an example of integration at

the data collection stage). Thus, although both methods are included, qualitative

questions are nested in the dominant source of data gathering (Creswell et al., 2003). This

is demonstrated in Figure 1 with the spherical shape embedded in the rectangle that

represents quantitative data.

For the third stage of my research plan, a rectangle and sphere in Figure 1

respectively symbolize the use of quantitative and qualitative data analyses that are

described in Chapter Five. Notably, the middle double-headed arrow refers to the

statistical data that is transformed into narrative interpretations and the documentation

that is transformed into quantitative equations, in order to enrich and better integrate the

results. Chapters Six and Seven provide the respective outcomes and my interpretations

of the analyses, including an assessment of quantitative and qualitative design quality.

Chapter Eight concludes this five stage project with my creation of an integrated

conceptualization of supervision. I also reflect on next steps for Ontario supervision

practices and potential implications for future study. A particular benefit of this

concurrent mixed model nested design is the flexibility to add a subsequent phase if

further research is warranted.

| The Research Question: What do Ontario social workers identify as their post-degree supervision needs? |
| Exploratory Questions |

| The Research Question: What do Ontario social workers identify as their post-degree supervision needs? |
| Confirmatory Questions |

Qualitative
Survey Questions

QUANTITATIVE
Survey Questions

Quantitative Data Analysis ←→ Qualitative Data Analysis

Findings & Interpretations   Findings & Interpretations

Integrated Conceptualization of Supervision
&
Implications for Social Work Supervision
Practice & Research

Figure 1. A Concurrent Mixed Model Nested Design

. The Research Questions

This study was designed to answer this central research question: What do

Ontario social workers identify as their post-degree supervision needs?

Four Associated Research Questions

1. What do the data generally reveal about the needs of Ontario social workers?

2. Do social workers' supervision needs for specific areas of supervision differ

    significantly compared to what they have currently or recently experienced? The

    specific areas of supervision are:

    2.1.   Administrative tasks

    2.2.   Supervisor authority

    2.3.   Supervisor training

    2.4.   The place of the social work mission of social justice and social change.

3. Which demographic variables are significantly related and help to explain social

    workers' supervision needs concerning (a) the purpose of supervision; (b) the

    authority in the supervision relationship, (c) the timing and duration of supervision,

    (d) the training and discipline of the supervisor; and (e) the place of the social work

    mission of social justice and social change?

4. Are Ontario social workers' needs similar or different from supervision

    descriptions offered through the literature?

Sampling Procedures

The study population I was interested in are persons (a) who reside in Ontario; (b)

who have completed a bachelor's (BSW), master's (MSW) or doctoral (PhD/DSW)

degree in social work; (c) who call themselves social workers or identify work

experiences where they have fulfilled social work responsibilities with individuals,

families, groups, or communities; and (d) who are currently, or have been historically,

supervised following their first social work degree. As of December 31, 2006, there were

10,289 social workers registered with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social

Service Workers (OCSWSSW, 2007), which the College would identify as the social

work population of Ontario[7].

My sampling frame (Rubin & Babbie, 2001) was the 2007 membership list of the

Ontario Association of Social Workers (OASW). The OASW is a voluntary, non-profit,

provincial association for social workers. As a branch of the Canadian Association of

Social Workers, the OASW currently has 3,553 members (personal communication, J.

Mackenzie Davis, May 18, 2007) from all areas of social work practice, who have either

graduated from or are currently registered as a student in an accredited university social

work program (OASW, 2007). Although this sample of social workers likely has many

similarities to College members, the fact that membership is voluntary may suggest a

level of commitment to the concerns and interests of social workers" (OASW, 2007) that

might not be shared by non-member social workers. Alternatively, non-membership

could be because of the prohibitive costs of joining the College and the Association and,

therefore, is not a reflection of an individual's level of interest in social work practice,

social issues, and employment concerns. Given that there is no available data on the

differences between OASW members and non-members, I believe it is possible to

suggest that OASW participants can be representative of the study population.

---

[7] Access to a randomized sample of College members was not possible (personal communication, G. McDonald, July 5, 2007). It is unknown how many people who call themselves social workers are not College members.

In order to maximize the number of respondents and to increase the potential of a

simple randomized sample from the sampling frame, my Invitation to Participate (See

Appendix C) was sent by the OASW to all post-degree members with active email

addresses (n = 2590; 25% of the study population) (R. Mascherin, personal

communication, June 14, 2007). Although this number was substantial, surveys have

notoriously low return rates, so I decided to include another significant source of

participants who could be emailed directly. The Dean of the Faculty of Social Work,

Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU), agreed that Social Work alumni could be contacted

through the Social Work Continuing Education Program. The WLU Social Work

Continuing Education Program assistant confirmed that a total of 995 social work alumni

(10% of the study population) (M. Whitwell, personal communication, Sept 10, 2007)

were emailed my Invitation to Participate along with two subsequent reminder emails

(See Appendix D).

In addition, I sought out provincial organizations that represented work settings

where many social workers are employed. I realized that including work settings could

mean that social workers might receive the Invitation to Participate from multiple

sources. Even so, my expectation and corresponding instructions to potential participants

was to complete the survey once and disregard any further requests.

In response to my inquiries, three provincial associations and one Ontario Family

Health Team (FHT) expressed interest in the research and agreed to be community

partners (a form of purposive quota sampling) (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). This meant that

each association representative sent an email of endorsement to member agencies that

was copied to me, encouraging management to forward my Invitation to Participate to

social work staff. The FHT Manager sent the email directly to her staff. In addition, at

least one reminder email was sent by these four community partners. The three

associations were:

1. Children's Mental Health Ontario (CMHO) representing 81 centres and at least

   450 social workers (L. Greenberg, personal communication, October 17, 2007).

2. Family Services of Ontario (FSO) representing 41 agencies and approximately

   200 to 300 social workers (J. Ellis, personal communication, July 4, 2007)

3. Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies (OACAS) representing 53 CASs

   and approximately 6,855 direct service staff (it is uncertain how many are social

   workers) (L. Gosling, personal communication, July 9, 2007).

Although the representatives of the three associations were apparently committed

to their members' participation in the research, association endorsement did not mean

individual agency consent to inform social workers. At each agency and centre, the

contact people could choose not to send on the email request. Furthermore, I learned from

one CAS that many child welfare agencies have their own internal review processes that

must be completed before any agreement to participate could be made. I only heard from

three child welfare agencies interested in participating but who required details of the

study in order for their internal ethics review committee to approve staff participation.

Given that I did not hear from any other CAS, I am uncertain how many staff were

actually informed about the research. Concerning the Family Health Team, I had the

assurance of the Manager that all 47 staff were emailed my Invitation to Participate (C.

McPherson-Doe, personal communication, July 12, 2007).

Finally, I used snowball sampling when social workers contacted me interested in the research, or when social workers requested permission to forward the email invitation on to colleagues (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

In conclusion, in spite of a number of potential sources for participants, I could only have reasonable confidence that 3632 social workers (35% of the study population) were contacted by email.

Data Collection Method and Process

The Mixed Methods Questionnaire

My source for data collection was a self-administered survey[8] that I designed using intramethod mixing (Johnson & Turner, 2003) of closed-ended (quantitative) statements and questions and open-ended (qualitative) questions. In keeping with my perspective that preferred knowledge and truth are socially constructed, I viewed the crafting of my survey as a creation negotiated between me and other viewpoints (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). This process occurred in two stages:

Stage One: The Initial Design

I began the conceptualization of the questionnaire through engagement with the supervision literature. I imagined the written narratives as representations of the authors who, if present, would have been "key informants" (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). In particular, I reviewed any appropriate, previously used, supervision surveys (Bourgue & Fielder, 2003; Fink, 2003). From these examples, I listed construct descriptions and question examples that I subsequently organized into emerging themes and sub-themes. Continually I moved between the literature, my conceptual framework, and my research

---

[8] According to Altschuld and Witkin (2000), approximately 60% to 70% of needs assessment research use surveys.

questions in order to operationalize concepts and create corresponding questions or

statements. Once I had exhausted the literature, I had found some potentially useful

questions from other surveys by Kadushin (1992), Laufer (2003), and Scott and Farrow

(1993) (Bourgue & Fielder, 2003; Fowler, 2002; Fink, 2003). As my survey developed,

all items were constructed in my own words.

The supervision literature helped me to create five focus areas for the

questionnaire. Statements and questions were assigned to a focus area according to my

understanding of the literature and compatibility with other items in the questionnaire.

Importantly, once a statement or question was considered part of a category, it was not

repeated elsewhere.

First focus area: The purpose of supervision. Three aspects were included. The

first aspect considered what topics of conversations between supervisor and supervisee

could best help develop social work practice. A useful framework was the educative,

supportive, and administrative elements of post-degree supervision, as proposed by

Kadushin (1976; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002). An example statement was, "I believe a

purpose of supervision needs to focus on the knowledge and skill development of

supervisees." For the second aspect, I inquired about participants' needs regarding

practice-focused and administrative-focused supervision. For example, "Knowing that

my supervisor has to complete my staff evaluation/performance appraisal makes it

difficult for me to raise practice concerns during supervision." The third aspect was the

place in supervision for reflection and discussion on ethical practice. For example, "I

need more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice."

Second focus area: The place of authority in the supervision relationship. This section included three aspects. First, statements were created to find out the perception participants had of supervisor authority. For example, "Supervisors have authority over me because of their workplace position." The second aspect was the relationship between supervisor authority and social workers professional autonomy. For example, "My knowledge and skills have equal value to that of supervisors." The final aspect was the decision making process between social workers and supervisors. For example, "My supervisor and I plan together what I can do for my clients."

Third focus area: The timing and length of supervision during a social worker's career. This area inquired about two aspects. The first was the need for ongoing supervision and the length of supervision relative to professional autonomy. For example, "Supervision that lasts for years discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions)." The second aspect concerned how long supervision was needed for particular areas of social work practice. For example, "What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for knowledge and skill development?"

Forth focus area: The training and discipline affiliation of the supervisor. The first of two aspects concerned the professional designation and experience of the supervisor. For example, "Supervisors need a degree in social work before becoming supervisors of social workers." The second aspect inquired about the training and discipline specific knowledge needed for supervisors. For example, "My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice."

Fifth focus area: The place in supervision of the social work mission of social justice and social change. This section included three aspects that explored the role or responsibility supervision could have in pursuit of the social work mission of social justice and social change. First, I created statements that explored supervision and anti-racist and anti-oppressive practice. For example, "My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice." The second aspect concerned the possible creation and support of just policies and practices. For example, "My supervisor and I talk about individual and social issues (e.g. racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege my clients." Finally, the third aspect highlighted the ethical balancing of care with control. For example, "My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control."

To give context to the responses, I added questions about particular demographic elements and background information that were identified by various authors as important to supervision practices (Greenspan, Hanfling, Parker, Primm, & Waldfogel, 1991; Jeffreys, 2001; O'Donoghue, Munford, & Trlin, 2005; Pilcher, 1984; Scott & Farrow, 1993). Questions included length of practice, highest completed social work degree, and type of work setting where supervision has been received.

Response choices for the quantitative data. The response choices for the quantitative items were varied. For statements and questions about supervision, I used a five-point ordinal rating scale (i.e., responses ordered according to rating importance) (Fink, 2003). In addition, a sixth point – *No response* – was given since participants had to answer every item (see below for data collection). For a few statements, it was appropriate to add a seventh response choice, *Not applicable.* Traditionally in the

research literature, a rating scale is referred to as a Likert-type or Likert-item response (Clason & Dormody, 1994; Rubin & Babbie, 2001). A particular strength of Likert-scales using ordinal responses is that the results can be used and analysed as interval data (Clason & Dormody, 1994; Fink & Kosecoff, 1998; Garson, 2007), which allowed me to perform analyses using inferential statistics. To gather background information, the responses I chose included interval rating scales and nominal data.

The qualitative questions. Along with the quantitative questions and statements, I included three qualitative questions. If a participant decided to respond, there was ample blank space for her or his written narrative. The questions were worded to invite different or more detailed information than what was sought already by the closed-ended survey questions. The intent of these questions was to tap into a deeper understanding of respondents' ideas and thoughts about supervision and the overall content of the survey. The three questions were:

1. Do you have any other suggestions for effective social work supervision?

2. What objections or concerns do you have about post-degree supervision for social workers?

3. Your comments about the survey content are welcomed. Do you have any information that you would like to add?

Stage Two: The Pre-Test

Once I had constructed the survey based on the literature, I invited 16 post-degree social workers to complete the survey (see below for the data collection process). I attempted to choose social workers who represented as much as possible the diverse demographics identified in the Background Information section of the survey.

Furthermore, I also choose a few social work supervisors to benefit from their

perspectives on supervision. Of the 16 respondents, 10 people provided feedback to the

following questions (Fink & Kosecoff, 1998; Fowler, 2002):

1. How long did it take you to complete the survey?

2. Are the instructions clearly written and sufficient?

3. Are the statements and questions easy to understand? If not, please write down
   those items that are unclear or awkward.

4. Are the response choices sufficient and clear? If not, please write down which
   responses are insufficient or not clear and, if possible, what you would prefer.

5. Do the statements, questions, and responses permit a wide range of ideas and
   opinions about supervision?

6. Do you have any suggestions regarding the addition or deletion of statements or
   questions, the response choices, or the clarification of instructions?

In collaboration with the pre-test participants, I made a number of changes to the

questionnaire that included additions to the instructions, and the elimination or

modification of a few questions and statements.

The Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire contained 42 statements and questions with Likert-type

scale responses that addressed five focus areas of supervision: (1) the purpose of

supervision, (2) the authority in the supervision relationship, (3) the timing and length of

supervision during a social worker's career, (4) the training and discipline of the

supervisor, and (5) the place of the social work mission of social justice and social

change. Of the 42 questions or statements, 17 asked about (a) current or recent

experiences, and (b) current needs, which were accompanied by six- or seven-point

Likert-type scales. In sum, the survey contained 59 scaled responses on supervision for

participants to complete. In addition to the quantitative items, three questions requested a narrative response. Finally, the survey began with one question about frequency of supervision and ended with 11 questions about participants' background relevant to their supervision experiences (For the complete survey, see Appendix E).

The Process of Data Collection

The questionnaire was only accessible to participants via the Internet through a Wilfrid Laurier University secured website. To use a computer-based medium exclusively, I made the following assumptions: That all potential respondents would be (1) motivated to participate, (2) computer literate, and (3) have easy access to a computer and the internet (Bourgue & Fielder, 2003; Fink, 2003). The estimated time for completing the web-survey was 20 minutes, which falls within the recommended time frame of 15 to 25 minutes for Internet surveys (Bourgue & Fielder, 2003).

I transformed the questionnaire into a web-survey using SurveyGold, a "complete software system for building and then administering surveys and analyzing their results" (Golden Hills Software, 2007). The survey and the Informed Consent Statement for Participants (See Appendix F) was up-loaded to an exclusive WLU website with the following web address: www.wlu.ca/fsw/hhair/swsupervisionsurvey . The web address or link to the WLU website was included in the Invitation to Participate and any subsequent reminder emails. A summary of the invitation including the web address was posted in an OASW Bulletin that was emailed to members.

Agreement to the Informed Consent Statement and entry to the web-survey occurred when a potential respondent completed the following instructions noted at the end of the Informed Consent Statement:

By clicking on the button below and entering the survey, you agree to have read and understood the above information. You also agree to participate in this study. Completion and submission of the survey is considered an alternative to your signed consent.

At the end of the survey, participants had the option of entering their name, email address, or phone number for a prize draw and/or to indicate their interest to be a focus group participant, if focus groups were developed for a potential second phase of research once my dissertation was completed.

Confidentiality and Security of Responses

Unfortunately, no data transmission over the Internet can be guaranteed 100% secure. With that understanding, all measures possible were taken to try to ensure the highest level of anonymity and confidentiality for participants.

After I finished designing the web-survey, I set up the survey program to block any identifying information from participant's computers. Respondents submitted their completed web-surveys via SSL, the leading security protocol on the Internet, by clicking a Submit button at the end of the survey. Submitted responses were temporarily stored on the secure surveygold.com website. According to the SurveyGold Privacy Policy, "Information collected by surveygold.com is stored in secure operating environments that are not available to the public. All of our employees are dedicated to maintaining and upholding your privacy and security and are aware of our privacy and security policies" (Point 8, Security, Golden Hills Software, 2005). Daily emails let me know when new responses arrived. Once I securely downloaded the web-survey responses for viewing and analyzing, surveygold.com automatically removed the data permanently from their

website. If for some reason I had neglected to click the "Get Web Responses" (which I

did not), surveygold.com stored the data for up to six months, after which any un-

retrieved web-surveys would be destroyed by the surveygold.com webmaster.

After I downloaded a web-survey to my computer, I maintained confidentiality by

storing all responses on a secure database that only I could access. Before I reviewed any

of the web-survey data, any identifying information was transferred to another file and

deleted from the web-surveys. This insured that all survey responses remained

anonymous as well as confidential. The winner of the draw was contacted after the

closing date of the web-survey; after which all submitted names and contact information

for the draw were destroyed.

Participants were informed that non-identifying survey results would be kept on a

secure database for up to five years after the completion of my dissertation, in preparation

for possible journal submissions. After that time, all file data will be deleted from

portable and permanent computer drives. No identifiable information has been used in

my dissertation, or will be in any presentation, publication, or discussion.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE PROCESS OF MIXED DATA ANALYSIS

Along with the traditional analyses that correspond to quantitative and qualitative data, mixed data analyses include the transformation of data. This means that numerical data can be *qualitized* (e.g., constructing descriptions), and narratives can be *quantitized* (e.g., creating corresponding numerical equations) (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Such transformations are used to expand the legitimacy and potential interpretations of the research results. Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) point out

> Because qualitative data analyses represent more *descriptive precision*, [and] quantitative data analyses provide more *numerical precision*, the use of mixed methods analyses offers the possibility of combining descriptive precision and numerical precision within the same interpretation. As such, legitimation is enhanced. (p. 361)

The results of my questionnaire emerged using parallel mixed data analysis, a primary means for triangulating data (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). This means that quantitative and qualitative items were analysed and interpreted sequentially and separately before being integrated into a meta-narrative of supervision (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003). The following is a description of my analytic process, beginning with data preparation, followed by separate analytic descriptions for the quantitative data and the qualitative data.

Preparing the Data for Analysis

Prior to my analysis, I transferred the raw data from SurveyGold into the SPSS version 15 Data Editor. I reviewed all web-surveys for possible duplications. I checked

respondents' demographics to be sure they corresponded to my sampling criteria. The

final number of participant web-surveys used for analysis was 636.

Preparing the Quantitative Data

For the demographic items 65, 66, 67, 71, and 73, I read over participants' written

responses for the *Other* option. For analytic purposes, I re-assigned participant self-

descriptions that I believed corresponded to an already established response of the Likert-

type scale. For example, the response "EAP" for Q65 was relocated to response choice

"13 – private counselling/therapy practice." As well, I created new categories, such as

"Addictions," for items that clustered well together, For statements 71 and 73, multiple

responses were possible for *Other*, therefore, where appropriate I added an additional

response to a pre-established option and kept the *Other* option. For example, I added

Member of a minoritized group for the participant who had written "gay" for the *Other*

option (this corresponded to the majority of persons who used this word or a similar

descriptor).

Along with using the data from all participants, I created data sets according to

the following work settings that employed the majority of respondents: (a) hospitals, (b)

child welfare agencies/children's aid societies (CW/CAS), (c) children's mental health

centres (CMHC), and (d) family counselling agencies (FCA).

Preparing the Qualitative Data

I copied the written responses for questions 61, 62, and 74, along with the

participants' corresponding ID number into three separate Word documents, in

preparation for thematic construction. Extraneous notation from the SurveyGold

documentation and any identifying information were removed. Finally, I corrected

spelling errors for all narratives that were used as quotes.

Analysis of the Reliability of the Quantitative Data

The reliability of a questionnaire with fixed-response items refers to how well the

scores from "specific persons, at a certain point in time, and under specific conditions are

reproducible" (Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2002, p. 89). In other words, reliability is a

relative measure of the consistency of a given set of scores by a particular group of

people, derived during a unique moment in time and place (Henson, 2001; Litwin, 2003;

Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2002; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

For questionnaires with Likert-type responses, there is an assumption that groups

of items cluster together to form a scale and an overall score that represents the concept,

or an aspect of the concept, being investigated. For this type of measure, reliability of the

questionnaire scores can be assessed with data from a single administration using a

statistical calculation known as the "internal consistency reliability coefficient"

(Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2002, p. 90) or Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Henson, 2001;

Litwin, 2003; Peterson, 1994; Streiner, 2003). This statistic presents a theoretical

estimate of the consistency or homogeneity of scores; in other words, how well "the

different items complement each other in their measurement of different aspects of the

same variable or quality" (Litwin, 2003, p. 22).

The acceptable level for the Cronbach's reliability coefficient varies across the

literature from .50 to .90 (Henson, 2001; Peterson, 1994). I selected my minimal standard

of reliability according recommendations of Nunnally (1978, Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), which have been widely referenced (Henson, 2001; Peterson, 1994; Streiner, 2003). For a questionnaire such as mine, in its initial stage of development, an alpha coefficient of .50 is the minimally accepted level of internal consistency and reliability, whereas an alpha of .70 is recommended (Henson, 2001; Nunnally,1978; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Peterson, 1994).

On two separate occasions, I calculated Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the 59 fixed-choice responses to statements and questions about supervision: (1) following the pre-test, and (2) following the collection of the final data. Notably, Streiner (2003) suggests that many questionnaire items (over 14 items) can inflate the coefficient alpha. Furthermore, high internal consistency on a long scale can camouflage the existence of more than two independent constructs (Onwuegbuzie & Daniel, 2002; Streiner, 2003). Consequently, for the final data I calculated the internal consistency reliability coefficient for the full questionnaire, as well as for each of the five scales that I developed using exploratory factor analysis (see below).

Analysis of the Inference Quality of the Quantitative Data: Assessing Validity

The reliability of the quantitative items does not assure relevant meaning to the responses. The formation of meaning or inference quality refers to the extent that the quantitative items actualize a representation of the constructs under investigation, while ruling out alternative explanations (Litwin, 2003; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). I chose two methods to assess the inference quality of the measure: content validity and construct validity.

Content Validity

Content validity is an initial way to consider the appropriateness of items on a mixed methods questionnaire. Validity is achieved relative to the favourable comments from various people familiar with the questionnaire topic (Litwin, 2003; Rubin & Babbie, 2001; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). During the development of the questionnaire, I made inquires with different social workers to find out their thoughts on how adequately I had represented the multiple facets of the supervision experience. Moreover, the written responses from participants were a valued contribution to the content validity that I achieved.

Construct Validity: The Process of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Once access to the web-survey ended, my task was to determine the construct validity of the closed-ended items. In other words, could there be empirical evidence that certain items clustered together to represent the concepts under investigation?

Although construct validity is a complex concept, a type of assessment of quantitative items is possible using a multivariate statistical method called exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Henson & Roberts, 2006). According to Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) "factor analysis is intimately involved in validation" (p.111). For a new measure, such as my questionnaire, EFA can be very useful for scale development (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003), which involves determining "the underlying dimensions (constructs) of a set of measures/variables" (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 117), and can be used to reduce the number of variables needed to describe a construct (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003; Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Henson & Roberts, 2006).

Steps of an exploratory factor analysis. The EFA process includes the following:

For the first step, factors (a term synonymous with components) are extracted from the

data using principal component analysis (PCA). The PCA model is a suitable option for a

construct analysis as long as the following essential conditions are present: (a) the sample

size is over 300 (Gorsuch, 1997; Henson & Roberts, 2006), and (b) the number of

participants are 10 times the number of questionnaire items (Fabrigar et al., 1999). For

the second step, the factors are rotated orthogonally using varimax[9]. Third, the number of

major factors representing a construct are chosen using two criteria: Kaiser's

eigenvalues-greater-than-1 standard, and the scree test. For the fourth and final step, to

avoid cross-factor loadings, the variables of each factor are chosen with a correlation

coefficient of .50 or higher (Gebotys, 1999; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). All

interpretations made of data from EFA are with the understanding that meanings are

tentative (a viewpoint notably congruent with my conceptual framework) (Henson &

Roberts, 2006).

An exploratory factor analysis of the web-survey items. Initially, I performed an

EFA for all 59 responses (Q2-Q60). The identified factors had variable clusters that

corresponded to the five areas of supervision on the web-survey. These results

encouraged me to view the five areas as separate scales or constructs of supervision.

Therefore, I proceeded to perform five EFAs, one for each of the five web-survey areas.

For the five scales that emerged, I selected factors (that I call subscales) that had achieved

an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 (and confirmed on the scree plot). Web-survey items for

each subscale were selected if they had correlation coefficients or loadings of .50 or

---

[9] With the varimax rotation procedure the factors remain uncorrelated while the variables are correlated
with the associated factor. In this way, the factors are considered to be "conceptually distinct" (Fabrigar et
al., 1999).

more. Finally, I gave descriptive names for each identified construct and for each accompanying subscale. I chose the descriptive names based on my interpretation of the combined questionnaire items. In addition, for each subscale I developed a brief narrative that I created from the subscale items.

Interpreting the EFA results. At the conclusion of the exploratory factor analysis, to thicken and enrich the results, I transformed the quantitative data into a narrative interpretation of supervision needs and current experiences (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). To do this, I considered each construct as represented by its scale and subscales, and sought out common and unique features of the clustered statements or questions. This process was guided by the ideas of the constant comparative method developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and the qualitizing recommendations of Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998). (For a detailed description, please see the section below: Analysis of the Qualitative Data).

<div align="center">Analysis of the Quantitative Data</div>

<div align="center">*Assessing for Practical Significance*</div>

The strength of any statistical relationship does not necessarily mean that the association is meaningful or important (Brace, Kemp, & Snelgar, 2006; Cohen, 1988, 1992). Although probability values have been accepted as measures of statistical significance (i.e., discovering that quantitative differences are not due to chance), nevertheless they do not indicate the "the degree to which the findings have practical significance in the study population" (Hojat & Xu, 2004, p. 241). My priority for this research was to find out the practical relevance of the data relationships. Therefore, I document findings based on practical significance rather than statistical significance.

In order to estimate the strength of the practical relationship or the magnitude of difference between variables, I calculated the standardized effect size (ES)[10] (Clark-Carter, 2003; Cohen, 1988, 1992; Levin & Robinson, 1999; Robinson & Levin, 1997; Rosenthal, 1996). Effect size has an advantage over inferential statistics since it is relatively unaffected by sample size (Clark-Carter, 2003; Hojat & Xu, 2004). This was important for my data, since my large sample size meant that the relevancy of statistically significant results could be questioned (Royall, 1986).

The pre-developed ES indexes I used were proposed by Jacob Cohen (1988). In order to "convey the meaning of any given ES index, it is necessary to have some idea of its scale" (Cohen, 1992, p. 156). Cohen created operational definitions to the qualitative terms – small, medium, and large – that have become conventional estimates. A small effect, although only statistically detectable, is "not so small as to be trivial" (1992, p.56); a medium effect size can be visible to the careful observer; and a large effect size is clearly evident without any calculations (Clark-Carter, 2003; Cohen, 1988; 1992; Todman & Dugard, 2007). Although my intent was to use effect sizes because of their practical relevance to my applied research, it was equally important to first determine statistical significance to ascertain that findings were not due to chance (Robinson & Levin, 1997). Thus, for all statistically significant results, I report the size of the effect using an appropriate ES index test (Cohen, 1992).

Exploratory Data Analysis

I used descriptive statistics to explore the distribution of the quantitative data for all 636 participants. For each variable, I considered the shape, center, and spread of the

---

[10] The *Publication Manual* of the American Psychological Association (2001) states that "it is almost always necessary to include some index of effect size" (p. 25) to indicate the practical importance of research findings.

data using frequency tables, histograms, box plots, and stem plots. I chose to display each

quantitative supervision question and the demographic data for all participants using

frequency tables, including the mean, median, and standard deviation. This stage of

analysis provided me with the necessary data to consider: (i) participant profiles, and (ii)

supervision needs.

Constructing Participant Profiles

First, I was curious how well the descriptive items about the respondents could be

representative of Ontario social workers. To that end I used the frequency charts of the

demographic results to create profiles of the participants based on their average scores

(Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). As Tashakkori and Teddlie point out, my data generated

composites that were inevitably tentative, oversimplified descriptions of respondents

influenced by my subjective viewpoints. Nevertheless, the descriptions were sufficient

and useful for comparisons with demographic information I acquired from the OASW

and the OCSWSSW.

Considering Emerging Supervision Needs

My second inquiry utilized the descriptive statistics for items Q2 to Q60 in order

to explore the first of my four associated research questions: *What do the data reveal*

about the needs of Ontario social workers? I considered the frequency charts for each of

the 59 supervision responses. I was interested in what the scores individually, and in

relationship to each other, suggested about supervision needs. I also looked over the data

for noticeable differences, and when the responses "not sure" and "no response" applied

to over 10% of the participants.

Considering data relationships. During my consideration of the data, I became

particularly curious about the relationship between age, years of experience, and

geographical location with five supervision items. These were: (a) the need for reflection

and discussion about ethical issues during supervision (Q6+Q7), (b) the need for one

person to provide practice/clinical supervision and another person administrative

supervision (Q10), (c) the authority of supervisors due to their expert knowledge and

skills (Q14), (d) the role of the OCSWSSW to grant supervisors authority to assess the

competency of social workers (Q16), and (e) the need for discussions in supervision

about power differences (Q23). I investigated the possible significance of the linear

relationships between the demographic items and the supervision variables using the

"Person's product moment" correlation (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994, p. 120). To

determine relational strength, I focused on significant correlations that had identified a

minimal practical association between the two variables (Hojat & Xu, 2004; Rosenthal,

1996). I used the effect size estimates developed by Cohen (1988) that correspond to

three correlational coefficients: $r = .10$ (small effect size), $r = .30$ (medium effect size),

and $r = .50$ (large effect size).

Interpreting the Exploratory Quantitative Data

At the conclusion of each of the two aspects of my exploratory data analysis, I

transformed the quantitative data into interpretative narratives. My process was guided by

the ideas of the constant comparative method developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and

the qualitizing recommendations of Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998).

Inferential Statistical Analyses and Effect Size Estimates

I used parametric statistics with questions 2 to 60 to investigate three of my four

associated research questions. Before I initiated each procedure, I confirmed that the data

satisfied the parametric assumptions of symmetrical distribution, independence, and

homogeneity of variance (Moore & McCabe, 1998).

Research Question #2: Dependent (Paired Sample) T-Tests

For my research question: *Do social workers' supervision needs for specific*

aspects of supervision differ significantly compared to what they have currently or

recently experienced? I calculated dependent (i.e., paired sample) t-tests. I wanted to

investigate differences for all participants between needs versus current or recent

experiences, according to administrative tasks, supervisor authority, supervisor training,

and the place of the social work mission for social justice and social change. I also

performed separate calculations for the four work settings with the highest sample sizes:

hospitals, CW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCAs. I created new variables by combining needs

questions and current or recent experiences questions. These are:

1. Administrative tasks (Q10+Q12 VS Q11+Q13).

2. Supervisor authority (Q19+Q21+Q23 VS Q20+Q22+Q24).

3. Supervisor training (Q37+Q39+Q41+Q43 VS Q38+Q40+Q42+Q44).

4. The place of the social work mission of social justice and social change

   (Q45+Q47+Q49+Q51+Q53+Q55+Q57+Q59 VS

   Q46+Q48+Q50+Q52+Q54+Q56+Q58+Q60)

Along with determining probability values, I calculated (a) confidence intervals to

locate the sample means relative to the population means; and (b) Cohen's *d* (Cohen,

1988; 1992), a mathematical calculation used to consider the effect size as a standardized

measure of difference between two means (Todman & Dugard, 2007). The equations I

used (Cohen, 1988) were: $d = \dfrac{\overline{X}a + \overline{X}b}{S_{pooled}}$ where: $S_{pooled} = \dfrac{S_a + S_b}{2}$ and $\overline{X}$ represents

the mean for group a and b; and S represents the standard deviation of group a and b.

Since my research is exploratory, I decided that if t had a level of significance less

than or equal to .05, then the effect size only needed to be small for the finding to be

reportable. As Cohen (1988, 1992) estimated, mean differences could have a small effect

size, represented by $d = .20$ (or about a quarter of a standard deviation), a medium effect

size, represented by $d = .50$ (or half a standard deviation), or a large effect size,

represented by $d = .80$ (or over three quarters of a standard deviation).

Research Question #3: Linear Multiple Regression Analysis

The next question I investigated was: *Which demographic variables are*

significantly related and help to explain social workers' supervision needs concerning (a)

the purpose of supervision; (b) the authority of the supervisor, (c) the timing and

duration of supervision, (d) the training and discipline of the supervisor; and (e) the

place of the social work mission of social justice and social change? I used linear

multiple regression analysis in order to explore the possible influence of the

demographics on supervision needs. Multiple regression is a statistical technique that

explores the relationship between two or more items (the independent variables) and a

single score representing the dependent variable (Brace et al., 2006; Todman & Dugard,

2007). The outcome of the procedure can suggest a model of what demographic qualities

are statistically significant in relationship to a particular supervision need.

To prepare the data, I used the five scales created through EFA and excluded all items concerned with current or recent supervision experiences. I also included one subscale because it isolated elements identified in the literature that are associated with the purpose of supervision: knowledge and skill development, emotional support, administrative tasks, and professional development. The supervision scales were:

1. The purpose of supervision (Q2-Q10,Q12)

2. The purpose of supervision, subscale 3: Four-fold purpose of supervision (Q2-Q5)

3. The authority of the supervisor (Q14-Q19, Q21, Q23)

4. The timing and length of supervision (Q25-Q33)

5. The training and discipline of the supervisor (Q34-Q37, Q39, Q41, Q43)

6. The place of the social work mission of social justice and change (Q45-Q59, odd numbers only)

Demographics were selected according to variables identified in the literature and investigated in previous research (Cearley, 2004; Kavanagh et al, 2003). These were:

1. Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision (Q1)

2. Discipline of the supervisor (Q66)

3. Years of experience since graduation from first social work degree (Q63)[11]

4. Degree of the social worker (Q64)

5. Gender of the social worker (Q70)

6. Work settings, specifically: hospitals, CW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCAs (Q65)

7. Geographical area of service (metropolitan, urban, rural/urban, rural/small town, rural) (Q68)

---

[11] Age of the social worker was not included in this list since my previous correlations demonstrated that this variable and years of experience were significantly associated with each other.

Analysis for all participants included all seven demographic variables; however, analysis using data organized by the four work settings, hospitals, CW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCAs, meant the exclusion of Q65, which asked about work settings (see above demographic item 6). Since I did not have any pre-conceived idea that certain variables were more influential than others, for each initial calculation I entered all the identified demographics simultaneously (the Enter method of SPSS) (Brace et al., 2006). If a model was not significant ($p > .05$), but had, at least, one significant B coefficient ($p < .05$), I performed a second analysis using Stepwise regression. Stepwise regression enters each variable in sequence and its potential contribution and the ongoing contribution of the collective variables are assessed. The process concludes when the smallest and most influential collection of variables are selected (Todman & Dugard, 2007).

I chose to report effect sizes on the models that met the following criteria: (i) the F test indicated that the model was significant ($p < .05$); (ii) the Durbin-Watson test for independence among residuals was between 1.5 and 2.5; (iii) the outliers outside of two standard deviations were 5% or less (Todman & Dugard, 2007); (iv) the colinearity statistics indicated independence between the variables (Tolerance and Variable Inflation Factor close to one); (v) the residuals on the normal probability plot created a close approximation to a straight line; and (vi) the residual plot formed a reasonably random pattern.

To calculate the ES index (Cohen, 1992), I used $f^2 = \frac{R^2}{1 - R^2}$, where R^2 equals the proportion of variation for the supervision scale (y) that can be explained by the demographic variables (Xs) (Moore & McCabe, 1998). Cohen (1988, 1992) identified that the practical influence of the demographic variables on supervision needs could be

represented by the effect size estimates of small ($f^2 = .02$), medium ($f^2 = .15$), and large ($f^2 = .35$).

Along with the multiple regression and effect size calculations, I also created frequency tables of demographic variables from work setting models that had at least minimal practical significance. This information was particularly helpful for my subsequent interpretation of and speculation about the results.

Research Question #4: Single-Sample T-Tests

The final associated question I investigated was: *Are Ontario social workers' needs similar or different from supervision descriptions offered through the literature?* In response to this question, I chose t-tests to statistically compare my data to the literature I reviewed. I took the following steps to transform or quantitize the relevant literature into numerical equations using the scales and subscales from the EFA:

1. I organized the supervision literature according to my five scales.

2. I developed short narratives from the supervision literature. For example, *studies have repeatedly shown that a focus on knowledge and skill enhancement is the most desirable and useful purpose of supervision.* For each particular narrative, I assigned a subscale from the associated scale that I deemed most similar to the qualitative statement. For this example, I chose the Purpose of Supervision Scale, and the third subscale, the Four-fold Purpose of Supervision.

3. For each subscale, I assigned a response from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) to the variables that I believed best represented the intent of the literature. These numbers were added up for a Total Score. Each Total Score became the hypothetical population mean.

To continue with the above example: According to the EFA, the Four-fold Purpose of Supervision contained the following web-survey items:

Q2 = I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the knowledge and skill development of supervisees.

Q3 = I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the emotional support of supervisees.

Q4 = I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.

Q5 = I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the professional development of supervisees.

Since the literature suggests that a focus on knowledge and skill enhancement is the most desirable and useful purpose of supervision, I quantitized the narrative as:

Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5 = 5 + 1 +1 + 1 = 8, where 5 equals Strongly Agree, and 1 equals Strongly Disagree. The Total Score of 8 represents the population mean and the number that would be used to contrast with the mean differences from my data.

I chose to only compare the quantitized findings with the data for all participants and not according to work settings. My reasons were three-fold: (1) the literature seldom specifies a work setting focus; (2) the larger sample size provided the best comparison to the estimated population mean; and (3) this form of engagement with the literature is relatively unusual; therefore I viewed the comparative analysis as exploratory.

Once all the population means were calculated, I performed single-sample T-tests for the 18 subscale Total Scores using the comparable scores of all participants. As well

as determining levels of significance, I also calculated confidence intervals of the mean difference between the two means.

Determining effect size: As stated previously, effect size can be used to demonstrate practical significance of the difference between means. For these comparisons, the larger the effect size the greater the difference between the average response of the participants compared to the literature as represented by the population mean. Effect size could not be statistically calculated due to the absence of a population variance. Nevertheless, I decided that for significantly different comparisons, there could be two notable effect sizes. The effect sizes I created for this analysis were: (1) a medium effect size, which equalled the difference between two responses on the Likert-scale (for example, Disagree compared to Agree), and (2) a large effect size equalled the difference between three responses or more (for example, Disagree compared to Strongly Agree). The effect size indices were calculated over three steps:

i. The highest score possible in the EFA equation was multiplied by the number of items of the equation assigned a score of 1 or above to achieve a score. For Likert scales with six responses I did not include the "No Response" option, so the maximum response for those scales was 5. For equations that had items with a maximum Likert response of 5, but also included Q30, Q31, Q32, or Q33, which have maximum scores of 7, I calculated an average highest score, which equalled 6. Returning to the above example using the Four Fold Purpose of Supervision: The maximum response for any item in the equation was 5. The resulting score was: 5 x 4 (number of items with scores of 1 or above) = 20

ii. For each equation the resulting score was divided by the maximum response score

to find the lowest point on the scale for the combined items. According to the

above example: $20 \div 5 = 4$. Therefore a score of 4 equals Strongly Disagree on

the web-survey.

iii. The lowest point was multiplied by two to equal a medium ES index or three to

equal a large ES index. For the above example a medium SS equals: $4 \times 2 = 8$.

Therefore, for a difference between the population mean and the sample mean to

achieve a medium degree of practical significance, the effect size needed to be

≥ 8. To conclude my example, the difference between the two means was 9.23,

which was greater than the ES of 8. Therefore, participants noticeably disagreed

with published studies that suggest a focus on knowledge and skill enhancement

is the most desirable and useful purpose of supervision.

These comparisons between web-survey results and the knowledge of supervision

according to relevant literature concluded my analysis of the quantitative data.

Interpreting the Inferential Statistical Analysis

At the conclusion of each of the three analyses, I transformed the quantitative

results into interpretative narratives (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Tashakkori & Teddlie,

1998). This was an important step toward the integration of the quantitative analyses.

An Integration of the Quantitative Data Narratives

In order to weave together a comprehensive outcome of the quantitative analysis,

I completed a coherent integration of the various interpretive narratives. The process

involved a careful review of all the quantitative narratives, with repeated data checks of

the statistical analysis. This narrative became a tapestry of shared as well as unique

outcomes that together formed a composite transformation of all the statistical data

(Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). The integration prepared the

quantitative data for the upcoming synthesis with the qualitative findings (Onwuegbuzie

& Teddlie, 2003) that I present in my concluding chapter.

Analysis of the Qualitative Data

The qualitative data was gathered from the written narratives provided by

participants in response to the three open-ended questions of the web-survey. These

questions were:

Q61.   Do you have any other suggestions for effective social work supervision?

Q62.   What objections or concerns do you have about post-degree supervision

for social workers?

Q74.   Your comments about the survey content are welcomed. Do you have any

information that you would like to add?

My interpretations and corresponding data selections were shaped by my first associated

research question, *What do the data reveal about the general needs of Ontario social*

workers? My analysis located in Chapter Seven includes an assessment of the

dependability and credibility of the data as well as the findings from the steps I took to

organize and interpret participants' narratives.

Assessing for Dependability and the Inference Quality known as Credibility

In their classic work, *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed that

the term dependability is the qualitative equivalent of the quantitative construct of

reliability, whereas credibility better represents the conventional concept of internal

validity. Unlike quantitative methods, the process of qualitative data gathering and

analysis forms an intimate interrelationship between dependability and credibility. In other words, how confident I can be that the emergent narratives are authentic representations of the multiple constructions of supervision presented by the participants relies on the stability and rigor of the data collection methods and analytic process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006; Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003).

Strategies that I used to increase the dependability and credibility of the qualitative data were (a) checking that there was congruence among clustered meaning units, (b) looking purposefully for contrasting or exceptional findings, (c) constructing descriptions and interpretations that, as best as possible, resonated with the themes and my research questions, and (d) strengthening associations between the quantitative and qualitative data through data transformation (Rubin & Babbie, 2001; Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Finally, I maintained a reflexive perspective with the data, so that I could be mindful how my preconceived notions about supervision were influencing the analytic process (Rubin & Babbie, 2001).

Processing the Qualitative Data: The Constant Comparative Method

In order to organize and analyse the emergent themes of my qualitative data, I chose to modify the seven step process of the constant comparative analytic template as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 344-351). The following is a description of the seven-step process that I followed for each of the three open-ended web-survey questions. My transformation of the quantitative data was also informed by these ideas.

Step One: Selecting Meaning Units

For the three web-survey questions, each participant's written response was already documented and labelled. Therefore, I began by sorting the narratives into meaning units, using my associated research question as guide. A meaning unit was the smallest unit of information I could select based on two criteria: (1) that the unit had a meaning in relationship to supervision or the web-survey, and (2) the collection of words created a unit of meaning without the need for any additional information. Thus, a meaning unit could be a sentence, a part of a sentence, or a paragraph. For each web-survey question, I selected the first participant response and continued sequentially until I had examined all responses and identified all meaning units according to the above criteria.

Step Two: Finding Thematic Relationships between Meaning Units

My understanding and interpretation of each meaning unit was used to decide which units could reasonably cluster together. The intent of this step was to bring together meaning units that shared a theme with each other. For each web-survey question, the first meaning unit represented "the first entry in the first yet-to-be-named" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 347) group of meaning units. The second, and subsequent meaning units, either joined with previous meaning units or started a new theme based "on a 'feels right' or 'looks right' basis" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 340) when compared to previous meaning units. Thus themes developed and were thickened as meaning units collected together. If a meaning unit did not appear to fit in any of the developing themes, it was used to start a new theme. Meaning units that appeared to be anomalous or

possibly irrelevant were put aside and any particular qualities were noted in the hope of

eventual inclusion with a theme.

Step Three: Creating Headings to Represent Themes

When I had a minimum of six meaning units per theme, I stopped introducing

new meaning units. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), a theme containing six to

eight meaning units was a sufficient number for extrapolating a theme heading, which

would make further sorting easier. For each theme I assigned a heading that embodied the

essence of the theme shared between the meaning units. Once each heading was created, I

confirmed congruence by reviewing the meaning units of each theme. Those meaning

units that seemed incompatible with the heading were removed to join another theme or

were placed in the miscellaneous group.

Step Four: Exhausting all Meaning Units

All further meaning units were placed in a theme according to their fit with the

theme heading or they were used to create a new theme. Steps one and two continued

until all meaning units were reviewed.

Step Five: Reviewing the Themes

I reviewed the "miscellaneous pile" to see what meaning units could be located in

one of the themes. As well, I examined each theme for internal homogeneity and external

differences among themes. As a result I created some new themes and headings and some

meaning units moved to themes with which they were more congruent.

Step Six: Integrating Themes

This stage involved the integration of data from the three questions. I re-read the

themes and meaning units of each question and sought out all possible relationships. This

meant some themes were blended together and corresponding new theme names were assigned to be more clearly inclusive of meaning units.

Step Seven: Creating Categories:

A review of the themes revealed that there were overarching similarities and differences that permitted a meta-level of organization. Thus, for the final step of my analysis, I gathered themes together according to categories that represented shared meanings among themes.

A Meta-Integration of the Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Chapter Eight includes the final phase of my analysis, which was the creation of a meta-narrative that wove together the quantitative and qualitative findings. My intent was to form a comprehensive description of supervision needs and current or recent experiences according to social work participants.

Following the creation of the integrated quantitative narrative, my second step was to weave in the qualitative findings. In order to do so, I used my research design as guide. This meant that the quantitative findings provided the dominant structure for the meta-integration narrative so that the qualitative findings were included to thicken and enrich the quantitative narrative. First, I selected qualitative findings that enhanced the various aspects of the quantitative data. Second, to further augment the composite description, I included qualitative themes that were not part of my quantitative inquiry. This meta-integration narrative became the focus for my concluding discussion.

CHAPTER SIX: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS & INTERPRETATIONS

My discussion of the quantitative findings from the web-surveys of the 636

participants corresponds to each stage of my analysis outlined in Chapter Five. I conclude

this chapter with an integration narrative of the quantitative findings. I acknowledge that

my meanings of these data are tentative, context and time-bound constructions.

Assessing for Reliability

Following the pre-test with 16 participants, Cronbach's Alpha for the fixed choice

items was strong at .781. After I completed the suggested changes to the web-survey, the

results for the 59 supervision items showed an average inter-item correlation of .854,

which indicates high measurement reliability.

As I previously noted, homogeneity among a large number of items could falsely

inflate the Alpha coefficient and camouflage the existence of independent constructs. It

was important, therefore, to assess the reliability of the five scales that emerged from the

EFA (see below). Calculations of Cronbach's Alpha for each scale demonstrated

acceptable (Alpha = .629) to high complimentarity (Alpha = .877) between scale items

(see Table 1). Therefore, an overall reliability estimate of .854 suggests that the web-

survey is a stable measure of supervision needs for the 636 participants.

SCALE NUMBER & ASPECT OF SUPERVISION	Cronbach's Alpha
SCALE 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13)	.629
SCALE 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24)	.672
SCALE 3: Timing & Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33)	.754
SCALE 4: Training & Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34 – Q44)	.713
SCALE 5: The Place in Supervision for the SW Mission of Social Justice & Social Change (Q45 – Q60)	.877

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for the Five Scales of the Supervision Questionnaire, where the complete questionnaire Alpha = .854

Inference Quality: Assessing Validity

Outcomes of the Content Validity Assessment

Prior to the launch of the web-survey, various social workers and pre-test participants submitted written and verbal comments about the wording of questionnaire items. All concerns and suggestions were considered, compared, and contrasted. The outcome was changes to wording for various items that helped to broaden the applicability of the statement or question, and more precisely focus the statement or question. Given the feedback I received, it appeared that I had adequately represented the multiple facets of the supervision experience.

Outcomes of the Construct Validity Analysis

I determined that principle component analysis was a suitable option for factor extraction and construct creation since the following conditions were present: (a) my sample was large (636 respondents), and (b) there were over 10 times the number of participants relative to the number of questionnaire items (59).

The results of the exploratory factor analysis allowed me "to make informal inferences" (Brace et al., 2006, p. 303) that certain items correlated highly with each other and not to others. The analyses supported the validity of five different constructs of supervision, represented by their respective scales, subscales, and factored items from the web-survey. The five constructs or scales were: (1) the purpose of supervision, (2) the place of authority in the supervision relationship (3) the timing and length of supervision during a social worker's career, (4) the training and discipline of the supervisor, and (5) the place in supervision of the social work mission of social justice and social change.

For each scale, I provide a table of the full factor matrix (Henson & Roberts,

2006), followed by a brief narrative description of each named subscale based on the

factored items identified in their corresponding table. The factored items for each

subscale were chosen if correlation coefficients were .50 or more. (Please see Appendix

G for a listing of scales, subscales and corresponding questionnaire items). I conclude

this section with a transformation of the quantitative results of the factor analysis into a

narrative of supervision needs and current or recent experiences according to the

participants.

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13): Four Subscales

Web-Survey Item	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	Subscale 4	h^2
Q2	.074	.050	**.783**	.052	.623
Q3	.151	.016	**.588**	**-.469**	.588
Q4	-.317	-.095	**.531**	.053	.394
Q5	.023	-.037	**.705**	.265	.569
Q6	.063	.125	.177	**.780**	.660
Q7	**.577**	-.039	.184	.393	.523
Q8	**.752**	-.040	-7.96E-005	.090	.575
Q9	**.638**	-.221	-.080	-.119	.477
Q10	**.679**	.432	-.004	-.053	.650
Q11	-.033	**.876**	-.002	.051	.771
Q12	**.699**	.439	-.038	.003	.684
Q13	.053	**.854**	-.041	.074	.739
% of variance	19.944	16.308	15.102	9.099	

All factors (i.e., subscales) with an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and confirmed on the scree plot were selected. Items for each subscale are identified as the bolded coefficients equal to or greater than .50. Communality coefficients are represented by h^2. Variance percentage is post-rotation. Alpha = .629

Table 2. Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision – Heuristic Factor Pattern and Structural Matrix using Varimax Rotation

Subscale 1: Separate purpose needs and their benefits. The need to separate

practice/clinical supervision from evaluations or performance appraisals is positively

associated with time needed to reflect on ethical practice and practice concerns, and the

belief that supervision is really for surveillance purposes.

Subscale 2: Separating practice and administrative supervision. In current or recent experiences practice/clinical supervision provided by one person is positively associated with another person providing administrative supervision and the evaluations/performance appraisals of staff.

Subscale 3: Four-fold purpose of supervision. The purpose of supervision has a positive association between: (a) the knowledge and skill development (b) the emotional support, and (c) the professional development of supervisees, as well as (d) work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.

Subscale 4: Less emotional support, more ethical conversations. Less focus on emotional support is associated with using supervision more as a primary forum for talking about ethical issues of practice.

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24): Four Subscales

Web-Survey Item	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	Subscale 4	h^2
Q14	.192	**.756**	.025	.048	.600
Q15	-.039	.214	-.042	**.815**	.732
Q16	.015	**.586**	-.033	.136	.422
Q17	.002	**.517**	.173	-.213	.376
Q18	.005	.431	-.179	**-.593**	.562
Q19	**.763**	.101	.021	.030	.577
Q20	**.778**	-.027	.167	.054	.648
Q21	**.809**	.099	.076	-.016	.652
Q22	**.800**	.066	.164	-.140	.688
Q23	.137	-.061	**.834**	.226	.710
Q24	.208	.179	**.802**	-.170	.768
% of variance	23.476	13.402	13.321	10.785	

All factors (i.e., subscales) with an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and confirmed on the scree plot were selected. Items for each subscale are identified as the bolded coefficients equal to or greater than .50. Communality coefficients are represented by h^2. Variance percentage is post-rotation. Alpha = .672

Table 3. Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship – Heuristic Factor Pattern and Structural Matrix using Varimax Rotation

Subscale 1: Advice and planning needs and experiences. The need for and the current practice/recent experience of getting advice from supervisors is positively associated with the need for and the current practice/recent experience of planning together what to do for clients.

Subscale 2: More supervisor authority by knowledge and skills, less equality for social workers. The more supervisor authority is based on their expert knowledge and skills and the more OCSWSSW endorses supervisors to assess social workers' competencies, the less social worker's knowledge and skills have equal value compared to supervisors.

Subscale 3: Power talk needs and experiences. The need for discussion with supervisors about power differences in the supervision relationship is positively associated with this being currently or recently experienced by social workers.

Subscale 4: More positional authority, less social worker autonomy. The more supervisors' authority is perceived according to their workplace position, the more professional autonomy is discouraged.

Scale 3. Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33): Three Subscales

Web-Survey Item	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	h^2
Q25	.074	.040	**.865**	.755
Q26	.153	.090	**.834**	.727
Q27	**.697**	.230	.342	.656
Q28	**.876**	.157	.002	.791
Q29	**.844**	.242	.095	.780
Q30	.304	**.666**	.132	.553
Q31	.067	**.658**	.094	.447
Q32	.145	**.730**	-.119	.568
Q33	.185	**.690**	.127	.527
% of variance	23.843	22.579	18.066	

All factors (i.e., subscales) with an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and confirmed on the scree plot were selected. Items for each subscale are identified as the bolded coefficients equal to or greater than .50. Communality coefficients are represented by h^2. Variance percentage is post-rotation. Alpha = .754

Table 4. Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision – Heuristic Factor Pattern and Structural Matrix using Varimax Rotation

Subscale 1: Need ongoing supervision, OK for autonomy. The more social

workers endorse ongoing supervision the more they agree that their professional

autonomy is not discouraged and that supervision not end after a certain period.

Subscale 2: Four-fold supervision purpose ongoing. There is a positive

association between the maximum length of time for supervision after graduation for

knowledge and skill development, emotional support, administrative accountability, and

professional development.

Subscale 3: Supervision needed for new graduates and new employees. A period

of supervision after graduation is positively associated with the need for supervision for

new employees.

Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34 – Q44): Three Subscales

Web-Survey Item	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	h^2
Q34	.020	.086	**.865**	.757
Q35	-.013	.097	**.762**	.591
Q36	-.013	.019	**.807**	.651
Q37	-.186	**.559**	.183	.380
Q38	**.722**	-.065	-.012	.525
Q39	.114	**.706**	-.061	.516
Q40	**.740**	.027	-.058	.552
Q41	.157	**.855**	.097	.765
Q42	**.845**	.186	.040	.750
Q43	.166	**.854**	.058	.761
Q44	**.865**	.150	.029	.771
% of variance	23.916	21.377	18.516	

All factors (i.e., subscales) with an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and confirmed on the scree plot were selected. Items for each subscale are identified as the bolded coefficients equal to or greater than .50. Communality coefficients are represented by h^2. Variance percentage is post-rotation. Alpha = .713

Table 5. Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor – Heuristic Factor Pattern and Structural Matrix using Varimax Rotation

Subscale 1: Experiences of supervisor training plus knowledge. The current or

most recent experiences of supervisors who have supervisor training is positively related

to supervisors' knowledge and skills about the work setting and clients, their knowledge

about the OSW Code of Ethics, and their current knowledge about legal requirements for

social work practice.

Subscale 2: Supervisor training plus knowledge needed. The need for supervisors

to have supervisor training is positively related to the need for supervisors to have

knowledge and skills about the work setting and clients, about the OASW Code of Ethics,

and the legal requirements for social work practice.

Subscale 3: Supervisors need to be experienced social workers. The need for

supervisors to be social workers is positively associated with the need that supervisors

have a social work degree and previous social work practice experience.

Scale 5: The Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and

Social Change (Q45-Q60): Three Subscales

Web-Survey Item	Subscale 1	Subscale 2	Subscale 3	h^2
Q45	.051	**.755**	-.110	.585
Q46	**.805**	.153	-.038	.673
Q47	.059	**.774**	-.056	.605
Q48	**.824**	.149	-.081	.708
Q49	.098	**.778**	.172	.645
Q50	**.839**	.065	.056	.711
Q51	.007	**.757**	.132	.591
Q52	**.801**	.026	.114	.656
Q53	.067	**.753**	.198	.612
Q54	**.807**	.058	.085	.662
Q55	.083	.332	**.775**	.718
Q56	**.546**	-.050	**.621**	.686
Q57	.054	**.687**	.411	.644
Q58	**.786**	-.028	.268	.691
Q59	.051	**.580**	**.561**	.655
Q60	**.705**	-.025	.450	.701
% of variance	29.824	24.326	11.736	

All factors (i.e., subscales) with an eigenvalue-greater-than-1 and confirmed on the scree plot were selected. Items for each subscale are identified as the bolded coefficients equal to or greater than .50. Communality coefficients are represented by h^2. Variance percentage is post-rotation. Alpha = .877

Table 6. Scale 5: The Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change – Heuristic Factor Pattern and Structural Matrix using Varimax Rotation

Subscale 1: Experiences of supervision and the social work mission. In current or recent experiences how well supervision helps social workers promote social justice and change is positively associated with how well supervision helps promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice, and how well social workers are helped to recognise and respect the cultural diversity of their practice communities, challenge unjust policies and practices, see how individual change and social justice are possible for clients, advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings, together talk in supervision about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege clients, and find ways for social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

Subscale 2: Need for supervision to promote the social work mission. The need for supervision to help social workers promote social justice and change is positively associated with the need for supervision to promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice, and the need for supervisors to help social workers recognise and respect the cultural diversity of their practice communities, challenge unjust policies and practices, see how individual change and social justice are possible for clients, and the need to talk together in supervision about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege clients and the need to find ways for social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

Subscale 3: Needs and experiences of advocacy, balancing care and control. The need and current or recent experiences for supervisors to help social workers advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings is positively associated with the need and current or recent experiences of supervisors helping social workers find ways in their practice to ethically balance care with control.

An Interpretative Narrative: Data Transformation of the EFA Scales and Subscales

The qualitization of the emergent scales and subscales formed into the following narrative that I organized according to my interpretations of the quantitative data.

The construct, the Purpose of Supervision, is woven together from four thematic threads. The first theme suggested that participant's need for more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice and practice concerns was related to their need for practice/clinical supervision to be separated from staff evaluations or performance appraisals. In turn, as these unmet needs increase, the belief that supervision is really for surveillance purposes also increases. The second purpose theme is related as participants highlighted that current or recent experiences of practice/clinical supervision provided by one person is positively associated with another person providing administrative supervision and the evaluations/performance appraisals of staff. Third, respondents need supervision to include a four-fold purpose of knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development, as well as work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures. Nevertheless, the final theme suggests that less focus on emotional support can mean more time to talk about ethical practice issues.

The first of four themes about Authority in the Supervision Relationship highlights how the need for and the current or recent experience of getting advice from supervisors is positively associated with planning together what to do for clients. Although the assistance from supervisors is needed, the second theme identifies that appreciation of the social workers' knowledge and skill is also important. The more supervisors' authority is based on their expert knowledge and skills, and the OCSWSSW

endorses supervisors to assess social workers' competencies, the less social worker's

knowledge and skills have equal value compared to supervisors. To help sort out the

authority of the supervisor, the third theme suggests that the need for social workers to

engage in discussions with supervisors about power differences in the supervision

relationship is positively associated for those social workers who have currently or

recently experienced these conversations. In other words, experiencing such a

conversation can increase the need for more opportunities. Finally, the fourth theme

identifies that the more supervisors' authority is perceived according to their workplace

position, the more professional autonomy is discouraged. This suggests that supervisors

are best to be mindful in their use of their work place authority.

Professional autonomy is also an important theme of the construct identified as

the Timing and Length of Supervision. Social workers who endorsed career-long, on-

going supervision also agreed that their professional autonomy was not discouraged.

Second, there appears to be a positive association between the maximum length of time

for supervision after graduation for knowledge and skill development, emotional support,

administrative accountability, and professional development. For the third and final

theme, participants were clear that a period of supervision is needed for new graduates

and new employees.

The Training and Discipline of the Supervisor was organized into three thematic

clusters. In a combination of two themes, participants supported the idea that the need for

and the current or most recent experiences of supervisors who have supervisor training

are positively related to supervisors' knowledge and skills about the work setting and

clients, their knowledge about the OSW Code of Ethics, and their current knowledge

about legal requirements for social work practice. The third theme is clear that the need

for supervisors to be social workers is positively associated with the need that supervisors

have a social work degree and previous social work practice experience.

Finally, three themes highlight the importance of the Place in Supervision for the

Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change. Current or recent experiences

of supervision conversations that promote all aspects of social justice and change as

stated on the questionnaire were positively associated with how well supervision helps

promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice. Moreover, that positive

association extends to current or recent experiences of supervisors helping social workers

advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings and to finding ways for social work

practice to ethically balance care with control. For the second theme, characteristics of

the social work mission were also recognised as a cluster of needs for participants. The

third and final theme weaves together the need and current or recent experiences that

supervisors help social workers advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings and

find ways in their practice to ethically balance care with control.

Summary Comments about the Exploratory Factor Analysis

The exploratory factor analysis actualized numerical representations of the

constructs under investigation. The five scales and their corresponding subscales appear

to provide data that are quantitatively credible, valid, and reliable. The different

dimensions or factors of the questionnaire collectively address the various facets of the

supervision experience. The transformation of this numerical data into narrative form

enriches the interpretative qualities of the emergent supervision themes. These outcomes

assured me that further analysis with the web-survey data would provide results that would legitimately illustrate the shared meanings of the participants.

Exploratory Data Analysis

The demographic data (Appendix H) and the frequency tables of each supervision statement and question (Appendix I) provided me with the necessary information to (a) consider who my participants were and how well they represent Ontario social workers, and (b) consider what supervision needs emerged out of the data distributions.

Participant Profiles and their Representation of Ontario Social Workers

The dominant participant profile is a White (83%) woman (86%), with a MSW (79%), practicing in a metropolitan area (48%) hospital (23%), CMHC (18%), CW/CAS (20%), or FCA (10%), counselling with individuals, families, or groups (43%). She could be in her thirties (29%), her forties (28%), or her fifties (25%). Since her first social work degree, she is likely to have been practicing between 6 to 10 years (22%) or for 21 years or more (27%).

According to participants, the dominant profile for a supervisor is a White (88%), female (74%) social worker (64%) who has a scheduled one-hour meeting less than once per month (34%), once per month (31%), or twice per month (21%), no matter how long the social work supervisees have been practicing. For example, of the 56 participants who have been practicing for 2 years or less, 59% are in their twenties. Given that these are social workers with the least amount of experience, it is notable that in their dominant places of employment – CW/CAS (29%), CMHC (16%), hospitals (16%), and family counselling (11%) – 34% reportedly do not have supervision during an average month.

Social workers with three to five years of experience (N=83) appear to have similar experiences.

Alternative profiles share some of the qualities above with a number of exceptions. For example, 30% of participants reported that their current or most recent primary work setting was at any one of 18 identified settings such as a community development or advocacy organization (2%), a government department (2%), or private practice (5%). Along with counselling, primary work responsibilities included hospital social work (20%), child welfare work (16%), and community worker and/or advocate (5%). A notable number of respondents indicated that their work setting was in a rural and urban area (23%) or an urban city (18%). Supervision for 37% of participants was provided by a wide variety of people, including nurses (9%); psychologists (5%); psychiatrists (3%), or various other persons (20%) such as lawyers, an anthropologist, child and youth workers, and Masters level counsellors.

A notable difference between social workers and supervisors is that 18% of practitioners self-described membership with a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, ethnicity), whereas only 9% of all supervisors were identified by participants as members of a minoritized group. Social workers who self-identified as members of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Colour, Black, Visible Minority) made up 6% of total participants and 5% of supervisors were identified as members of a racialized group. Yet, in spite of these apparently similar numbers, only 7 racialized social workers (18%) out of 40 indicated that they had a racialized supervisor. Likewise, out of the 11 self-described Aboriginal/First Nations social workers, only two (18%) identified that their supervisors were Aboriginal/First Nations people.

Participant Profiles in Relation to Population Profiles

My study population was represented by the 2007 membership of the OASW. For comparison purposes I constructed a tentative population profile using data from the OASW *Quality of Work Life Survey-Final Report* (Antle, et al., 2006) based on 1,114 participants who completed the survey during the fall of 2005.

The dominate profile of an Ontario social worker is a woman (83%) with a MSW (63%), working in a large urban centre (65%) at a health setting (including hospitals, adult mental health, community health centres, family health teams) (55%) or child and family services (including CAW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCA) (30%) with individuals, families, or groups (67%). She could be in her thirties (24%) or her forties (28%). She is likely to have been practicing for 21 years or more (28%) with fewer working for 6 to 10 years (13%), 11 to 15 years (14%) and 16 to 20 years (17%). Along with working in a metropolitan area, alternative employment locations include rural and urban areas (12%) or urban cities (21%). Supervision or consultation for approximately 60% of Ontario social workers was provided by social workers. For the other 40% of social worker supervisees, supervision or consultation was provided by a wide variety of persons including nurses (33.6%), psychologists (5%), or other persons (25%) such as lawyers, dieticians, and early childhood educators.

Table 7 below provides a visual comparison of web-survey participant profiles and the profiles of Ontario social workers. Some profile characteristics were combined to best suit all data sources. The comparison according to work settings and service focus is very tentative since the information was collected using different criteria. Even so, there

appears to be notable similarities between the two groups, suggesting that the web survey

participants were representative of Ontario social workers.

Profile Characteristics	Web-Survey Participants N = 636	Ontario Social Workers N = 1,114
Gender – Women	86%	83%
Degree – MSW	79%	63%
Age Range • 30s • 40s • 50s	29% 28% 25%	24% 28% 15%
Years of Practice • 6-10 years • 11-15 years • 16-20 years • 21 years +	22% 14% 15% 27%	13% 14% 17% 28%
Geographical Setting • Metropolitan area • Urban city • Rural-urban area	48% 18% 23%	65% 21% 12%
Work Setting • Health settings* • Child & family services**	33% 48%	55% 30%
Service Focus • Individuals, families, groups***	81%	67%
SW supervisor	64%	60%

* including hospitals, adult mental health, community health centres, family health teams
**including child welfare, children's mental health centres, family counselling agencies
***includes counselling, hospital social work, child welfare work, school social work

Table 7. Profile Comparisons of Web-Survey Participants and Other Ontario Social Workers.

For one variable, "job responsibilities," I was able to access data from the

OCSWSSW. The OCSWSSW (2006) annual report identified that, as of December 31,

2006, the primary job responsibilities of 68% of registered social workers was clinical

practice, followed by management/administration, policy planning and analysis, program

design, evaluation and consultation (18%); community development and organization

(7%); and research and training (5%).

Although I was unable to access OCSWSSW members, I wondered about the

potential inference transferability of my web-survey data to the College identified

population of social workers on this variable, job responsibilities. Table 8 below is a

presentation of the data. I used the categories and results of the web-survey question 67

(In your current or most recent work setting where you received supervision, your

primary job has been), and created comparable categories for the College and OASW

members. The data suggest that web-survey participants were reasonably representative

of Ontario social workers according to their membership with the OASW and the

College.

Primary Job Responsibilities	Web-Survey Participants N=636	OASW Study N=1,114	OCSWSSW Members N=10,289
Direct/clinical practice	81%	67%	68%
Management/administration, Policy planning/analysis, Program design/evaluation, Consultation	11%	10%	18%
Community development and organization	5%	5%	7%
Research and training	3%	4%	5%

Table 8. Profile Comparisons of Primary Job Responsibilities for Web-Survey Participants and Other Ontario Social Workers.

An Interpretation of Participant Profiles

The web-survey demographics provided a number of qualities that wove together

to form a tentative, albeit simplistic description of the respondents. Profile comparisons

based on data provided by the OASW and gathered from the OCSWSSW suggest that the

web-survey participants can be considered representative of Ontario social workers.

The average social worker appears to be a White woman between 30-50 years of

age with a MSW, who provides counselling services with individuals, families, or groups

in a metropolitan area hospital, CMHC, CW/CAS, or FCA. Since her first social work

degree, she is likely to have been practicing between 6 to 10 years or for 21 years or

more. The profile of the typical supervisor appears to be a White woman, identified by

respondents as a social worker by profession. Social worker and supervisor have

scheduled one-hour meetings between less than once per month to twice per month, no

matter how long the social work supervisees have been practicing.

Aside from these dominant descriptions, alternative qualities emerged that hint at

the complexity of practice and supervision needs for social workers in Ontario. A

significant number of social workers appear to be poorly represented by their supervisors

according to discipline and self-described identities such as race or ethnicity.

The Emerging Supervision Needs

Time spent reflecting on the frequencies and numerical center and spread of each

of the 59 items (See Appendix I) allowed me to consider web-survey statements that

inspired cohesion and variability of responses, thus suggesting dominant and emergent

supervision needs. This process allowed me to explore my first associated research

question: *What do the data reveal about the needs of Ontario social workers?*

In the following discussion of each of the five scales, I highlight points of

apparent agreement, disagreement,[12] noticeable differences of opinion, and when the

responses "not sure" and "no response" applied to over 10% of the 636 participants.

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2-Q13)

There appeared to be consistent and compelling agreement that the purpose of

supervision for participants had four axioms: knowledge and skill development (96%),

professional development (95%), emotional support (90%), and administrative tasks

---

[12] Agreement = agree + strongly agree scores; Disagreement = disagree + strongly disagree scores

(80%). This degree of cohesive unity between participants dissipated for the two statements concerning the possible role of supervision conversations with ethical issues in practice. In response to the idea that supervision is a primary place for such conversations, social workers were almost equally divided, with 52% indicating agreement. Moreover, the need for more time in supervision to reflect on ethical practice not only resulted in divided opinions (39% agreed, 37% disagreed), but 18% replied with "not sure."

The presence of evaluation or performance appraisals also resulted in a lack of unity, with 28% acknowledging that this task made it difficult for them to raise practice issues in supervision compared to 60% who disagreed. Although 71% of respondents disagreed that supervision was really for surveillance purposes, 11% weren't sure, and 16% agreed. In relation to these points, the idea of one person providing supervision and another person completing staff evaluations/performance appraisals was an expressed need for 30% of participants. Even so, the need for one person to provide practice/clinical supervision and another person to provide administrative supervision was quite divisive, with 46% disagreeing, 39% in agreement, and 11% not sure.

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14-Q24)

Participants appeared to share agreement (90%) that the authority of supervisors was due to their workplace position. In contrast, the authority and value of supervisors' knowledge and skills in relationship to social workers prompted a wide array of responses. The belief that supervisors had authority over social workers because of their expertise was endorsed by 37% of respondents, however, 11% indicated that they weren't sure, leaving only a slim majority who disagreed (52%). When respondents considered if

their knowledge and skills had equal value to supervisors, 67% agreed/strongly agreed, while 21% disagreed or weren't sure (10%).

The disparity of opinions on the value and authority status of supervisor knowledge and skill became quite apparent in the spread of responses to the proposal that the OCSWSSW should give supervisors authority to assess social worker competency. Seventeen percent agreed, whereas 56% disagreed. Although those positions appear considerably different, 26% indicated that they were not sure, suggesting that a polarity of opinion could surface should the idea gain attention.

For most social workers, their professional autonomy was not discouraged (72%) by the authority of supervisors, no matter how that authority was understood. Nevertheless, 19% believed that their ability to make independent practice decisions was discouraged because of supervisors' authority.

Given the differing viewpoints about how knowledge and skills could add to the authority of supervisors, it is not surprising that the need for discussions about power differences also resulted in a range of opinions. Forty-one percent disagreed, whereas 38% agreed that supervision conversations about the discrepancy of power between supervisors and social workers were needed. It is also worthy of mention that 15% were not sure if they needed these discussions or not.

Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25-Q33)

The need for supervision after graduation (98%), for new employees (97%), and for experienced social workers (86%) received exceptionally strong endorsement. In fact, 80% disagreed that after a certain period supervision needs to end. Moreover, 78% of

respondents were clear that supervision that lasts for years is not associated with any

experiences of reduced professional autonomy.

The strongest reason for career long supervision after graduation was for

emotional support (77%), followed closely by the need for professional development

(75%). A diversity of opinion was more evident when supervision was for knowledge and

skill development: 63% agreed it was needed for the duration of the social worker's

career, whereas 25% indicated time frames up to and including 3 years. Finally, the need

for career long supervision for administrative accountability was shared only by 53% of

respondents.

Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34-Q44)

In order to provide social work supervision, respondents agreed that supervisors

need a degree in social work (75%) and previous social work experience (87%).

Correspondingly, 75% concurred that supervision from a social worker, as opposed to a

professional from another discipline, helps respondents better learn and practice social

work. Nevertheless, respondents demonstrated that supervision requires more than social

work knowledge and experience. Eighty-eight percent of participants agreed that

supervisors need specific supervisor training, while 87% approved the need for

supervisors to have practice knowledge and skills relevant to their work setting and

people served. Finally, supervisors who have knowledge of the Ontario Social Work

Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice (84%) and the legal requirements for the social

worker's setting (85%) are strongly sanctioned needs for respondents.

Scale 5: The Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and

Social Change (Q45-Q60)

For 70% of the respondents, a purpose of supervision is to help social workers

promote social justice and change. Notably for this item, 13% were unsure and 14%

disagreed. However, when the statements became more specific, endorsement noticeably

increased. Seventy-seven to eighty-two percent of participants agreed that supervision

was to help social workers promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive practice (81%); recognize

and respect cultural diversity (82%); challenge unjust policies and practices (81%); and

see how individual change and social justice could be possible for the people they serve

(77%). Supervision was also desired to be a relationship where conversations were

possible about how individual and social issues, such as racism and sexism, could

oppress or privilege clients (79%), and how to best ethically balance care with control

(78%). Lastly, when applicable, participants needed supervisors to help advocate for

clients during interdisciplinary meetings (79%).

Considering Data Relationships

I used correlation analysis to investigate the possible linear relationships between

age, years of experience, and geographical location, with the five supervision items that

had a spread of scores and a high percentage of "not sure" responses. The items were (a)

the need for reflection and discussion about ethical issues during supervision, (b) the need

for one person to provide practice/clinical supervision and another person administrative

supervision, (c) the authority of supervisors due to their expert knowledge and skills, (d)

the role of the OCSWSSW to grant supervisors authority to assess the competency of

social workers, and (e) the need for discussions in supervision about power differences.

From a total of 20 correlation equations, there were three statistically significant

relationships of demographics with supervision aspects, all of which achieved practical,

albeit minimal relevance (Small ES = .10) (See Table 9 below). First, the need for one

person providing practice/clinical supervision and another person providing

administrative supervision was negatively correlated with how long participants had been

practicing following their first social work degree ($r = - .096$, $p = .016$, two-tailed). This

association suggests that the fewer the years of social work practice, the greater the need

for divided supervision responsibilities. Second, the belief that supervisors have authority

over social workers because of their expert knowledge and skills also had a negative

relationship with the current age of participants ($r = - .152$, $p < .001$, two-tailed) and how

long they had been practicing following their first social work degree ($r = - .160$, $p <$

.001, two-tailed). In other words, the younger and less experienced participants were, the

more they believed supervisor's authority came from the supervisor's expertise (See

Table 4 below).

Web-Survey Item	Q10	Q14
Q69		$r = - .152$ $p < .001$
Q63	$r = - .096$ $p = .016$	$r = - .160$ $p < .001$
N	636	636

Where Q69 = Age of participants; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q10 = Division of
supervision tasks; Q14 = Authority of supervisors because of their expert knowledge and skills.
Table 9. Effect Sizes between Demographics and Aspects of Supervision.

An Interpretation of What is Revealed through an Exploration of the Web-Survey Data

The emergent dominant composite of supervision contained elements from all

aspects of supervision. Participants appeared strongly united in their belief that the

purpose of supervision needs to address knowledge and skill development, professional

development, emotional support, and administrative tasks. Furthermore, the purpose of

supervision needs to promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive practice, recognize and respect

cultural diversity, and challenge unjust policies and practices. The supervisor who

engaged supervisees in these purposes would have authority to do so because of their

workplace position and supervision training. Moreover, respondents were clear in their

need for supervisors with previous social work experience, knowledge of the Ontario

Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, and the skills, practice knowledge,

and legal knowledge appropriate to work settings and people served. According to

results, this formation of supervision is needed on an ongoing basis for new graduates

and new employees as well as experienced social workers.

Alternatively, threads of difference were apparent concerning the purpose of

supervision. Opinions were divided over the need for supervision to provide more

conversational space or to be the primary place to address ethical issues in practice. As

well, the individual items regarding the separation of practice focused supervision from

administrative or performance/evaluation tasks demonstrated a range of opinions. A

notable minority acknowledged that the presence of evaluations or performance

appraisals made it difficult to discuss practice issues, and a third of participants agreed or

weren't sure if supervision was primarily for surveillance purposes.

The authority of the supervisor also had elements of variability. The idea that

supervision authority was due to the supervisor's expertise did not receive shared

endorsement or rejection. Greater years of experience appeared to be associated with less

belief that supervisor's authority came from supervisor's expertise. Whatever the

attributions given for supervisors' authority, a small but noticeable number of participants

(20%) identified that their ability to make independent practice decisions was discouraged because of that authority. The variability of needs was further reflected in the mixed responses, particularly those who were undecided, to the idea of the OCSWSSW endowing supervisors with the capacity to assess professional competencies. Finally, differences between participants also surfaced concerning the need for supervision discussions about power differences.

While a need for on-going supervision was sanctioned by the majority, a sizable group of participants (25%) indicated that supervision for knowledge and skill development was only needed for up to 3 years. Practice experience as a social worker was apparently desirable, yet approximately a quarter of respondents did not endorse a social work degree or professional affiliation for supervisors. Finally, the items concerning the social work mission identify that responses depend on what is being stated. The need for supervision to help social workers promote overall social justice and change resulted in some disagreement and uncertainty. On the other hand, cohesive responses were associated with specific aspects of social justice such as promoting anti-racist, anti-oppressive practice, or challenging unjust policies and practices.

Finally, there were associations with practical significance between selected aspects of supervision and certain demographic qualities. First, the more practice experience social workers had, the less need for practice/clinical supervision and administrative supervision to be provided by two different people. Second, the older and more experienced participants were, the less they believed that supervisors' authority came from the supervisors' expertise.

Inferential Statistical Analyses and Effect Size Estimates

An assessment of the variable data assured me that, although several distributions were somewhat skewed, approximate symmetry, independence, and homogeneity did not appear adversely effected. Corresponding to my analysis, for each of my three research questions, I present findings with practical significance that were calculated only for statistically significant results. Outcome data for the statistical significant findings are available in corresponding Appendices.

Do Social Workers' Supervision Needs for Specific Aspects of Supervision Differ Significantly Compared to What They have Currently or Recently Experienced?

A total of 20 paired t-tests were calculated for five participant groups according to needs for and current or recent experiences of (i) administrative tasks, (ii) authority in the supervision relationship, (iii) supervisor training, and (iv) the place of the social work mission for social justice and social change (See Appendix J for the findings). There were 19 statistically significant results that also had practical significance.

Administrative Tasks

On average, all participants, as well as social workers currently or recently employed at hospitals, CW/CASs, or FCAs, indicated that their needs for one person to provide practice/clinical supervision and another person to provide administrative supervision and staff evaluations or performance appraisals were significantly greater ($p < .001$), with a medium degree of effect, compared to what they currently or recently experienced. For social workers with CMHCs, findings indicate that the difference is statistically significant ($p = .005$), but with minimal effect (see Table 10).

Employment Setting	All settings N=636	Hospital N=146	CW/CAS N=124	CMHC N=111	FCA N=65
Effect Size	$d = .50$ Medium	$d = .73$ Medium	$d = .50$ Medium	$d = .33$ Small	$d = .52$ Medium

Table 10. Effect Sizes for Administrative Tasks.

Authority in the Supervision Relationship

The need for supervisors to give advice, for supervisors to plan together with

social workers about what to do for clients, and for discussions about power differences

to occur in supervision was significantly greater than what was currently or recently

occurring for four out of five employment groups ($p \leq .001$). Results for participants

from CW/CAS employment settings were not significant ($t = 1.35$, df $= 123, p = .181$).

Medium effect sizes were evident for hospital and CMHC participants, whereas

for total participants and FCA social workers, effect sizes were small (See Table 11).

Employment Setting	All settings N=636	Hospital N=146	CMHC N=111	FCA N=65
Effect Size	$d = .31$ Small	$d = .50$ Medium	$d = .50$ Medium	$d = .30$ Small

Table 11. Effect Sizes for Authority in the Supervision Relationship.

Supervisor Training and Discipline

The results from the five analyses strongly suggest that the need for supervisors to

be trained for supervision, and to have profession specific and setting specific knowledge,

has not been currently or recently met for any employment setting ($p < .001$). Moreover,

for each participant group, effect sizes were large (See Table 12).

Employment Setting	All settings N=636	Hospital N=146	CW/CAS N=124	CMHC N=111	FCA N=65
Effect Size	$d = .84$ Large	$d = .95$ Large	$d = .80$ Large	$d = .80$ Large	$d = .80$ Large

Table 12. Effect Sizes for Training and Discipline.

The Place in Supervision of the Social Work Mission for Social Justice and Change

Participants across all work settings identified a significant need for supervision

to recognize, promote, and provide conversational space for the various identified aspects

of the social work mission of social justice and change ($p < .001$). The effect size for all

participants ($d = .80$), hospital social workers ($d = .91$) and participants from CW/CASs

($d = .84$) were large. The findings for CMHC and FCA participants indicate effect sizes

that approach large (See Table 13).

Employment Setting	All settings N=636	Hospital N=146	CW/CAS N=124	CMHC ·N=111	FCA N=65
Effect Size	$d = .80$ Large	$d = .91$ Large	$d = .84$ Large	$d = .73$ Med/large	$d = .70$ Med/large

Table 13. Effect Sizes for the Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission.

An Interpretation of Supervision Needs Compared to Current or Recent Experiences

For each of the five work settings, participants' results suggest that what they

need concerning identified administrative supervision and staff evaluations/performance

appraisals, supervisor training, and the inclusion of the place of the social work mission

for social justice and change has not been occurring during current or recent supervision

experiences. However, concerning the authority in the supervision relationship, four work

settings indicated a notable difference between needs and current or recent experiences,

whereas one setting indicated no significant differences. These participants from

CSW/CAS work settings reported that their needs for supervisors to give advice, plan

together with social workers about what to do for clients, and for discussions about power

differences to occur in supervision have been met currently or recently in their

supervision experiences.

Which Demographic Variables are Significantly Related and Help to Explain

Social Workers' Supervision Needs?

Using the enter method, 30 linear multiple regression calculations were initially

calculated for five participant groups across six different aspects of supervision needs. An

additional 16 stepwise regressions were completed for those models that were not

significant, yet had at least one demographic variable that had a significant regression

coefficient. Upon completion of all 46 calculations, 11 statistically significant regression

models ($p < .05$) attained at least a small effect size and one model achieved medium

practical significance. There were no significant regression models for respondents

identified by the FCA work setting. I report the results of the 12 models highlighting their

practical significance according to the f^2 effect size (See Appendix K for statistically

significant findings). In addition, for the three work settings (hospitals, CW/CASs, and

CMHCs), I created frequency tables of the demographic variables from the models that

achieved at least a small effect size (See Appendix L for frequency tables). This

information was particularly helpful for my subsequent interpretation of and speculation

about the results.

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13)

Only one significant model with one significant coefficient emerged as a possible

practical explanation of what could influence the overall purpose needs of participants.

Evidence suggests that for all participants, the number of monthly occurrences of

scheduled supervision has a small influence on how well purpose needs of supervision

are achieved when all other demographic variables are controlled ($f^2 = .02$). That is, the

fewer times per month all participants have a one-hour meeting with their supervisor, the

greater their need for purpose aspects of supervision. These aspects include the four-fold

purpose of supervision (see below), ethical conversations, and a separation between

practice/clinical supervision and administrative tasks and staff evaluations/appraisals.

Scale 1, Subscale 3: The Four-fold Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q5)

This subscale represents how much participants' believe supervision needs to

focus on knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development,

and work place administrative tasks. The higher the score the stronger the total need

score. Regression calculations revealed models with practical significance for three work

settings. Each model contained only one significant demographic variable when all other

variables were controlled.

The stepwise regression model for participants in hospital settings showed that the

academic degrees of social workers appeared to have a small influence on their need for

the four-folds of supervision ($f^2 = .04$). The negative association suggests that, holding

all other variables constant, as respondents from hospitals gain graduate education, there

seems to be less need for this combination of supervision elements. It is notable that the

frequencies of BSW and MSW degrees for participants working for hospitals (14% of

BSWs and 86% of MSWs) and CMHCs (16% of BSWs and 83% of MSWs) are very

similar, whereas the distribution for CW/CAS participants are approximately equally

distributed (43% of BSWs and 56% of MSWs).

The stepwise regression model for social workers from CW/CAS settings

indicates that being male or female can make a small difference to the average level of

need for the four-fold purpose of supervision ($f^2 = .03$). The model suggests that men

working for CW/CAS appear on average to have lower four-fold purpose scores than

women, suggesting they have less need for a focus on the four identified purpose

elements. This is the only finding in all my analysis where a difference according to

gender occurred, even though a similar percentage of men and women worked for

CW/CAS, hospitals, and CMHC (See Appendix L).

Finally, given the small effects of the other models, the regression model for

participants with CMHCs is notable. As the only significant coefficient, the discipline of

the supervisor provides a regression model with a medium effect size $(f^2 = .16)$ and an

explanation for 14% of the variance of the average subscale score. In other words, having

a supervisor other than a social worker increases the likelihood that CMHC participants

expressed, on average, a strong need for supervision to focus on the combined purposes

identified by the subscale. Frequency comparisons show that 71% of CMHC participants

are supervised by a social worker, whereas this variable is not significant for respondents

from CW/CAS, who identified that 86% of their supervisors were social workers, or for

hospital social workers, where only 49% of the supervision of participants is provided by

social workers and 30% from nurses.

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24)

Two regression models surfaced, each identifying that the frequency of one-hour

supervision meetings per month provided a minimal negative explanation about

participants' beliefs and needs concerning the quality and degree of authority in the

supervision relationship. The significant regression analysis for all participants $(f^2 = .03)$

and the stepwise calculation for participants of CW/CAS work settings $(f^2 = .06)$ suggest

that fewer one-hour supervision meetings per month has a small association with less

need for the combined aspects that represent the authority in the supervision relationship.

These aspects include advice from supervisors and planning together, a need for conversations about power in the supervision relationship, and conceptualizing whether a supervisor's authority is achieved by superior knowledge and skill and/or workplace position.

I find it notable that a comparison of the average number of one-hour supervision meetings per month for CW/CASs, hospitals, and CMHCs demonstrates similar experiences for participants (See Appendix L). For example, 36% to 39% of participants reported having no supervision per month across all three work settings.

Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33)

Two models achieved practical significance. First, the small effect size (f^2 =.03) of the regression model for all participants suggests that the more one-hour meetings per month for all participants, the more need for ongoing supervision during a social worker's career. Second, for respondents associated with hospitals, the negative regression coefficient for geographical area of service best explained the minimal influence (f^2 =.05) on the supervision timing and duration score. In other words, the more urbanized the geographical area of service associated with hospitals, the less need was identified for ongoing supervision during a social worker's career. A review of the percentages for question 68 (See Appendix L) shows that fewer participants from hospitals work in rural or small town municipalities, and more hospital employed participants work in rural/urban and metropolitan areas compared to participants employed at CW/CASs and CMHCs.

Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34 – Q44)

The stepwise regression for participants of CW/CAS work settings produced the only model with practical significance concerning training and discipline needs of the supervisor. The single coefficient, the social work degree of respondents, was the identified demographic that could explain the small effect size (f^2 =.04) of the model. In other words, the higher the educational designation of the CW/CAS respondents, the greater the need for supervisors to be appropriately trained and have practice experience as social workers. The frequency table (See Appendix L) shows that the distribution of degrees for CW/CAS participants is approximately the same (43% of BSWs and 56% of MSWs), compared to hospitals and CMHCs, where MSW degree participants are the overwhelming majority.

Scale 5: The Place for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change (Q45 – Q60)

For the final scale, three equations attained practical significance. First, the results for all participants created a regression model with a small effect size (f^2 =.02). The significant relationship was between two of the regression coefficients and the dependent variable. Specifically, as one-hour supervision meetings per month increase for all participants who work in more urbanized settings, there is an associated higher need for social justice and change to be part of the supervision relationship.

The second model emerged out of a stepwise regression. The results for hospital associated participants suggest that two coefficients explained the need for the social work mission to be included in supervision conversations. The small effect size

(f^2 =.06) represents the negative relationship between the dependent variable and the length of social work practice, plus the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month. In other words, for respondents working in hospital settings who are less experienced and who have more one-hour supervision meetings per month, there is an associated tendency to have less need to include concepts representing the social work mission in supervision. A visual comparison of years of experience and the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month across CW/CAS, hospital, and CMHC work settings does not indicate any substantial differences between settings on these two variables.

The third and final model is for participants identified with CW/CAS work settings. A stepwise regression discovered that the degree of the social worker provides a small explanation (f^2 =.06) for the dependent measure. This means that the need to include the social work mission of social justice and change is greater for those participants of CW/CAS settings who have gained graduate social work degrees. As I noted previously, the distribution of degrees for CW/CAS participants is approximately the same (43% of BSWs and 56% of MSWs), whereas the majority of participants from hospitals and CMHCs have their MSW degree.

An Interpretation of the Relationship between Selected Demographic Variables and Supervision Needs

As previously noted, there were no significant regression models for respondents identified by their FCA work setting. Thus, these comments concern all participants and those social workers who identified their work settings as hospitals, CMHCs, and CW/CASs and where practical significance occurred for the regression calculations.

Small effect sizes were found for eleven significant linear regression models associated with the five supervision scales. In relation to the Purpose Subscale, a model emerged for CMHC respondents that had the only medium effect size. The results suggest a few possible trends.

The demographic variable that appeared to have the broadest influence was how many times per month participants had one hour of scheduled supervision. For all participants, the evidence suggests that the fewer one-hour meetings of scheduled supervision during a month, the greater the average need for the various aspects that make up the purpose of supervision, but the less need for the combined aspects that represent authority in the supervision relationship. In contrast, the more one-hour supervision meetings per month, the greater the need for ongoing supervision. Finally, as the number of one-hour meetings per month increased for all participants providing services in more urban settings, there was evidence for a greater need to include the social work mission of social justice during supervision conversations.

For hospital associated respondents, three models suggested relationships to various needs. First, hospital social workers, who have less experience and more one-hour supervision meetings per month, appeared to have less need to include concepts representing the social justice and change mission in supervision. A visual comparison of years of experience and the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month across CW/CAS, hospital, and CMHC work settings does not indicate any substantial differences between settings on these two variables. Second, the more urbanized the geographical area of service associated with hospital social workers, the less need was indicated for ongoing supervision during a social worker's career. Notably, fewer

participants from hospitals work in rural or small town municipalities, and more hospital

employed participants work in rural/urban and metropolitan areas compared to

participants employed at CW/CASs and CMHCs. The third and final model demonstrated

that, as respondents from hospitals gain graduate education, there appeared to be less

need from supervision for knowledge and skill development, emotional support,

professional development, and work place administrative tasks. Although the majority of

participants working for hospitals and CMHCs had their MSWs, education only seemed

to make a difference for hospital social workers in relationship to a need for the four-fold

purpose of supervision.

Data from participants of CW/CAS settings created four regression models. The

first model suggests that fewer one-hour supervision meetings per month has a modest

association with less need for the combined aspects that represent the authority in the

supervision relationship. I find it notable that a comparison of the average number of one-

hour supervision meetings per month is similar across the three work settings, but it is a

significant factor for child welfare workers in relationship with the various aspects of

authority. For the second regression equation, the higher the educational designation of

the CW/CAS respondents, the greater the need for supervisors to be appropriately trained

and have practice experience as social workers. The third model identified that the need

to include the social work mission of social justice and change is greater for those

participants of CW/CAS settings who have gained graduate social work degrees. These

two findings are associated with evidence that there was similar representation of BSW

and MSW participants working for child welfare settings, suggesting that the level of the

degree makes a difference. The fourth and final model indicated that men working for

CW/CAS appear on average to have lower purpose subscale scores than women, suggesting they have less need for a focus on the identified purpose elements. This was the only finding where a gender difference was detected, even though a similar percentage of men and women worked for CW/CASs, hospitals, and CMHCs.

The data for the CMHC work setting is the only grouping that did not produce a model that included number of one-hour supervision meetings per month. The single regression model that occurred for participants of CMHCs identified that having a supervisor other than a social worker increases the likelihood that, on average, CMHC participants have a stronger need for supervision to focus on the various purpose aspects of supervision. A medium effect size is notable given that approximately two thirds of CMHC participants are supervised by a social worker, whereas no practical effect was found for participants from hospitals settings where only half of their supervisors were social workers.

Are Ontario Social Workers' Needs Similar or Different

From Supervision Descriptions offered through the Literature?

Data Transformation: The Quantitization of the Supervision Literature

Seventeen themes emerged from my analysis of the literature and were located within the supervision scale that provided the best fit. One theme intersected three supervision scales and therefore is considered separately. I shaped each theme into a single statement with enough of an accompanying narrative to thicken the concept and give a context for the analysis (for further information and references, please refer to my Chapter Two: Literature Review). Each theme was transformed into a numerical equation using the most closely related EFA subscale, which was then used for statistical analysis.

One theme was explored using two equations from one subscale and another theme used

three equations from one subscale for a total of 20 equations.

Inferential Data Analysis

A total of 20 single-sample t-tests were calculated to compare the estimated

population means and the corresponding sample means. An unfortunate side-effect of the

large sample size is that all results were significant, even when the means were

noticeably similar, thus creating an unknown number of Type I errors (Moore &

McCabe, 1999). Consequently, my self-designed medium and large effect sizes (E)

became my approach for speculating about the practical value of the differences between

the means.

For each of the five supervision scales and the one combination equation, I report

the findings according to relative effect size (Please see Chapter Five for how I

constructed the effect sizes). Practical effect sizes that are non-significant suggest

similarities to the literature, which for this analysis is equally important as differences.

Out of the 20 comparisons, fifteen analyses resulted in statistically significant differences

but with nonsignificant effect sizes. Differences, as defined by medium effect sizes,

emerged for five equations: two that corresponded with the Supervision Purpose Scale,

and one equation each for the Authority in the Supervision Relationship Scale, Timing

and Length Scale, and the Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission Scale. (See

Appendix M for a list of the selected narratives from the literature, their corresponding

quantitized equations, and statistical findings).

Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13)

Using the Purpose Scale, I created three themes from the literature that I then quantitized according to the related Purpose Subscales. These are:

1. *Focus on knowledge and skill.* Studies have repeatedly shown that a focus on knowledge and skill enhancement is the most desirable and useful purpose of the traditional triad (educative, supportive, administrative) purpose of supervision. Although Ontario participants endorsed a similar position, they also demonstrated that, on average, a focus on professional development, administrative tasks and emotional support were valued needs for supervision practices ($E = 9.23$, where a medium $E \geq 8$). Thus, in apparent contrast to the dominant research, it appears that Ontario participants need the purpose of supervision to have a four-pronged focus.

2. *Knowledge and skill development combined with administrative tasks and performance review/staff evaluations can be ethically problematic and undesirable.* Research has shown that knowledge and practice development when combined with organizational and administrative tasks, as well as an evaluative agenda, can encourage fear and reluctance to disclose difficulties, and result in ethically questionable and ineffective services. In contrast, Ontario participants appeared to have greater ambivalence about the possible divergent foci. A mean difference of 10.90 points for this comparison is acceptable for a medium effect size ($E \geq 10$). Thus, contrary to reported research, Ontario participants, on average, appear to have less concern about the ethical effects to practice when supervisors having both practice and administrative responsibilities.

3. *Need for reflective conversations on ethical practice in supervision.* The responsibility of the supervisor to encourage reflective conversations about ethical practice has been highlighted in the literature. Research has demonstrated that for some social workers, supervision has been the primary source for ethical decision-making. Two variables were isolated from two different subscales to explore these ideas. For both equations, the medium effect size difference of 2 was not achieved ($3AE = 1.70$ and $3BE = 1.66$). Therefore, participants appear to agree with published knowledge that supervision conversations are a primary forum for talking about ethical practice issues, and that supervision needs to provide more space for such conversations.

Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24)

The Authority Scale helped me to discover two emergent themes from the literature.

1. *Traditional authority upheld: Expertise and position of the supervisor.* The classic supervision literature appears to endorse power and authority through the supervisor's knowledge as well as position. This appears to be somewhat agreeable for Ontario participants, since the mean difference of 3.03 points does not reach the desired medium effect size of 4. However, a closer look at the individual variables shows that participants are more inclined to accept supervisor authority due to workplace position, ($E = .86$) as opposed to supervisor expert knowledge and skill ($E = 2.17$), given that for both equations, a medium effect size needed to be ≥ 2.

2. *Supervision authority through position and co-creative dialog.* If the supervisor's authority is granted by position, then knowledge can more freely be a shared discovery through reflective, co-creative dialog. This stance means that supervisors

question the existence of expert knowledge and seek out alternative views through collaborative conversation with supervisees. Ontario respondents seem to agree with this idea given that a medium effect size of 10 is not achieved ($E = 2.17$).

Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33)

From the Timing and Length Scale, I found four themes in the literature.

1. *Knowledge and skill development through supervision is needed throughout the career of the social worker.* There remains a tenacious belief in the literature that the educative and supportive purposes of supervision are needed throughout the career of the social worker for the development and safeguarding of effective, skilled practitioners. The resulting practical difference of 3.55 between the approximated population mean and the average score for research participants, given that the medium effect needed was 12, demonstrates that respondents appear to agree career-long supervision is needed for ongoing knowledge and skill development.

2. *On-going supervision can discourage professional autonomy.* There is another opinion in the literature that on-going supervision for the purpose of knowledge and skill development may be interpreted to mean that social workers need someone else to be accountable for their work with clients throughout their careers. Given the medium effect size of 11.89 (where a medium $E \geq 10$), respondents, on average, do not appear to agree with this position.

3. *The need for administrative supervision for the duration of a social worker's employment with an organization.* Another theme in the literature is that administrative supervision is needed for the duration of employment with social services organizations.

The lack of achieving a medium difference equal to or greater than five ($E = 1.28$),

provides evidence that this idea is shared by the web-survey respondents.

4. *The need for supervision after graduation and for new employees.* The final

concept that emerged from the literature in relation to timing and length of supervision

suggests that the need for some designated period of social work supervision for new

graduates or inexperienced practitioners has been supported by social workers. The lack

of an effect size ($E = .60$, where a medium $E \geq 4$) provides evidence this is a shared idea

amongst participants.

Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34 – Q44)

From the Training and Discipline Scale, I found and quantitized three literature

themes.

1. *Supervision training is necessary to provide effective services. Practice*

experience is not enough. Repeated recommendations have been made that supervision

training is necessary to provide effective services. Moreover, research results have been

quite clear that having experience as a practitioner has not been adequate for supervisors.

The trivial effect size of 2.76 (where a medium $E \geq 8$) suggests that the needs of research

participants agree with the literature.

2. *A lack of supervisor training is associated with the absence of desirable*

educative and supportive supervision. Research has begun to demonstrate that a lack of

supervisor training can be associated with the absence of desirable educative and

supportive supervision. Given that a medium effect size was not achieved ($E = 8.59$,

where a medium $E \geq 14$), participants appear to agree with the literature.

3. *The importance of supervisors being social workers.* Concerning the final theme for this aspect of supervision, research has demonstrated that the professional affiliation of the supervisor is important. Cross-discipline supervision, particularly for new graduates, can easily jeopardize resolutions to ethical dilemmas, and lead to the devaluing of social work skills. Given the associated lack of effect size ($E = 2.49$, where a medium $E \geq 6$), participants appear to concur with the literature.

The Place for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change (Q45-Q60)

The Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change Scale gave me a scaffold from which I was able to construct four themes from the literature.

1. *The social work mission of social justice and social change is not encouraged in the dominant supervision literature.* The classic texts of social work supervision offer little to inform or encourage supervisors to include ideas or encourage the practice of social justice in supervision. Nevertheless, the absence of support in the supervision literature for supervisors apparently has not discouraged web-survey participants from currently or recently having supervision conversations that have helped actualize the social work mission of social justice. The medium effect size between the means ($E =$ 19.44, where a medium $E \geq 16$) suggests that Ontario social workers are participating in more supervision conversations that promote various aspects of social justice ideals and practices compared to the literature.

2. *There is an emerging alternative configuration of supervision that proposes the social work mission of social justice and social change needs to be part of supervision. A* small but growing number of international publications are beginning to encourage a conceptualization of social work supervision that affirms and encourages the social work

mission for social justice and social change. Part of this expectation is that differences and local understandings of knowledge and values would be explored between supervisors and social workers. The lack of a reportable effect size ($E = 6.43$, where a medium $E \geq 14$) between the literature equation and the web-survey respondents suggests agreement that supervisors needs to promote and actualize elements of social justice and change for social workers and their practice.

3. *Supervisors have a responsibility to explore cultural diversity, and ideas and assumptions that could oppress or privilege clients.* The literature has surfaced the idea that supervision needs to include conversations about cultural diversity and beliefs, as well as assumptions that can silently erode the supervision relationship, and potentially have deleterious effects on the social worker-client relationship. The absence of a discernible effect size ($E = 3.42$, where a medium $E \geq 8$) gives support to this needed aspect of supervision practice.

4. *The need to include conversations that explore race and gender differences in supervision relationships.* Brown and Bourne (1996) in particular use race and gender to deconstruct the "social-structural" power differences in the supervisory relationship. Not only do they consider cross-gender and cross-racial combinations but they introduce how a same sex White supervisor and White supervisee can – quite unknowingly – develop and/or encourage racial collusion. The inconsequential effect size ($E = .95$, where a medium $E \geq 2$) indicates agreement with this idea.

A Combination of Scales: The Intersection between Authority of the Supervisor, the

Timing and Length of Supervision, and the Place of the Social Work Mission.

The supervision literature suggests that if authority is granted to the supervisor's

position more so than their expertise, then supervision could be on-going in order to

provide continued opportunities for growth and development, particularly to support

social action initiatives of the social worker's practice. Given the obvious lack of a

recognized effect size ($E = 9.52$, where a medium $E \geq 32$), it appears that this

conceptualization of supervision has the support of Ontario respondents.

An Interpretation of the Similarities and Differences between Research Participants and

the Social Work Supervision Literature

The quantitization of the 17 themes that emerged from the supervision literature

provided a unique way to discover similarities and differences compared to the needs of

Ontario social workers as represented by the 636 web-survey respondents.

Although the dominant literature suggests a focus on knowledge and skill

enhancement is the most desirable and useful purpose of the traditional triadic purpose of

supervision, Ontario participants appear to need supervision to also include professional

development, administrative tasks and emotional support. Respondents also did not share

the concern in the literature that supervisors providing both practice and administrative

responsibilities, and an evaluative agenda, encouraged social worker's to fear discussing

difficulties, which could contribute to ethically questionable practices. Furthermore,

participants appeared to agree with published knowledge that supervision conversations

can be a primary forum for talking about ethical practice issues, and that supervision

needs to provide more space for such conversations.

Concerning the authority of the supervisor, participants initially appeared to agree with the dominant literature that the supervisor's knowledge as well as position are necessary components. Yet a closer look at each factor shows that participants are more inclined to accept supervisor authority due to workplace position. Given that the supervisor's authority is granted by position, then participants agree that supervision can be an opportunity for co-creative, reflective conversations.

Similar to the literature, respondents agreed that career-long supervision for knowledge and skill development was needed, but disagreed with the documented concern that their professional autonomy would be eroded. Moreover, participants concurred with documentation that administrative supervision was needed throughout their social work careers. Supervision, particularly for new graduates or inexperienced practitioners, was another point of agreement between the literature and web-survey respondents. In order for supervision to be most effective, participants agreed with the repeated recommendations in the literature that supervisors need to have supervision training and by profession be social workers; otherwise educative and supportive supervision can be negatively affected.

The absence of published support that a purpose of supervision needs to help actualize the social work mission of social justice and change has apparently not discouraged respondents from having supervision conversations that include these topics. That is, participants reportedly are having more supervision conversations that promote various aspects of social justice ideals and practices as compared to the literature. Even so, participants agreed that supervisors need to intentionally promote and actualize social justice and change for social workers and their practice.

Finally, respondents supported the following conceptualization of supervision from the literature: When authority is granted to the supervisor's position more so than their expertise, then supervision can provide on-going opportunities for social workers' growth and development, particularly their social action initiatives.

<div align="center">An Integration of the Quantitative Data Narratives</div>

The following integration narrative of the quantitative findings highlights the expressed needs of Ontario social work participants regarding (a) the purpose of supervision, (b) the use of authority in the supervision relationship, (c) the timing and length of supervision, and (d) the discipline and training of supervisors.

<div align="center">*The Purpose of Supervision*</div>

The Five-Fold Purpose

A cluster of needs appeared to coalesce into a five-fold purpose configuration, which expands the traditional three-fold or triadic purpose of supervision (i.e., educative, supportive, and administrative). Moreover, this combination is in contrast to the dominant supervision literature that suggests a focus on knowledge and skill enhancement is the most desirable and useful purpose. Four of the identified five-folds are (i) knowledge and skill development, (ii) professional development, (iii) emotional support, and (iv) work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.

For hospital social workers with graduate degrees, there appeared to be a little less need for supervision to focus on knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development, and work place administrative tasks compared to social workers in other work settings. Even though the majority of participants working for

hospitals and CMHCs had their MSWs, education did not influence participants from CMHCs. It appears, therefore, that hospital settings and graduate social work education has the potential to create a unique association that can decrease a need for the four identified purposes of supervision.

Similarly, men working for CW/CAS appeared on average to have a little less need for supervision to focus on these four purpose areas than women working for CW/CAS. This was the only finding where a gender difference was detected, which suggests that there could be something distinctive about the relationship between child welfare work and how much men and women need supervision to focus on knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development, and administrative tasks.

The fifth purpose: Social justice and change. For the fifth identified purpose, participants across all work settings identified that a significant need for supervision is to recognize, promote, and provide conversational space for the various identified aspects of the social work mission of social justice and change. This purpose is a strong need compared to what has been currently or recently experienced by all participants, as well as social workers employed by hospitals, CW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCAs. This emergent purpose need of supervision, which has been largely absent in the literature, means that supervision conversations would promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive practice, recognize and respect cultural diversity, challenge unjust policies and practices, help social workers advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings, and find ways for social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

The amount of supervision per month, geographic location, social work experience, and work settings appeared to have a modest effect on the need to include the social work mission purpose of supervision. For participants providing services in more urban settings, the need to include the social work mission of social justice and change during supervision conversations appeared to intensify slightly as one-hour supervision meetings per month increased. For less experienced social workers in hospital settings, more one-hour supervision meetings per month was associated with less need to include concepts representing the social work mission in supervision. Interestingly, a similar relationship was not detected for participants from child welfare and CMHCs settings, even though a visual comparison of years of experience and the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month does not indicate any substantial differences between settings. Finally, even though there appears to be a reasonably balanced representation of BSWs and MSWs, the higher the educational designations of CW/CAS social workers, the greater was the expressed need for supervision conversations to include the social work mission of social justice and social change.

Supervision to Provide Opportunities for Reflective Supervision Conversations, including a Focus on Ethical Issues

Research participants appeared to agree with published knowledge that a purpose of supervision conversations was to focus on ethical practice issues and that supervision needs to provide more space for such conversations. While the need appeared to be present, there was variability about how well current practices of supervision can effectively meet the need for these types of conversations.

Opinions were divided over the need for supervision to provide more conversational space or to be the primary place to address ethical issues and practice concerns. These opinions were potentially associated with the practice and administrative purposes of supervision, as well as the presence of staff evaluations and performance appraisals. A notable minority acknowledged that the presence of staff evaluations or performance appraisals made it difficult to discuss practice concerns and ethical issues, and a third of participants agreed or were not sure if supervision was primarily for surveillance purposes. For some participants, having more time available for conversations on ethical issues was associated with less focus on emotional support. Finally, for participants across all work settings, the fewer one-hour meetings of supervision per month were related to a slightly greater need for the purpose aspects of supervision, including time to reflect on ethical issues and practice concerns.

Changing the Landscape of Supervision: Suggestions for a Better Relationship between Practice and Administrative Purposes

Perhaps as a possible means to expand supervision conversations, a prevalent suggestion amongst respondents was to have practice supervision, administrative supervision, and staff evaluations and performance appraisals addressed by two separate people. All participants, as well as social workers working for hospitals, CW/CASs, FCAs, and to a less extent CMHCs, indicated that their need for one person to provide practice/clinical supervision and another person to provide administrative supervision was greater compared to what they currently or recently experienced. Notably, when all participants were considered, the more experience a social worker had, the need was less

for two different people to provide practice focused/clinical and administrative

supervision.

As a final point, although the need for a division of supervision responsibilities

was present, it was not as pronounced as what the literature appears to present. That is,

respondents did not appear to share the same level of concern that supervisors providing

practice and administrative responsibilities, as well as an evaluative agenda, would

encourage fear for social workers to discuss practice difficulties, which could potentially

create ethically questionable practices. So, while participants expressed a need for a

change in task allocations, the majority did not appear to be as adversely affected with

current practices as highlighted in the current literature.

Authority in the Supervision Relationship

The Exercise of Power to Benefit Learning

For all participants, as the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month

increased, there was a modest increase in their need for the various elements of

supervisor authority. For example, there were participants who expressed a need for so-

called expert knowledge and skill from supervisors for activities such as getting advice

from supervisors and planning together what to do for clients. Even so, it is uncertain

how much and for how long participants value their supervisors as holders of privileged

knowledge. The older and more experienced participants were, the less they believed

supervisors' authority came from supervisors' expertise.

Exercising Authority and Power within the Supervision Relationship

When the supervisor's knowledge as well as position are considered together,

research participants appeared to agree with the dominant literature that both are

necessary components. On closer inspection, however, participants appeared more inclined to accept supervisor authority due to workplace position. These perceived needs for authority are supported by published documentation, which suggests if supervisor authority is granted to workplace position more so than supervisor expertise, then supervision can provide reflective, co-creative conversations that encourage opportunities for growth and development, particularly about policy implications and social action initiatives. Alternatively, for some participants, the more supervisors' authority is perceived according to their workplace position, the more professional autonomy appears to be discouraged. This suggests that supervisors are best to be mindful in their use of their workplace authority.

Respondents demonstrated a mixed response to the idea that the Ontario College should grant supervisors the authority to assess social workers' competencies. The number of undecided participants suggest that a polarity of opinion could surface should the idea gain attention. Findings also suggest that the more supervisors' authority is based on their expert knowledge and skills, and the OCSWSSW endorses supervisors to assess social workers' competencies, the less social worker's knowledge and skills have equal value compared to supervisors.

Whatever the attributions given for supervisors' authority, there were some participants who identified that their ability to make independent practice decisions was discouraged because of that authority. To help make more visible the authority of the supervisor, about half of the respondents expressed a need to engage in discussions with supervisors about power differences in the supervision relationship. Current or recent

experiences of these kinds of conversations appear to increase the need for these opportunities to continue during supervision.

When respondents considered their needs for the various aspects of authority in the supervision relationship, practical differences were discovered. All participants, as well as those employed in FCAs, and to a greater extent, social workers in hospital settings and CMHCs, reported that the need for supervisors to give advice, for supervisors to plan together with social workers about what to do for clients, and for discussions about power differences to occur in supervision was greater than what was currently or recently occurring. Alternatively, the current or recent experiences of participants in CW/CAS settings suggest that their needs are met according to these examples of authority in the supervision relationship. Even so, for CW/CAS respondents fewer one-hour supervision meetings per month appeared to have a modest association with less need for the combined aspects that represent the authority in the supervision relationship. Although participants from hospitals and CMHCs appear to share a similar average of one-hour supervision meetings per month, it is only a significant factor for child welfare workers in relationship with the various aspects of authority.

Timing and Length of Supervision

The majority of participants suggested that career long supervision for knowledge and skill development, emotional support, administrative accountability, and professional development will not erode their professional autonomy, which is a proposed concern in some literature. The strongest reason for career long supervision after graduation was for emotional support, followed closely by the need for professional development.

For the majority of participants, as the number of one-hour supervision meetings per month increased, there was a somewhat greater need for ongoing supervision. In contrast, the need for ongoing supervision decreased slightly for participants working in hospitals located in cities with more than 10,000 people. Notably, fewer participants from hospitals work in rural or small town municipalities, and more hospital employed participants work in rural/urban and metropolitan areas compared to participants employed at CW/CASs and CMHCs.

In contrast to a need for ongoing supervision, there were participants who did not believe that supervision is needed after three years, particularly for knowledge and skill development, and for administrative accountability. In spite of differing opinions about the duration of supervision, there was strong endorsement, supported by published writings, that graduates, inexperienced practitioners, and new employees definitely need supervision for some designated period.

Training and Discipline of the Supervisor

In order for supervision to be most effective, the majority of participants agreed with the repeated recommendations in the literature that supervisors need to have supervision training. Training can help prepare supervisors to know the OASW Code of Ethics and the legal requirements for social work practice, as well as be appropriately knowledgeable and skilled for different social work settings and people served.

The majority of the respondents also expressed the need that supervisors by profession be social workers; otherwise, educative and supportive supervision can be negatively affected. When discipline and training were considered together, results indicate that the need for supervisor training and the need to have profession specific and

setting specific knowledge has not been current or recently experienced for participants overall nor for social workers employed in hospitals, CW/CASs, CMHCs, and FCAs.

There were, however, respondents from CMHCs who identified that having a supervisor other than a social worker noticeably increased their need for supervision to focus on knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development, and administrative tasks. This is an interesting finding since approximately two thirds of CMHC participants identified that their supervisor was a social worker. A similar finding was not reported for participants from hospitals settings where only half of their supervisors were social workers.

Finally, for CW/CAS social workers, the higher their educational designations, the greater their need for supervisors to be appropriately trained and have practice experience as social workers. It appears that for child welfare workers, graduate education appears to make a difference in relationship to their supervision needs.

Concluding Comments

The integration narrative of the quantitative findings illustrates the complex relationships between a dominant portrait of supervision and various alternative viewpoints. Moreover, the participant qualities of education, geographic location, work setting, and gender created modest associations with different aspects of supervision. While these associations were not dominant themes, they demonstrate how various experiences contribute to a comprehensive view of supervision needs.

CHAPTER SEVEN: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS & INTERPRETATIONS

As Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) have described, "the essence of qualitative data analysis of any type is the development of a typology of categories [and] themes that summarize a mass of narrative data" (p. 119). My interpretations and corresponding data selections were shaped by my first associated research question, *What do the data reveal about the general needs of Ontario social workers?* I acknowledge that my organization and interpretations of the participants' written narratives are tentative, context and time-bound constructions.

For each participant, providing a written response to the three open-ended questions of the web-survey was optional. Therefore, the number of responses varied for each question. These were:

Q61.   Do you have any other suggestions for effective social work supervision?

- There were 342 responses or 54% of the 636 participants.

Q62.   What objections or concerns do you have about post-degree supervision for social workers?

- There were 313 responses or 49% of the 636 participants.

Q74.   Your comments about the survey content are welcomed. Do you have any information that you would like to add?

- There were 165 responses or 26% of the 636 participants.

When I concluded my constant comparative analytic process, I was left with approximately five percent of the total meaning units not assigned to a theme. This number of miscellaneous meaning units is within the seven percent maximum recommendation of unassignable units suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985). According

to the authors, a greater number of unassignable meaning units "probably signals a serious deficiency" (p. 349) in the organization of the themes.

Assessing for Dependability and the Inference Quality known as Credibility

The categories and themes I identified appeared to have acceptable dependability and credibility. This means I deemed the findings were trustworthy according to the following criteria. First, there appeared to be congruence among meaning units for each theme and notable differences when compared to other themes. Second, I included contrasting or exceptional findings to enrich the complexity of themes. Third, in order to maintain congruence as I constructed my descriptions and interpretation of the themes, I engaged in a back and forth comparative process between my research question, the original narratives, the meaning units, and the emerging themes. Fourth, my awareness of my own preconceived notions about supervision helped me to be mindful and remain tentative how I deconstructed narratives and constructed themes. Finally, the dependability and credibility of findings were strengthened since I could use the category headings that represented constructs developed from the exploratory factor analysis.

Interpreting the Qualitative Data about Supervision Needs

Due to the large number of themes, in Table 14, I provide a summary of the headings I assigned to the categories and themes that surfaced from the quantitative results. Following Table 14, I present my interpretations of the emergent supervision categories and themes.

The Need for Supervision
• The Particular Importance of Supervision for New Graduates
• The Dangers of Absent or Inadequate Supervision
Meeting the Need for Supervision
• Making Supervision a Priority in the Work Place
• Making Supervision Mandatory for Social Workers
• Ensuring Mandatory Supervision: Supporting the Role of the OCSWSSW
• Concerns about Mandatory Supervision and the Possible Role of the OCSWSSW
Purpose of Supervision
• To Promote Knowledge and Skills
• To Provide for the Emotional Needs of Social Workers
• To Promote Professional Development
• To Promote Anti-Oppressive Social Work Practice
• To Provide Opportunities for Reflective Supervision Conversations about Ethical Issues
The Relationship between Administrative and Practice Purposes of Supervision
• Maintaining the Accountability of Social Workers
• The Need to Balance Administrative and Clinical/Practice Supervision
• Problems with Integrating Evaluations or Performance Appraisals with Clinical/Practice Supervision
• Changing the Landscape of Supervision: Suggestions for a Better Relationship between Practice and Administrative Purposes
Authority in the Supervision Relationship
• Exercising Authority and Power for a Positive Supervision Relationship
• The Exercise of Power for Collaborative Relationships
• The Misuse of Supervisor Power Over Social Workers
The Timing and Length of Supervision
• Supervision Available As Needed
• A Need for Career-Long Supervision
• A Need for Supervision to End and a Consultation Relationship to Begin
The Discipline, Training, and Other Qualities of the Supervisor
• Supervisors Need to be Social Workers
• Drawbacks and Benefits when Supervisors are from Other Disciplines
• Needs Concerning Practice Experiences and Knowledge of the Supervisor
• The Need for Training and Supervision-of-Supervision for Supervisors
• The Need for Supervisors with Particular Qualities
Alternatives to Inadequate or Absent Supervision in the Work Place
• The Benefits of Peer Supervision or Consultation for Social Work Practice
• Peer Supervision or Consultation and Experiences of Power and Authority
• Peer Supervision or Consultation for Experienced Social Workers
• The Benefits of Mentoring
• Alternatives to In-House Supervision

Table 14. Titles of the Emergent Categories and Themes from the Qualitative Findings.

The Need for Supervision

As one respondent rather dramatically stated, "I feel that supervision is like the air we breathe-one would not survive without it" (Q74, P430). Two themes formed a category about the need for supervision for social work practice. These are: (i) the particular importance of supervision for new graduates, and (ii) the dangers of absent or inadequate supervision.

The Particular Importance of Supervision for New Graduates

Many respondents agreed that for new graduates "supervision is an essential part of developing as a social worker" (Q74, P525) as well as being "an integral part of maintaining high standards in social work" (Q62, P404). As one respondent pointed out "...we do a disservice to our young graduates by one day giving them supervision and then the next telling them they have graduated and now they are ready to take on their challenging work alone" (Q62, P144). Rather, supervision after graduation is needed to help "orient a new graduate to feel supported and enabled to develop the specialized skills and knowledge that will result in feelings of competency and adequacy in meeting the needs of clients as well as the organization" (Q62, P669).

Unfortunately, as one respondent notes, supervision "was not underscored enough in my training as an MSW" (Q61, P213). Instead,

> Schools of Social Work need to do more to help students to understand that they will not have mastered all of the clinical skills to provide care to patients and families when they graduate. It is through supervision that professional skills and judgement develop under the guidance of someone who has greater experience. (Q61, P519)

Although there were not enough meaning units to create a theme, there were a few responses that challenged the need for post-graduate supervision. According to one respondent,

> ....If graduates continue to actually 'need supervision' even after completing their social work education, then I'd suggest that they had an inadequate/incomplete education, including internship supervision, where they were trained. I'd make a case for the need for evaluating social work education at the University level to ensure that trainees are adequately prepared for autonomous employment rather than to continue to treat accredited, employed adults as if they were still children at school. (Q62, P266)

The Dangers of Absent or Inadequate Supervision

The importance for supervision for social workers was detailed by a respondent, who stated:

> I think supervision is essential for all workers with all levels of experience. Many of our clients have very complex situations/needs and I need to discuss them with my supervisor to enable me to provide the best service I can. Additionally there are many potential legal/ethical quagmires that even the most experienced practitioner can fall into unless s/he has the support of administrative staff --- which is best guaranteed if that administrator is aware of the casework you are engaged in. Practicing without supervision is like driving without a seatbelt. Possible, but silly. (Q61, P291)

Although many people might not drive without a seatbelt when they know they need one, many social workers in Ontario, contrary to their expressed needs, have had experiences

of practicing without supervision. Narratives repeatedly shared a need for supervision in work settings, such as "school boards, hospitals," (Q61, P193) that often "do not offer any type of social work supervision" (Q61, P193).

Alternatively, when supervision has been available, "too often it is poorly done, inconsistent and inaccessible" (Q61, P283). A respondent candidly wrote, "The main issue is IT DOES NOT EXIST in the way social workers need/want supervision. SW supervision is primarily at its lowest common denominator in bureaucratic settings - discussions about paperwork, statistics and policies" (Q61, P491). The noted consequences included "feeling isolated and unsure of myself sometimes" (Q61, P448) and "frustrated by the lack of supervision" (Q74, P294). As one respondent noted, "I've generally felt totally abandoned by the profession and the workplace" (Q62, P150).

Meeting the Need for Supervision

The following four themes suggest ways and ideas for how to insure needed supervision is available and provided. These are: (i) making supervision a priority in the work place, (ii) making supervision mandatory for social workers, (iii) ensuring mandatory supervision: supporting the role of the OCSWSSW, and (iv) raising concerns about mandatory supervision and the possible role of the OCSWSSW.

Making Supervision a Priority in the Work Place

The need for effective supervision for new or experienced employees will not be met as long as social workers continue to work for organizations that show a "lack of commitment to supervision" (Q62, P402). This means that available, "effective social work supervision first requires the proper organizational structure (i.e. does the organization value it, sanction it, etc.)" (Q61, P91). Work settings need to prioritize the

quality and quantity of supervision with the understanding that "many factors need to be addressed: [such as] financial constraints and time limitations in an agency" (Q62, P501). As one participant clearly wrote,

> The importance of ongoing social work supervision in the workplace needs to be recognized and valued in the workplace. Discussions need to happen within agencies to find ways to provide supervision to staff. It is important to ensure that social workers are healthy and effective. Everyone can benefit this way: social workers, the clients they work with as well as the organizations they work for. (Q61, P501)

Making Supervision Mandatory for Social Workers

Rather than expecting work settings to independently address supervision needs, respondents put forward the need for standardized and mandatory social work supervision across Ontario. As one participant stated, "Right now there is no standards of supervision… [but they are] absolutely necessary for the credibility of the profession and the protection of the public" (Q62, P283). Mandatory supervision was identified as a need for "new staff, particularly new grads who are navigating their first jobs, in generally very complex work settings" (Q61, P587). Suggestions were made that supervision be mandatory for one to two years.

One hoped for outcome of mandatory supervision was the effect it could have within work settings. "It would motivate employers…. to insure consistent, periodic and accessible supervision" (Q61, P283) that would no longer get "crowded out by the time demands of increased caseloads" (Q62, P56) or administrative issues.

Ensuring Mandatory Supervision: Supporting the Role of the OCSWSSW

Although one participant suggested the "OASW may have a role in advocating for effective supervision for social workers" (Q61, P78), it was the OCSWSSW that was repeatedly identified as the organization that would ensure mandatory supervision.

According to respondents, the responsibilities of the College for supervision could include:

- Setting standards for supervision that would include "a specific course given under the hospice of the OCSWSSW and supervisors should have to maintain the certification by retaking/recertification every so many years" (Q61, P519).

- Providing "specific liability protection to supervisors" (Q61, P283).

- Creating "a listing of what [supervision] is available and where" (Q61, 244).

- Ensuring "that social workers are receiving social work supervision in their places of employment from a SOCIAL WORKER and not an R.N or a psychometrist, for instance" (Q61, P643).

- Keeping "track of the hours of supervision social workers collect, which could help in moving up to a supervisor position...[and be used] by the college to reflect the level of learning which could be provided to employers" (Q61, P577).

- Providing a "structured credentialing process that focuses on clinical development of the supervisee. [Supervision] would be available for a certain specified time, for a certain specified number of hours, for new professionals in order to obtain full status with the College" (Q61, P244).

Two possible consequences of College mandated supervision were identified by one respondent. First, supervision could become necessary for social workers "to obtain

and maintain membership with the College" (Q61, P283). Second, supervision could

have a role in establishing standardized social work competencies. For example,

> A post-graduate period of supervision by an experienced qualified social worker
>
> [would be] offered, then a comprehensive exam to ensure that all qualified social
>
> workers had the same skill sets. This may then ensure the baseline for
>
> professionals entering the field and determine what ongoing supervision is needed
>
> and by whom. (Q62, P283)

Concerns about Mandatory Supervision and the Possible Role of the OCSWSSW

The idea of mandatory supervision standardized and monitored by the College

was not supported by all respondents. As one participant stated, "I don't think anything

should be mandatory. As long as SW's are abiding by their Rules of Practice and seeking

help when needed, that is enough" (Q62, P220). Another respondent expressed a

"concern about loss of autonomy if supervision becomes a requirement for a certain

number of years. I think that the social worker needs to be able to opt out of supervision

if it is more an oppressive situation for them than helpful" (Q62, 69). As one respondent

wrote, "I think we need to be careful about over regulating supervision. Supervision is

very important but I think we need to be mindful that over regulating doesn't always

mean better quality for those served" (Q62, 232). While disagreeing with mandatory

supervision, one respondent offered an alternative:

> I do not think it should be mandated/overseen by the OCSWSSW or OASW as I
>
> think it is so different for everyone, as we all have different needs for supervision.
>
> However, offering guidelines for supervision, e.g., a document or some sort of

seminar/discussion groups for people interested in getting support on how to supervise others could be helpful if it isn't already available. (Q62, P243)

A final caution about required supervision was made by a respondent concerned about the power that would be given to the supervisor. "The suggestion that supervisors could determine their staff's competency for the College is concerning. I have known Social Workers who have been discriminated against by their supervisors" (Q62, P39).

Purpose of Supervision

The importance of understanding and clarifying the purpose of supervision was clearly articulated by one participant, who wrote, "If supervisor and supervisee do not agree on the purpose of supervision, it can lead to a lot of misunderstanding and ultimately will not benefit either parties nor the delivery of services" (Q62, P423). The following five themes suggest what respondents need supervision for and how to best attain those purposes. The themes are: (i) to promote knowledge and skills, (ii) to provide for the emotional needs of social workers , (iii) to promote professional development, (iv) to promote anti-oppressive social work practice, and (v) to provide opportunities for reflective supervision conversations about ethical issues.

To Promote Knowledge and Skills

Respondents identified that effective supervision "promotes skill knowledge" (Q61, P388) and practice development that will benefit clients. This purpose highlights "how supervision should be about helping staff develop their skills …. so that they can pass this on in their own work with their clients" (Q61, P652). A focus on knowledge and skills was often identified by participants as practice or clinical supervision. Participants documented their need for "more clinical supervision…to be consistently implemented

regardless of experience or skill level" (Q62, P578). As a point of exception, however, one participant shared a concern that supervision is already "very clinically focused and does not easily translate into community settings" (Q62, 95).

Although there were not enough meaning units to create a theme, a few respondents identified that during supervision, "case management discussions" (Q61, P78), or a "focus on risk assessment all the time" (Q61, P641), provided a distraction from their need for knowledge and skills development. Simply, "in child welfare, there needs to be more clinical supervision in order to help protection workers work more effectively with families" (Q61, P641).

To Provide for the Emotional Needs of Social Workers

Respondents identified two ways that supervision needs to provide for the emotional needs of social workers. First, "there needs to be more emotional support for the things that you will encounter" (Q62, P407) so that it is easier to "feel comfortable sharing concerns and asking questions" (Q61, P574). Second, respondents highlighted that emotional support needs to help "the social worker to identify their self-care needs and take care of it themselves" (Q61, P57).

To Promote Professional Development

The need for supervision to "be a place to deal with professional development" (Q61, P319) was another identified purpose theme. This aspect of supervision would help promote the "professional self of the social worker" (Q62, P614) and would include a focus "on core social work values" (Q62, P400)

To Promote Anti-Oppressive Social Work Practice

Respondents identified that supervision needs to promote anti-oppressive practice, which is an aspect of the social work mission of social justice and social change. As one respondent wrote, "social workers beginning in the field must have strong clinical supervision, that reflects the anti-oppressive, theoretical models learned in the classroom, coupled with the experience of how to make this practical for the field"(Q62, P459). However, as one participant noted, supervisors can have an "overall lack of knowledge of anti-oppressive practice" or can discourage social workers from raising anti-oppressive practice ideas during supervision conversations because "it creates conflict and make people feel uncomfortable!!!!!" (Q62, P38)

To Provide Opportunities for Reflective Supervision Conversations about Ethical Issues

Respondents identified that supervision conversations were needed to help social workers "self-reflect and think about their own personal and professional functioning" (Q61, P33), "engage in critical thinking and dialogue" (Q61, P260), and "to work through the ethical challenges of the work that I do" (Q61, P319). According to narratives, these conversations appear to be needed throughout the career of a social worker. As one respondent clearly explained,

> At present, I work in an environment in which program management is the
> prevailing approach to providing social work services in a tertiary health care
> setting. I have experienced more ethical dilemmas related to shrinking resources
> and the administrative pressures to provide more with less. At no other time in my
> social work career have I felt the need for a social work supervisory modality in
> which to share and discuss professional or ethical concerns. These concerns

impact my ability to practice and feel job satisfaction that I have met the best

interests of my clients and social justice in accordance with the values, ethics and

standards of the social work profession. (Q61, P669)

The Relationship between Administrative and Practice Purposes of Supervision

The following four themes highlight the importance to participants for an

acceptable "balance of agency needs and policies with client focused needs" (Q61, P528).

The themes are: (i) maintaining the accountability of social workers, (ii) the need to

balance administrative and clinical/practice supervision, (iii) problems with integrating

evaluations or performance appraisals with clinical/practice supervision, and (iv)

changing the landscape of supervision: suggestions for a better relationship between

practice and administrative purposes.

Maintaining the Accountability of Social Workers

Respondents appeared to acknowledge that an aspect of supervisors'

responsibilities is to help social workers maintain accountability to their clients and the

work place. As respondents pointed out, "regardless of where you are in a hierarchy you

DO need to be accountable to your agency and thus a supervisor needs to carry that role"

(Q62, P205). Furthermore, as social workers, "we all need to be accountable for our work

whether we have just graduated, or whether we have been in the field for years.

Supervision is an important way for us to hold ourselves accountable" (Q62, P143).

Respondents described that effective supervision occurs when supervisees' needs

for "ethics, skills and knowledge" (Q61, P614) development are balanced with

accountability to the "code of ethics, legal parameters, [and] agencies' job requirements"

(Q61, P614). One participant described that "the best supervisors I have had encouraged

self directed practice with clarity around accountability issues" (Q61, P344). In other words, the need for accountability was not questioned, but concerns could surface depending on how supervisors approach accountability with their supervisees. As one respondent pointed out "issues of power and control come in when a supervisor does not understand...how to hold people accountable in an effective way" (Q62, P57).

The Need to Balance Administrative and Clinical/Practice Supervision

The administrative purpose of supervision is common to social work settings as a "way to ensure accountability where the legal and ethical obligations of the organization are monitored and ensured" (Q61, P244). A notable challenge raised for supervisors was how to "balance combining the clinical supervision with the administrative role" (Q74, P33), since "often the administrative part 'takes over' due to time restraints or other factors" (Q61, P605). Respondents also pointed out that organizations can appear to be offering practice supervision, whereas the offer is a veil for an alternative agenda. As one participant documented,

> I have sought and been told I was receiving clinical supervision, when it was quite evident that the primary needs being met were the organization's for compliance to policy and procedure. When an employee is inescapably caught in this kind of situation, it can be terribly damaging. (Q61, P244)

Repeatedly, respondents identified how the "dual role and...multiple agendas [of supervisors] creates its own set of struggles" (Q61, P150). The evaluation of staff emerged as one notable point of concern that is part of the workplace agenda.

Problems with Integrating Evaluations or Performance Appraisals with Clinical/Practice Supervision

Participants identified that evaluations or performance appraisals were closely associated with job retention and promotion. For some respondents, the close association between performance and job retention identified supervision as a potentially "unsafe place for any discussions deeper than administrative and how to issues" (Q61, P387). The extent of this concern suggested that staff members could not "fully benefit from supervision due to fear of being vulnerable and worrying about this being held against them" (Q62, P418). For example, "delicate ethical problems cannot be brought to your [supervisor's] attention because they might affect his appraisal of your work. (Q62, P609)

Nevertheless, two participants proposed alternative viewpoints supporting the need for evaluations or performance appraisals. As one participant explained, "all social workers need performance appraisals and feedback when they do things well or when they need assistance" (Q61, P233). The other respondent went so far as to propose that "it is naive and dangerous to separate the evaluative component from the other aspects of supervision" (Q61, P162). Rather, "establishing a trusting relationship and setting ground rules for supervision can eliminate the false dichotomy related to supervision and evaluation" (Q61, P162).

Changing the Landscape of Supervision: Suggestions for a Better Relationship between Practice and Administrative Purposes

Respondents provided suggestions for how supervisors could better provide administrative and practice supervision and decrease the potential use of supervision as a surveillance tool and a "venue to obtain employee information" (Q62, P376). One suggestion was the need for supervision "to be confidential and not shared with the ED" (Q61, P427).

Participants also proposed the need for some protective mechanism to be in place so that supervisors would be accountable for their evaluations of supervisees. As one respondent noted, "I have seen countless managers and supervisors who break every standard in the college guidelines repeatedly and there is no recourse to the college or anyone else about their conduct" (Q62, P387). Therefore, "there should be a formal process of reverse evaluation, i.e. supervisees evaluating the performance of their supervisors" (Q62, P456). The intent would be to provide social workers with "some method for challenging/supporting particular supervisors' judgement. A supervisor can end someone's career - where is the accountability for them?" (Q61, P64).

Finally, a prevalent suggestion amongst respondents was to have practice supervision and administrative supervision, along with the evaluative component, addressed by two separate people. Simply, the "supervisor must not be in a position to complete performance appraisals" (Q62, P381). As one participant pointed out, "In my experience, it is when the administrative and clinical aspects of supervision are combined in one person, there is a higher likelihood of the abusive use of the power of the position on the supervisee (Q61, P244).

As a concluding comment, one participant stated, "I truly believe that the role of administrative supervision (hiring, reviews, decisions etc) are very different from CLINICAL [practice] supervision, and I believe that the two roles should ALWAYS be separate! I believe they are a conflict of interest" (Q61, P515).

Authority in the Supervision Relationship

Respondents' narratives formed three themes about how the power associated with authority in the supervision relationship could be exercised and shared. The themes

are: (i) exercising authority and power for a positive supervision relationship, (ii) the

exercise of power for collaborative relationships, and (iii) the misuse of supervisor power

over social workers.

Exercising Authority and Power for a Positive Supervision Relationship

A number of respondent narratives agreed it is how supervisors exercise their

authority that supervision can "be a very powerful and positive process" (Q74, P405). For

this positive process to occur "the sessions should not be used as a way of keeping

control over workers" (Q62, P180). Rather, "supervisors [need to] regard their power

with some humility, and be ever cautious to use that power in the best interests of those

they supervise" (Q62, P73) and their clients. For example, a participant highlighted how

transparent discussions of power between supervisors and supervisees can have important

isomorphic implications for practice:

> If the power in the relationship and it's implications are explicitly discussed and
>
> do not influence one's evaluation, it can be quite helpful because it could free one
>
> up to address the power that we, as social workers, have in the therapeutic
>
> relationship. (Q62, P513).

The Exercise of Power for Collaborative Relationships

Narratives from many respondents strongly discouraged supervisors from

developing "a power-based relationship where the expectation is that only the supervisee

will be learning and the supervisor holds the sole authority-based power of whether the

supervisee maintains a job or not" (Q61, P402). Instead, supervisors were encouraged to

"follow the model of servant leadership and capacity building... [which provides] a

mutual learning opportunity" (Q61, P95). In such a relationship, the supervisor could

encourage "transparency of process [and] purpose" (Q61, P260), which includes "a

collaborative approach to problem-solving and discussion of relevant issues" (Q62,

P664), such as goal setting for the supervisee. Narratives repeatedly endorsed "that the

supervisor needs to ensure that professional development [of the social worker] is

encouraged in a non-threatening, non-judgemental way" (Q61, P215). Hence, the

learning aspects of the supervision relationship "need not be a power imbalance situation

but an opportunity for mutual professional growth, learning and development despite

length of social work experience" (Q61, P265).

The Misuse of Supervisor Power Over Social Workers

When supervisors do not understand "issues of ethics, power and control and how

they might play out in the particular setting in which one is working" (Q62, P205), the

consequences for social workers can be unfortunate. As one participant recounted,

> I have worked under managers who are power mongers, who are bullies, who
>
> have no formal training whatsoever.... I have concluded that in house supervision
>
> is a necessary evil, is not to be considered a trusting, supportive relationship –
>
> ever – that at best it is friendly in demeanour... Supervision is a management tool
>
> – and an abused one at that. (Q62, P387)

Participants repeatedly highlighted experiences when the supervision relationship

has been "used as one way of exerting power and control issues onto the supervisee"

(Q62, P122). Examples include "being micromanaged" (Q62, P 355), being treated "as

second class workers" (Q62, P288), and having supervision topics "imposed rather than

agreed on mutually" (Q2, P547). According to one respondent, "many supervisors ...get

caught up in 'power' trips or fear of being exposed in their lack of knowledge. This

creates a lack of trust and the social worker is not able to use supervision for the purpose

of growth because of fear of repercussions" (Q62, P103). These situations are further

exacerbated when supervisors cannot or will not "examine, address, or even discuss the

power differential" (Q61, P38) in the supervision relationship.

The Timing and Length of Supervision

Participants repeatedly stressed "supervision times need to be protected" (Q62,

P558) as "dedicated time, free from distractions" (Q61, P77). Along with an expressed

need to have "regularly scheduled weekly meetings planned a month in advance as

'protected supervision time'" (Q61, P566), respondents also identified the following three

themes: (i) for supervision to be available as needed, (ii) for supervision to be career-

long, and (iii) for supervision to eventually end and a consultation relationship to begin.

Supervision Available As Needed

Along with scheduled supervision times, respondents also proposed that

supervisors "need to be available for ad hoc meetings… Our jobs are demanding and

fluid and often stressful. I find that my supervisor is always available to talk and this

enables me to feel supported and able to function better" (Q61, P556). However, for

some settings, expecting supervisors "to be always available" (Q61, P51) and have "…an

open door policy" (Q61, P563) could be a questionable expectation. As one participant

pointed out, "supervision is not always readily available to social workers when they

need it due to supervisors having their own hectic case loads and not enough time to

spend with social workers"(Q62, P259).

Equally important, for supervision to work on an ad hoc basis, social workers

need to be comfortable to seek out their supervisors. According to one respondent, "much

of the supervision I receive is due to the fact that I request it" (Q61, P441). On the other

hand, needing to request supervision can have concerning consequences:

> I have been in the field for seven years and no longer receive one-to-one
>
> supervision from a supervisor. It is left to me to request supervision, but I feel that
>
> requesting it is viewed negatively -- as if I am incompetent, so I don't request it.
>
> (Q61, P511)

A Need for Career-Long Supervision

Many respondents agreed that supervision "is essential throughout one's career for

the purpose of ongoing growth and accountability" (Q61, P477) "in order to be the best

we can be with our clients/patients" (Q61, P402). Furthermore, career-long supervision

can be viewed as "key to ethical and clinical practice" (Q62, P630). As one participant

wrote, "supervision must continuously occur throughout the duration of one's

professional career, to ensure current professional growth and skill development, and that

one remains true to the ethical foundations of social work. (Q62, P459)

For a few respondents, however, the idea of on-going supervision appeared to

challenge their desired professional autonomy, work credibility, and, potentially, the

respect of other professionals. As one participant clearly stated,

> Supervision must have an end point just like childhood. There is a point at which
>
> a social worker must be able to function as an autonomous professional at a
>
> clinical level particularly for a master's level social worker. This is important for
>
> a number of reasons: Clients deserve to be served by social workers capable of
>
> this type of work, this is a level of functioning expected by other disciplines, our
>
> credibility as a profession is undermined if social work does not have this as an

expectation, perpetual supervision will block the individuals drive to achieve this level of functioning. (Q62, P613)

A Need for Supervision to End and a Consultation Relationship to Begin

In contrast to the respondents who wrote about career-long supervision, a number of narratives suggested a configuration of supervision that would be time-limited and yet ongoing. A shared meaning seemed to be that for experienced social workers, "supervision feels oppressing. [Therefore], a consultation model is more useful" (Q62, 452). Accordingly, "at a certain stage supervision sessions would be seen to be consultations (moving away from the power over model of supervision)" (Q62, 594). As such, "supervision should be an evolving role to a point where there is no longer a 'junior' and 'senior' but rather work colleagues who continue to support each other" (Q61, 521).

The Discipline, Training, and Other Qualities of the Supervisor

Respondents identified "it is essential that the supervisor is skilled, educated and has engaged in on-going professional training in the area of SW that the supervisee is working and has a supervisor themselves" (Q61, P485). These points emerged as five themes: (i) the need for supervisors to be social workers, (ii) the drawbacks and benefits when supervisors are from other disciplines, (iii) the need for supervisors to have practice experiences and knowledge, (iv) the need for training and supervision-of-supervision for supervisors, and (v) the need for supervisors with particular qualities.

Supervisors Need to be Social Workers

Many participants shared that "social workers NEED to be supervised by SOCIAL WORKERS!" (Q61, P640). Words such as "must," "should," "requires," "ensure," "feel strongly," were used to emphasize the importance that supervisors be

social workers for a variety of identified work settings: health care, child welfare, corrections, and community practice. As one narrative identified, supervision from a social worker means "my supervisor being aware of the code of ethics" (Q61, P78).

Drawbacks and Benefits when Supervisors are from Other Disciplines

A number of meaning units described working with supervisors from other disciplines, such as psychiatrists, nurses, psychologists, and administrators. I identified two threads of meaning. First, respondents seemed to suggest that supervision from a non social work supervisor "is not appropriate" (Q61, P201), "creates many challenges" (Q61, P294), and "has enormous practice implications" (Q61, P490). Specifically, "supervision from other educational backgrounds leads to the unweaving of the fabric that is the true nature of the social work practise" (Q62, P297), such as "a psychosocial perspective in care and treatment" (Q61, P662).

A second and contrasting perspective of this theme suggests that supervision from other disciplines can enhance professional practice. As one participant noted, "I think… by advocating to be profession specific we are overlooking the thing that makes our role strong- diversity- of skills, of approach, of perspectives. (Q74, P144)

Needs Concerning Practice Experiences and Knowledge of the Supervisor

Respondents agreed that "supervisors need to possess [and maintain] relevant clinical expertise and/or work experience prior to being hired" (Q61, P404). One respondent pointed out that "for those of us doing community planning and organizational policy writing, there is lack of knowledgeable supervision. I often rely on my own research and then share that with my supervisor" (Q61, P158). As well,

supervisors need to remain "current with research, both clinical and in terms of

community practice" (Q62, P293). As one respondent wrote,

> Social Work is an evolving practice constantly faced with new and unique
>
> problems, which may have been unforeseeable in preceding years. Therefore,
>
> supervisors must remain well informed of the new issues facing individuals in
>
> society as well as best practice models for empowering clients to successfully
>
> cope with the new challenges they face. Accepting this obligation to remain
>
> current and able to inform their supervisees of best practice models is vital to the
>
> integrity of the Social Work profession. (Q61, P184)

The Need for Training and Supervision-of-Supervision for Supervisors

When staff are promoted or hired to a supervisory position, "often it is assumed

that because one has been practicing for a certain number of years, that experience will

translate into strong supervisory skills, and this is not always the case" (Q61, P459). As

one participant pointed out, "supervision of staff is a difficult transition for front line staff

who migrate to a management position and in my experience they are not well prepared

for this transition" (Q62, P536). Instead, participants suggested that supervisors need

"training in how to provide supervision" (Q61, P558) and could benefit from

"supervision in their practice of supervision" (Q61, P161).

Participants suggested "all supervisors should go through a supervision course for

a year- even while supervising- as first time supervisors" (Q61, P256). Initial training

was not only considered for social workers. When "another profession supervises SW,

they should as well take a specific course on the supervision of SW where the values,

beliefs, ethics of the professions are taught" (Q61, P283). Ongoing training was also

encouraged in the form of "courses or certificates" (Q61, P122) or "refresher workshops" (Q61, P178). In other words, "most effective supervision comes from persons who have successfully completed courses in supervision" (Q61, P61).

One respondent brought forward an emerging area for training: "Effective social work supervision will be a reality only if the supervisor is culturally competent in congruence with the changing demographics of the Canadian population" (Q61, P459). Other identified topics for training could include:

- "Ethical practice and best practice guidelines" (Q62, P109).

- "How to focus supervision "on core social work values" (Q62, P400).

- "The process of supervision and on how to maintain positive, respectful and transparent relationships with front line staff" (Q61, P242).

- "How to transfer knowledge effectively to those they are supervising" (Q61, P340).

- "How to conduct supervision in terms of both clinical and administrative work" (Q61, P109).

- "Different styles of management and then discussing these styles with staff to identify what works for individual staff" (Q61, P114).

- "How to balance the need for work accountability with their staff person's specific needs and challenges" (Q61, P74).

- Work-site specific topics, such as "child welfare" (Q61, P657), "family therapy" (Q61, P306), and "areas such as mental health; housing issues; social activism; crisis intervention so that when these issues come up in supervision, they will be able to provide immediate and effective supervision to the worker" (Q61, P627).

In spite of the apparent need for training, none of the respondents identified a current available course specific for social work supervision. As one respondent pointed out, "there are very few opportunities for social workers to learn and develop their supervisory skills and knowledge" (Q61, 449).

The Need for Supervisors with Particular Qualities

Along with a supervisor's discipline, experience, and supervision training, respondents also identified qualities about the self of the supervisor that could enhance the supervision relationship. For example: "I believe that the supervisor needs to be one who lives and practices the values of the code of SW ethics and [is] able to balance that with the polices of the organization, [while] valuing diversity and cultural competency" (Q61, P215). Furthermore, supervisors need to be "...supportive; aware of the supervisee as a whole person; encouraging; empathetic; forgiving.... a buffer between the supervisee and upper management" (Q61, P416), and "have a strong work ethic and ensure that there is equal division of work among the team members (Q61, P356). A respondent identified that when the qualities of "respect, honesty, humility, courage and humour" are combined with a supervisor's skills, it "... makes working with her so enriching" (Q61, P30).

Alternatives to Inadequate or Absent Supervision in the Work Place

When supervision is not offered, not sufficiently available, or ineffective, social workers have been finding ways to meet their own supervision needs, albeit not without particular challenges. Many participants shared their experiences and ideas about peer supervision or consultation, mentoring, and alternative ways to access supervision. For my final category, five themes clustered together: (i) the benefits of peer supervision or consultation for social work practice, (ii) peer supervision or consultation and

experiences of power and authority, (iii) peer supervision or consultation for experienced social workers, (iv) the benefits of mentoring, and (v) alternatives to in-house supervision.

The Benefits of Peer Supervision or Consultation for Social Work Practice

For many respondents, peer supervision or consultation describe conversations "between social workers [or] between social workers and other disciplines" (Q61, P452) that "provides an opportunity for an exchange of several different approaches to clinical intervention" (Q61, P510). These discussions also help to address "clinical and ethical issues" (Q61, P91), and offer space for "cooperative education/learning and brainstorming" (Q61, P460). Access to and the scheduling of peer supervision or consultation can vary. Some respondents "benefit from regularly scheduled opportunities for peer supervision" (Q61, P510). Alternatively, consultation can occur informally: "I routinely cross-consult with peers if I feel the need, and in turn, am routinely sought out for consultation by others" (Q74, P250).

Repeatedly, respondents wrote how peer supervision or consultation have been important to their social work practice, whether in organizational settings ("efforts need to be made to encourage peer-supervision among fellow social workers across work places" (Q62, P84)) or for those social workers "working in isolated careers such as private practice" (Q62, P140). For many respondents, peer supervision or consultation becomes a valued resource when supervision is inadequate, insufficient, or simply not available. One participant stated, "My supervisor is a MSW but is too busy to attend our monthly scheduled supervision. I am left to find peer consultation…" (Q74, P271). For some respondents, participation in peer conversations has become supervision. "Once

when I had a mis-fit with a supervisor at work I consulted more with a senior colleague who I respected, and joined a peer supervision group among colleagues. The key is that I was receiving supervision" (Q61, P139).

Peer Supervision or Consultation and Experiences of Power and Authority

A cluster of respondents highlighted that they appreciate how peer supervision "minimizes the power-related issues" (Q61, P108) and moves "beyond the evaluative authority model" (Q74, P594) of a supervisor/supervisee relationship. Nevertheless, one respondent proposed a different perspective into the potential relational politics of organizational life:

> There is always a power differential in the work place and often even during peer
>
> supervision there is a concern that questions or requests for support are going to
>
> be looked at as a professional deficit and may be used against you in the future.
>
> Your expertise as a social worker may be called into question. (Q61, P325)

In spite of the above insight, the majority of narratives for this theme appeared to agree peer supervision is "less intense than one-on-one supervision and is an effective way of balancing out the power differential" (Q61, P486).

Peer Supervision or Consultation for Experienced Social Workers

For experienced social workers, there were participants who shared an objection about "the seemingly never-endingness of 'supervision.' After 3-5 years, the practitioner should be able to function fully independently and be responsible for [their] actions, decisions, successes, [and] mistakes" (Q62, P93). For these respondents, supervision needs to "be replaced by peer consultation" (Q61, P89) "for support, information and possible training opportunities" (Q61, 477). As one participant explained,

I believe that all social workers must become autonomous professionals who can

function independently and within the interdisciplinary team context when

appropriate.... It is for these reasons that I see a real benefit... in peer supervision

for ALL social workers regardless of how many years they have been practicing.

(Q62, P486)

The Benefits of Mentoring

A number of narratives clustered together to form the second alternative

relationship possibility, identified as "mentoring." According to respondents, mentoring

describes a one to one relationship between a less experienced or new social worker and a

"senior, experienced/skilled colleague who is a mentor" (Q61, P93). The intent of the

relationship is to help facilitate learning and "share social work skills" (Q61, P243). The

benefit for new employees was explained by one participant: "In my current position, I

felt as though I was thrown into the fire without having proper knowledge of what I

would be doing; a mentoring project for new employees... should be considered" (Q62,

P407).

In some settings, mentoring has become an alternative to absent supervision. As

one participant explained, "There has been no supervision in the hospital where I work,

for over 10 years.... There is a mentoring program at our hospital for new workers for the

first year" (Q74, P587). Mentoring was also an expressed need for respondents when "we

don't have a supervisor who has expertise in the same discipline. So I would like to have

a very good mentorship program.... so that I can get some input from other social

workers" (Q61, P284).

Alternatives to In-House Supervision

In response to organizational situations where supervision is not offered or not sufficiently available, respondents repeatedly suggested that social workers need to contract for supervision outside of their work setting. Typically this means that social workers "arrange to have good supervision on a private basis, which [is] quite expensive" (Q61, P662). In spite of the cost, one respondent stated, "I strongly believe that graduating social workers should pay for clinical supervision for at least a couple of years if clinical supervision is not available in their workplace" (Q61, P70).

For many social workers, however, "wanting supervision and affording it (either privately or from an agency standpoint) is what can be challenging" (Q61, P644). As a possible response, one participant suggested that "agencies likes CAS, hospitals or community organisations should provide their employees with access to a professional social worker, for supervision" (Q61, P609). The question of affordability and accessibility of supervision is particularly relevant for social workers in rural or isolated settings, and "small organizations [where] it is not always practical to have in-house supervision" (Q61, P409). Possible solutions to help keep costs manageable, yet still offer effective supervision, could be "group supervision, dyadic supervision, [and] multidisciplinary team consultations" (Q61, P363). The use of "online live SW supervision" (Q61, P604) is also an option that could help address accessibility, especially for "Northern Ontario needs" (Q61, P255).

Summary Comments about Supervision Themes

My constant comparative analysis of respondents' meaning units created 31 themes about various aspects of supervision. Themes were collected together into eight

mutually exclusive categories according to a shared focus. The first category, the Need

for Supervision, garnered two themes about the need for supervision after graduation as

well as the theme that emerged when needed supervision is absent or inadequate. The

next category, Meeting the Need for Supervision, yielded four themes that highlighted the

need to make supervision a work place priority or mandatory for social workers, and two

themes that explored the possible involvement of the Ontario College.

The third category, The Purpose of Supervision, included five themes that

suggested supervision needs to (i) promote knowledge and skills, (ii) provide for social

workers' emotional needs, (iii) promote professional development, (iv) promote anti-

oppressive practice, and (v) provide opportunities for reflective supervision conversations

about ethical issues. The next category, the Relationship between Administrative and

Practice Purposes of Supervision, identified four themes that explored how these two

purposes of supervision can weave together, embrace the accountability of social

workers, address evaluations or performance appraisals, and finally, be configured for a

better relationship between practice and administrative purposes.

The fifth category brought together three themes about Authority in the

Supervision Relationship. The first two themes explored how the exercise of power and

authority can be positive for the supervision relationship and benefit collaborative

relationship development. The last theme that emerged focused on the misuse of power

by supervisors over social workers.

The Timing and Length of Supervision category identified the need to have time

dedicated. The first of three themes highlighted supervisors being available when needed.

The last two themes considered the need for career-long supervision, which contrasted to

the need to end supervision and allow a consultation relationship between supervisor and supervisees to begin.

The penultimate category brought together five themes about the Discipline, Training, and Other Qualities of the Supervisor. Three themes considered respondents' needs about the discipline, practice experiences, and knowledge of supervisors. The fourth theme identified the need for supervisors to be trained and even have supervision of their supervision. Finally, a theme emerged of particular qualities of a supervisor that could further enrich the supervision experience.

My interpretation of the qualitative findings concluded with the creation of an eighth category entitled, Alternatives to Inadequate or Absent Supervision in the Work Place. Three themes considered peer supervision or consultation and how these configurations interface with power and authority and work experience. The benefits of mentoring relationships, particularly when supervision is unavailable, was the fourth theme. The fifth and final theme identified ways social workers can access supervision outside their work settings. This category and its associated themes were not identified topics of the quantitative statements and questions in the web-survey.

CHAPTER EIGHT: INTERPRETATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The 636 research participants represented a broad spectrum of Ontario social work practice settings, located across a provincial landscape of organizational change and complex societal concerns. The web-survey results identified that these participants have many post-degree supervision needs that have not been met recently or are not being met currently. Given that the quality of supervision can be a key indicator of organizational wellbeing (Eisikovits et al., 1985), then the situation for Ontario's human services does indeed appear grave.

Although there are a considerable number of supervision needs; needs that reiterate many previously raised concerns about social work supervision in Canada (Aronson & Sammon, 2000; CASW, 2004; Stephenson et al., 2000), the results also suggest how these needs could be met. That is, a cohesive configuration of supervision, preferred by participants, is not only possible from the findings, but is one of my hoped for outcomes of this research. This outcome corresponds to a key purpose of needs focused research, which points out that identified needs are used to influence and inform the development and allocation of resources and/or policy creation (Altschuld & Witkin, 2000; Witkin, 1984). Therefore, I believe that a presentation of a dominant configuration of supervision according to participants is important for my subsequent reflections, as well as for the implications for Ontario supervision practices and future research.

A Dominant or Preferred Configuration of Supervision According to Participants

The creation of the following possible portrait of preferred supervision emerged from my integration of the quantitative and qualitative findings (see Appendix N for how I achieved design and transferability quality assurance). I acknowledge that my meanings

gleaned from the data are tentative, context and time-bound constructions. Subsequently, I respond with my speculations and wonderings about this composite supervision configuration.

Social work participants of all ages, experiences, work-settings, and geographic locations across Ontario clearly identified a need for effective and available post-degree supervision. When face-to-face meetings are not possible, alternative options, such as on-line supervision or peer consultation, are essential. The person providing supervision needs to be an experienced social worker with training specific to supervision and the particular needs of the work setting. Some participants also suggested that supervisors receive supervision of their supervision.

The purpose of the supervision relationship needs to have two predominant facets. The first is a cluster of five foci (hereafter identified as the five-fold purpose) that includes: (i) knowledge and skill development; (ii) professional development; (iii) emotional support, (iv) social justice and change that would promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive practice, recognize and respect cultural diversity, challenge unjust policies and practices, help social workers advocate for clients during interdisciplinary meetings, and find ways for social work practice to ethically balance care with control; and (v) administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures. The second facet is the need for reflective conversations, particularly about ethical issues and practice concerns. Since administrative tasks often take over supervision meetings, fulfilling these different facets could mean the division of responsibilities between two people represented by a practice/clinical supervisor and an administrative supervisor.

The element of accountability for social workers is expected and accepted as long as supervisors exercise their workplace authority and power to encourage a transparent process. To help make power relations more visible, supervisors need to encourage discussions with social workers about power differences in the supervision relationship. Furthermore, knowledge development and learning is shared by all participants through a collaborative, co-creative process. According to participants, these needed elements of the supervision relationship could clarify what and how information from supervision conversations about ethical issues and practice concerns would be used by supervisors for staff evaluations and performance appraisals.

The meetings for supervision need to be protected and regular, especially for new graduates, inexperienced social workers, and new employees. A supervision agenda is determined and negotiated according to the needs of supervisees in relationship to their clients. In addition, supervisors need to be available for unscheduled conversations with staff. Regular, scheduled supervision needs to be on going for at least 3 years after which there is uncertainty about how the relationship would best unfold. Choices include career-long supervision, a supervision relationship that would transform into a consultation relationship, or the supervision relationship ends and social workers engage with peers for consultation as needed. Participants identified that the strongest reason for career-long supervision would be for emotional support, followed closely by the need for professional development.

Finally, the assurance of how this configuration of supervision will be actualized is still uncertain. On the one hand, work settings could become committed to providing supervision. On the other hand, the Ontario College could mandate and regulate

supervision. The latter option first needs to address concerns about how supervisors' authority is understood, how supervisors' power could be potentially abusive, and how social workers' knowledge and practice expertise would be valued.

The Emergence of a New Paradigm or More of the Same?

While the needs of social workers can be sculpted into a solution of apparent clarity of purpose and process, what does the above portrayal of supervision mean for Ontario practice? Is this support for the traditional practice of supervision according to the literature, or an emergent alternative discourse or paradigm that might contain traditional and alternative elements? In response, I return to Kuhn (1970) and his concept of a disciplinary matrix, and the four elements I developed to define a supervision paradigm. These elements are (1) shared generalizations about supervision; (2) shared ideas about the purpose and process of supervision; (3) shared value about the place in supervision for the social work mission of social justice and social change; and (4) shared agreement about the knowledge and skills of supervisors.

For my analysis and corresponding reflections, I organized the aspects of the proposed supervision configuration according to the four elements of my disciplinary matrix. I was particularly curious how well the supervision aspects adhered to the dominant supervision paradigm of the literature and/or presented anomalies that are not part of the existing paradigm, and which, according to Kuhn, are signs of a paradigm transformation. In addition, I weave in Foucault's ideas about power and discourse.

Disciplinary Matrix Element One: Shared Generalizations about Supervision

Findings indicate that there was unity amongst participants that supervision is essential for effective practice, that overall, supervision is inadequately provided for in

the workplace, and that supervision needs are unmet. This generalization is congruent with the traditional and alternative literature. As well, most participants appeared to agree with the literature that supervision of social work practice can enhance an understanding of social work ethics and values, develop social work skills, increase job satisfaction, and improve service delivery (Brown & Bourne, 1996; Cearley, 2004; Hensley, 2002; Rossiter et al., 1996).

<div align="center">Disciplinary Matrix Element Two:</div>

<div align="center">Shared Ideas about the Purpose and Process of Supervision</div>

The Five-Fold Purpose of Supervision

There appears to be shared beliefs amongst participants concerning the creation of a five-fold purpose for supervision. The addition of the two purposes, (i) professional development, and (ii) social justice and change, are anomalies compared to the "normal" tri-purpose of supervision (represented by educational, supportive, and administrative supervision), that were initially developed by Kadushin (1976).

Participant endorsement for supervision to have a focus on professional development identifies this area as a distinct need of supervision. While professional development has been included in the supervision literature, the focus area has often been couched with other purposes. For example, Kadushin and Harkness (2002) identify that educational supervision socializes the supervisee into the "culture of the social work profession" (p. 135). This proposed need resonates with the position taken by other helping professions, such as family therapy (AAMFT, 2007a, 2007b) and psychology (Edwards, 2000), that professional development needs to be an intentional focus of supervision.

The agreement of participants that the social work mission of social justice and change needs to be part of the purpose of supervision provides evidence to support the supervision conceptualizations of alternative writers such as Brown and Bourne (1996), Cooper (2002), O'Donoghue, (2003), and Tsui (2005b). I reflect further on this purpose aspect in response to the third element of the disciplinary matrix.

I believe that the addition of professional development and the social work mission for social justice and social change to the traditional supervision paradigm demonstrates that participants are in transition about what knowledge is valued for their social work practice. Moreover, while participants agreed there is a need for administrative supervision, there was also recognition of how administrative tasks easily encroach on practice supervision time. As one alternative, and in contrast to traditional supervision, there was some participant endorsement to assign practice and administrative supervision to different people. This apparent need to protect practice supervision time from organizational demands provides empirical support for recent research that demonstrated the incompatibility of administrative and practice supervision for social workers (Erera & Lazar, 1994; Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998). The following points provide further signs that the participant preferred configuration of supervision has elements of an emergent alternative paradigm.

Reflective Conversations about Ethical Issues and Practice Concerns

The idea of using supervision conversations for ethical issues and practice concerns appears to be a need supported by the traditional paradigm and alternative literature. Nevertheless, findings suggest that the amount of time participants spend in supervision talking about these topics could be lessened due to concerns about staff

evaluations or performance appraisals, which are ubiquitous to organizational life. To be clear, participants did not indicate that the use of formal feedback was the predominant issue, but rather how the information could be used for job retention and promotion. This association is similar to the concerns identified through the qualitative research by Walsh-Bowers, Rossiter, and Prilleltensky (1996). They note that fears of negative performance evaluations curtailed supervision discussions about ethics and practice dilemmas for social work staff at an Ontario agency.

Thus, for supervision to become a needed safe space for reflective conversations about ethical issues and practice concerns, the context for evaluations and performance appraisals needs to change.

The Process of Authority and Power: Creating Space for Reflective Conversations

As I have noted previously, there is a long history of documentation that describes how supervisors through their knowledge, position, and practices, can have considerable power to ensure that staff comply with organizational policies, procedures, and task expectations (Jones, 2004; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Scherz, 1958/1979). In turn, with these responsibilities the supervisor can sustain bureaucratic control and surveillance of practice (Levy, 1973; Munson, 2000; Wasserman, 1971/1979). These qualities easily lead to a supervisory relationship that values task performance and compliance over client advocacy, knowledge and skill development, or staff support. In such a context, any ethical concerns, practice difficulties, or queries about supervisor knowledge or decisions could lead to questions of competence and potential job dismissal. Consequently, suspicion and fear of reprisals can become the dominant experiences for social workers.

The idea that supervision practices could be for surveillance purposes finds support from Foucault (1980b, 1984a, 1984b) who identified that certain techniques, procedures, or practices are the "anatomy" of power, which are used to bring individuals into line with the truths of the dominant discourse. These "small acts of cunning" (Foucault, 1984a, p. 183) can create and reinforce uniformity and establish preferred knowledge and practice expectations. For example, the traditionally informed supervisor most often sees staff individually for supervision, which can discourage the sharing and valuing of knowledge created between practitioners, and reinforce the so-called expertise of the supervisor. As well, the hierarchical position of supervisor can sanction the exclusive right to view the work of staff, whereas it is much more difficult for staff to view the work of the supervisor.

In contrast, the participants' dominant supervision configuration advocates for supervisors who are granted authority and power more according to their work place position than their so-called expert knowledge and skill. Participants also identified that the assignment of authority according to organisational position means that learning can be collaborative and transparent with supervisees since no one person has superior information. Therefore, knowledge, skill, and professional development can be a co-creative, reflective, and supportive process that can invite other social workers, community partners and clients, and other organizational staff into supervision conversations (Jones, 2004; Karvinen-Niinikoski, 2004; O'Donoghue, 2003). Even so, supervisors need to be well informed, not only about the social work code of ethics and standards of practice, but also about preferred social and organizational knowledges, and to be transparent about these expectations with supervisees. In order to maintain

collaborative practices, participants identified that supervisors need to remain mindful of their positional authority, and provide on-going opportunities to discuss power relations that exist throughout the organizational culture and community (Fine & Turner, 1997).

Although the participants' configuration suggests that knowledge is a co-created adventure, the positional authority of the supervisor also means it is up to the supervisor to take the initiative to tailor supervision conversations to meet the needs of supervisees. For example, new graduates and less experienced social workers indicated a need for the so-called expert knowledge of supervisors, especially for advice and planning opportunities about what to do with clients. As well, participants, irrespective of work experience, reported a need, greater than current or recent experiences, for supervisors to give advice and provide help with client related planning. Nevertheless, accessing supervisor knowledge does not mean less valuing of the knowledge and experience of supervisees (Fine & Turner, 1997).

The participants' portrait of authority in the supervision relationship implies that staff evaluations or performance appraisals would be created in a context that invites questions and reflections, and accepts uncertainty about ethical issues and practice concerns. Actually, the qualities of authority identified by participants have the potential to transform supervision from being an exercise of power marked by a simple binary relationship of dominator and dominated, to becoming a complex interrelationship that is dynamic, liberating, and a positive energizing aspect of peoples' lives (Foucault, 1984d). Notably, for this supervision configuration to be successfully implemented, the organizational context also needs to be included during the social construction of the parameters defining the supervision relationship (Tsui, 2005). These ideas resonate with

alternative writers, such as Baldwin (2004b), Jones (2004), Karvinen-Niinikoski (2004),

and O'Donoghue (2003), as well as the research recommendations of Gibbs (2001).

The Length of Supervision

Participants collectively endorsed the need for supervision to last around three

years for new employees and graduates. This position corresponds to documented

dominant and alternative ideas about the need for supervision for new practitioners.

Although the uncertainty of how long supervision should continue during a social

workers career is reflected in the divergent opinions in the literature, the dominant

literature is clear that career-long supervision is best. I propose that agreement

concerning the accepted and expected duration of supervision during a social worker's

career will be easier when an understanding of the power relations between supervision

participants has been clarified and accepted.

<div align="center">

Disciplinary Matrix Element Three:

Shared Value about the Place in Supervision for the

Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change

</div>

Participants were united that social justice and social change are valued as part of

the purpose of supervision. This means that supervision conversations would promote

anti-racist and anti-oppressive practice, recognize and respect cultural diversity,

challenge unjust policies and practices, help social workers advocate for clients during

interdisciplinary meetings, and find ways for social work practice to ethically balance

care with control. The clear inclusion of the social work mission for social justice and

social change, is supported by authors of alternative supervision practices (such as Brown

& Bourne, 1996; Cooper, 2002; O'Donoghue, 2003; Tsui, 2005b), and is a strong sign

that an alternative paradigm could be emerging that is more congruent with a values-based social work practice supported by writers such as Bisman (2004), Payne (1999), Reamer (1994), and Saleebey (1994).

Disciplinary Matrix Element Four:

Shared Agreement about the Knowledge and Skills of Supervisors

The majority of participants agreed that supervisors need to be social workers, skilled as practitioners, and have training to provide supervision. Supervision training would prepare supervisors to know the OASW Code of Ethics and the legal requirements for social work practice, and be appropriately knowledgeable and skilled for different social work settings and the people served. Moreover, participants also stated that supervisors need to be supportive, respectful, and live and practice social work values that are effectively balanced with organizational expectations. The needed knowledge and skills identified by participants have been repeatedly documented across the supervision literature (for example, Barretta-Herman, 2001; Bogo & McKnight, 2005; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Munson, 2002; Strong et al., 2003; Tsui, 2005b).

A Paradigm in Transition?

In summary, the disciplinary matrix for supervision in Ontario appears to share qualities of the long-standing dominant paradigm, but there are also signs that a reconstruction of supervision is underway. Three participants' needs in particular have the potential to transform the current purpose and process of supervision for social workers. First, is the need for supervision to intentionally promote professional development and the social work mission of social justice and change. Second, the expressed need for collaborative, reflective supervision conversations is intimately woven

together with the third need, which is for the authority in the supervision relationship to

be characterized, by transparent power relations and the valuing of the knowledge and

skills of social work supervisees. The years to come will determine if the supervision

needs of social workers are silenced and assimilated or if they persistently grow into a

new "norm."

In the meantime, the shape of supervision will have little hope of evolving if the

availability, accessibility, and quality of supervision continue to be of marginal

importance to social workers collectively in Ontario. Since one of my aims of this

research was to initiate needed change for social work supervision practice, what, then,

are the next steps for this research in order to make a difference for Ontario social

workers?

So What? Contributing to Supervision Changes for Ontario Social Workers

The perspectives on need that I have attained from this research are a first step

toward creating intentional changes for social work supervision in Ontario. Given that a

needs assessment is a form of participatory research, I view my next task to be the

organization and dissemination of pertinent results to Ontario social workers, particularly

to the groups who partnered with me on this adventure. I believe the results of this

research can then be used by (a) Ontario social workers to promote effective practice in

the workplace, as well as (b) social work organizations and university social work

programs to develop supervision knowledge and practice.

Equipping Ontario Social Workers to Advocate for their own Supervision Needs

The results of this research support the many concerns about supervision practice

in Canada and the recommendations that have been repeatedly made for supervision

practises (CASW, 2001; MacDougall, 2001; Stephenson et al., 2000). Unlike some of the

respondents and the literature (Stephenson et al., 2000), I do not believe that the

transformation of social work supervision is the initial responsibility of the work place.

Rather, social workers are in the best position to advocate for their own needs. Therefore,

it is imperative that these findings are given back to Ontario social workers if further

actions are to ensue.

My first step is to prepare a suitable summary document of the results and the

preferred supervision configuration and deliver the information to the following groups:

    a.   Ontario Association of Social Workers

    b.   Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers

    c.   Children's Mental Health Ontario

    d.   Family Services of Ontario

    e.   Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies

    f.   Three Ontario child welfare agencies who made specific requests for results

    g.   Hamilton Family Health Team

The dissemination of the information could be sufficient to mobilize social workers from

these various organizations and settings. I would be willing to consult with any of the

organizations representing work-settings or with individual agencies about ways in which

the identified needs could be addressed. I would encourage social workers who provide

direct services to be a part of any discussion about supervision that would affect their

work settings.

As part of any discussions about supervision, I believe it will be necessary to

create agreeable nomenclature that would clarify terms and expectations. For example,

participant results suggest to me that establishing the differences between supervision, consultation, and mentoring, and encouraging the consistent use of each appropriate descriptor is essential. Furthermore, it would be important to explore supervision ideas for underserved geographical areas or work settings where social workers are isolated from peers. For example, on-line supervision presents accessibility advantages where technology is available (Munson, 2000, 2002).

As a second step, I am willing to engage in a collaborative, consultative relationship with representatives of the OASW and the OCSWSSW to encourage discussion about possible next steps that would be carried forward by each respective organization. An important goal of these conversations would be the clarification of areas of supervision that are currently ambiguous, such as (a) the minimal supervision hours per month, (b) the minimal duration of supervision over a social worker's career, (c) the discipline of supervisors, (d) the training needs of supervisors, and the (e) the division of administrative and practice purposes of supervision. A hoped for outcome of discussions would be the development of a proposal for supervision expectations that would be shared with Ontario social workers for their feedback and input.

Reflections on the Standardization of Social Work Supervision

The idea of the OASWSSW granting supervisors the authority to assess social workers' competencies received a spread of responses from participants. While a slim majority of participants agreed with the idea, the number of undecided responses suggests this is a potentially divisive proposal. Admittedly, like some of the research participants, I have some internal debate between the need for the eventual standardization of supervision practice and the freedom for social workers to challenge, and perhaps

dismiss, supervision relationships that become oppressive or seem, in their opinion, to have outlived their usefulness. In my mental wanderings, I have wondered: Does the establishment of standards of supervision mean the loss of professional autonomy (i.e., the ability to make independent practice decisions)? Does one preclude the other? These questions encouraged my following speculations.

I believe that supervision has the potential to significantly affect the delivery of services and the professional and practice development of social workers. Although I recognize the various tensions with professional regulation, I do have a concern that without the eventual creation of standards, the very existence of social work supervision and the unique services of social work in Ontario remain in jeopardy.

While I support the idea that "there is no such thing as a completely autonomous practitioner" (Munson, 2002, p. 199), I am also aware that depending on how and what standards are put in place, social workers' practice could be significantly constrained. Although the preferred configuration of supervision that emerged from this research suggests a relationship that would value and encourage the practice knowledge and skills of social workers, participants cannot be confident that this portrait would be the one chosen to shape provincial supervision standards. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that members of the OASW and the OCSWSSW consider exercising their substantial collective influence over any developments concerning supervision.

I propose that the discipline and the public would be best served if the OASW and the OCSWSSW were equally involved in conversations and potentially the construction of a social work supervision framework. Actually, it is my hope that collaborative co-

creation is the agreed upon process given that both groups could have a vested interest in

an outcome that could benefit social workers and the people of Ontario.

So What? Contributing to Supervision Changes through Future Research

The successful mobilization of Ontario social workers, representative

organizations, and agencies to form a response to supervision needs will continue to be

strengthened by further practice-based evidence. This research on the perspectives of

supervision needs is only a beginning, and thus an invitation for further investigative

avenues towards the creation of effective social work supervision and social work

practice in Ontario.

The use of a mixed model research design and the number of participants allowed

me to address the recent recommendation of Marion Bogo and Kathryn McKnight (2005)

that investigations of supervision include large numbers of participants representing

various service settings and geographical locations. While, I believe this exploratory

research is a step towards discovering what supervision could be, the use of an original

questionnaire and the accompanying results prompted my following reflections,

comments, and suggestions for future research.

Limitations with my Sample of Participants and Suggestions for Future Research

I am very pleased with the number of people who responded to my web-survey.

Nevertheless, various social work groups were poorly represented. Notably, responses

from social workers in child welfare settings and corrections were very low. As well,

there were few social work participants from work settings developed and maintained by

and for Aboriginal/First Nations peoples in Ontario. The fact that the questionnaire was

in English, and not French, left out an unknown number of social workers. In sum, I

believe that participation was restricted by language and my limited window of time to network with the various individual organizations across the province.

I would suggest that future research build in preparation time to allow for engagement with and the development of potential research partners from child welfare, corrections, and Francophone and Aboriginal/First Nations communities and work settings. Corresponding changes to the questionnaire would also be required. A French translation of the questionnaire would need to be prepared (I am also aware that there are many agencies, particularly in the Toronto area, that provide services in various languages that could also be considered). An inquiry into the supervision needs of social workers of Aboriginal/First Nations social service settings could mean significant alterations to the questionnaire to be congruent with an Aboriginal worldview and corresponding practice expectations. A pre-test participant presented me with the following excellent questions that could stimulate valuable changes to the questionnaire: "What if supervision included a 4 day fast or a ceremony? What if it was important to go into the bush with an elder for supervision? Why does it have to be a western way and context of looking at supervision?" (Pre-test person K)

Limitations with the Questionnaire and Suggestions for Future Research

I developed the supervision questionnaire specifically for this research. Although reliability was high for the quantitative items, two scales in particular were relatively weak compared to the other three scales and the overall reliability estimate. I suggest that the restructuring of the Purpose of Supervision scale and the Authority in the Supervision Relationship scale would strengthen reliability. In turn, the design quality, specifically construct validity, would become clearer.

The limitations of fixed-item responses and the use of the term "client" were problematic for some participants. In response, I have two suggested modifications to the structure of the questionnaire (with thanks for the comments from participants). First, I would be interested to learn if the addition of a comments section after each scale or each section of questions would enrich responses. The second proposed change involves my use of the term "client." While I believe I carefully selected this word, participant comments have encouraged me to re-think what term would better embrace social workers from community settings. As one participant explained, "many of the questions I answered with no response because they referred to working with clients which is not really applicable to me because I work within the community" (Q74, P69).

Limitations of the Quantitative Findings and Suggestions for Future Research

Many of the inferential statistical results are best approached with caution. Although significant differences were achieved, most equations had only small effect sizes. While the evidence of even minimal practical significance has value, the various results invite further research and modifications to the questionnaire, such as those suggestions I have noted above. As well, I am curious how the order of the fixed response items influenced results. Specifically, I wonder what analytic and interpretive differences would occur if the response option "not sure" was removed or moved from the middle to the end of the Likert scales?

Some Puzzles to Ponder for Future Research

From my diverse analyses and accompanying interpretations, I found that my multiple regression analyses in particular surfaced some curious findings that would be

interesting to develop into future research projects. I provide a few examples for three

demographic variables and my corresponding speculations.

The Number of One-hour Supervision Meetings per Month

The average number of one-hour supervision meetings per month was similar for

participants working for hospitals, CW/CASs, and CMHCs. Yet I discovered that for

participants from CW/CAS settings, fewer meetings per month were associated with less

need for the various representative aspects of authority in the supervision relationship,

such as needing advice from supervisors and needing conversations about power in the

supervision relationship. Given this unique finding, I wonder what qualities about child

welfare work could discourage a need to meet with supervisors for planning, advice, and

possible conversations about power relations? I am curious if these results suggest that

child welfare supervisors wield their power from an expert stance rather than inviting

collaboration and co-creation? Alternatively, perhaps participants find that supervision

conversations do not provide enough help with planning or advice with clients so that it is

actually more appealing to meet less often?

When my analysis included responses from all 636 participants, the fewer

meetings of supervision per month was associated with a greater need for the various

aspects that make up the purpose of supervision, which includes a focus on knowledge

and skill development, emotional support, professional development, work place

administrative tasks, and conversations about ethical issues and practice concerns. This

finding suggests that there could be sufficient benefit from supervision so that more

meetings would be welcomed. Furthermore, participants also indicated that the more

supervision meetings per month, the greater their need for ongoing supervision.

The number of supervision meetings per month was the one demographic variable that had the broadest influence in my analysis. I propose that future research would help to tease out what could be the optimum number of meetings, and whether or not that number would vary depending on the work setting and the supervision configuration.

The Educational Degree of Participants

Another demographic variable that had practical significance for two different participant groups was level of education. As respondents from hospitals gained graduate education, there seemed to be less need from supervision for knowledge and skill development, emotional support, professional development, and work place administrative tasks. Although the majority of participants working for hospitals and CMHCs had their MSWs, education only seemed to make a difference for hospital social workers in relationship to their need for the four-fold purpose of supervision.

Perhaps the process of gaining a masters degree led hospital social work participants to believe that supervision was no longer needed for the four-fold purpose? Alternatively, perhaps a graduate education contributes to different expectations from supervision? Notably, 50% of participants in this setting reported that they are no longer being supervised by social workers (a common experience according to Berger and Mizrahi, 2001, and Strong et al., 2003), whereas only 29% of participants in CMHCs reported non-social work supervisors. Therefore, could it be possible, when MSW social workers have a non-social work supervisor and the work context is not encouraging of a social work perspective, the need for supervision would decline?

For participants from CW/CASs, the higher their educational designations, the greater the need for supervision conversations to include the social work mission of

social justice and social change, and for supervisors to be properly trained and have

practice experience as social workers. Unlike participants from hospitals and CMHCs,

the distribution of BSW and MSW degrees for CW/CAS respondents was approximately

the same. These findings suggest that graduate social work education is related to

changing supervision needs of child welfare workers. Anecdotal information suggests to

me that many social workers in child welfare pursue a master's degree after years of

experience following graduation with a BSW. Therefore, I wonder, is there a relationship

between years of experience prior to graduate school and the addition of new knowledge

that could influence the expectations of social work practice and supervision upon

returning to child welfare work following a graduate education?

As a final comment, these results suggest that education potentially could have an

effect on the supervision needs of social workers. This preliminary evidence, in

combination with various participant comments supporting how practice experience is

related to changes in supervision needs, encourages further investigation into the need for

a configuration of supervision that includes developmental changes according to

education and practice experience.

Gender Differences between Participants

Curiosity about how men and women share and compare life experiences

encouraged me to highlight one final result. Men working for CW/CAS appeared on

average to have lower purpose subscale scores than women participants, suggesting they

have less need for supervision to focus on knowledge and skill development, emotional

support, professional development, and work place administrative tasks. This was the

only finding where a gender difference was detected, even though a similar percentage of men and women worked for CW/CASs, hospitals, and CMHCs.

I am very curious about what could contribute to gender differences that occurred only in relationship to the four-fold purpose of supervision and only for participants working for CW/CASs. If the purpose subscale was teased apart, I wonder if particular elements would demonstrate greater differences? For example, could men need more or less emotional support compared to women, in a setting where harm to children is a daily occurrence? If, as I have already speculated, child welfare supervision is more often experienced as directive and non-reflective (supported by the research of Gibbs, 2001), could men find that approach to be less appealing or more appealing no matter the gender of their supervisors?

Finally, there is the question: Does it make a difference for men if their CW/CAS supervisors are men or women? Kadushin and Harkness (2002) suggest that women supervisors can provide male social workers with "a consciousness-raising learning situation regarding women's experiences" (p. 307). I wonder how the participants of my research would respond to that possibility? However, that does little to explain the unique experience of men and women working for CW/CAS. Munson's (1979) research found that the only apparent difficulties during supervision actually occurred when men supervised men. Although his explanation is somewhat dated, Munson speculated that the desire of organizations to have male social workers could encourage their rapid movement into supervisory positions before they are adequately prepared compared to women. Perhaps in CW/CASs, men are more affected than women are by less than competent male supervisors? Moreover, could the results I found be a sign of

organizational gender bias? Further exploration of my data could help to guide future research about gender differences and the supervision relationship. Otherwise, in respect of the complexity of sexual politics (Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Turner & Fine, 1997), I will leave further speculation to future research.

Final Considerations for Future Research

The value of the supervision measure I developed for this research will increase with repeated use. Therefore, it is my hope that I will have further opportunities to assess the supervision needs of social workers using this questionnaire. One possibility could be to investigate the supervision needs of specific social work groups in Ontario, perhaps identified according to work setting, practice focus, or geographical location. It would also be very interesting to extend the questionnaire to other provinces across Canada, or to use the questionnaire for international comparisons.

I would expect that each time I use the questionnaire, modifications would be considered and integrated to strengthen inference quality and inference transferability. Furthermore, as I have already stated, I am very interested if changes to wording, content, and delivery would make the questionnaire more accessible and useful for specific social work settings. For example, I would welcome an invitation to explore the perspectives on post-degree supervision needs of social workers of Aboriginal/First Nations social service settings.

A particular benefit of my concurrent mixed model nested design is the flexibility to add a subsequent phase. For example, focus groups or interviews with social workers alone and with their supervisors would add valuable knowledge, and, would in turn, enrich the complexity of current information and extend meanings of present concepts.

Research that included the clients of social workers would help to extend the influence of the supervision relationship to all participants and potential beneficiaries.

Concluding Reflections

This research is one contribution toward filling the gap in knowledge about what social workers need from post-degree supervision to help them provide effective services. The results clearly indicate that supervision is a valued relationship for social workers. The usefulness of this research will be discovered as the anticipated actualization of social work supervision unfolds. However, the successful emergence and establishment of effective, available post-degree supervision cannot rely on these findings alone. Social work practitioners and academics are strongly encouraged to actively advocate for and creatively engage in the development of education, training, and research opportunities about post-degree social work supervision.

I close with the comments of participants whose words represent current observations about social work supervision along with the hope that research can help facilitate change. As one participant noted:

> I hope that something can be done with this. I am tired of working in community organizations where "supervision" is not understood or valued. I am tired of receiving bad supervision and/or no supervision - and although I choose to purchase supervision - I am tired of working with social workers and supervisors who do not receive good quality supervision. (Q74, P311)

Like the participants, it is my hope that this research "will be contributing to the development of competent social workers through excellent supervision" (Q74, P247).

APPENDIX A

Post-degree Supervision Research: 1970-2007

Research using Surveys/Questionnaires

Berger, C., & Mizrahi, T. (2001). An evolving paradigm of supervision within a changing health care environment. *Social Work in Health Care, 32*(4), 1-18.

Cearley, S. (2004). The power of supervision in child welfare services. *Child & Youth Care Forum, 33*(5), 313-327.

Cohen, B.-Z, & Laufer, H. (1999). The influence of supervision on social workers' perceptions of their professional competence. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(2), 39-50.

Darlington, Y., Osmond, J., & Peile, C. (2002). Child welfare workers' use of theory in working with physical abuse: Implications for professional supervision. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 83*, 54-63.

Drake, B., & Washeck, J. (1998). A competency-based method for providing worker feedback to CPS supervisors. *Administration in Social Work, 22*(3), 55-74.

Eisikovits, Z., Meier, R., Guttmann, E., Shurka, E., & Levinstein, A. (1985). Supervision in ecological context: The relationship between the quality of supervision and the work and treatment environment. *Journal of Social Service Research, 8*(4), 37-58.

Erera, I. P., & Lazar, A. (1993). Training needs of social work supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(1), 83-93.

Erera, I. P., & Lazar, A. (1994). The administrative and educational functions in supervision: Indications of incompatibility. *The Clinical Supervisor, 12*(2), 39-56. Gibelman & Schervish (1997). Supervision in social work: Characteristics and trends in a changing environment. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16*(2), 1-15.

Gibelman, M., & Schervish, P. H. (1997). Supervision in social work: Characteristics and trends in a changing environment. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16*(2), 1-15.

Granvold, D. (1977). Supervisory style and educational preparation of public welfare supervisors. *Administration in Social Work, 1*, 79-88.

Granvold, D. (1978). Training social work supervisors to meet organizational and worker objectives. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 14*, 38-45.

Gray, S. (1990). The interplay of social work licensure and supervision: An exploratory study. *The Clinical Supervisor, 8*(1), 53-65.

Greenspan, R., Hanfling, S., Parker, E., Primm, S., & Waldfogel, D. (1991). Supervision of experienced agency workers: A descriptive study. *The Clinical Supervisor, 9*(2), 31-42.

Himle, D. P., Jayaratne, S., & Thyness, P. A. (1989). The buffering effects of four types of supervisory support on work stress. *Administration in Social Work, 13*(1), 19-34.

Itzhaky, H., & Aviad-Hiebloom, A. (1998). How supervision and role stress in social work affect burnout. *Arete, 22*(2), 29-43.

Jayaratne, S., Brabson, H. V., Gant, L. M., Nagda, B. A., Singh, A. K., & Chess, W. A. (1992). African-American practitioners' perceptions of their supervisors: Emotional support, social undermining, and criticism. *Administration in Social Work, 16*(2), 27-43.

Kadushin, A. (1974). Supervisor-supervisee: A survey. *Social Work, 19*, 288-297.

Kadushin, A. (1992a). Social work supervision: An updated survey. *The Clinical Supervisor,10*(2), 9-27.

Kadushin, A. (1992b). What's wrong, what's right with social work supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 10*(1), 3-19.

Kavanagh, D. J., Spence, S. H., Strong, J., Wilson, J., Sturk, H., & Crow, N. (2003). Supervision practices in allied mental health: Relationships of supervision characteristics to perceived impact and job satisfaction. *Mental Health Services Research, 5*(4), 187-195.

Ko, G. (1987). Casework supervision in voluntary family service agencies in Hong Kong. *International Social Work, 30*, 171-184.

Landau, R. (1999). Ethical judgement, code of ethics and supervision in ethical decision making in social work: Findings from an Israeli sample. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 23*(2), 21-29.

Laufer, H. (2003). Long-experienced social workers and supervision: Perceptions and implications. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 153-171.

Melichercik, J. (1984). Social work supervision in transition: An exploration of current supervisory practice. *The Social Worker, 52*(3), 108-112.

Miller, R. R., & Robb, J. R., (1997). New professionals' preparedness for clinical social work: Supervisors' perspectives. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 25*, 351-363.

Munson, C. (1979a). An empirical study of structure and authority in social work supervision. In C. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 286-296). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing.

Munson, C. (1979b). Evaluation of male and female supervisors. *Social Work, 24,* 104-110.

Munson, C. (1980). Differential impact of structure and authority in supervision, *Arete, 6,* 3-15.

Munson, C. (1981). Style and structure in supervision. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 17,* 65-72.

O'Donoghue, K., Munford, R., & Trlin, A. (2005, Summer). Mapping the territory: Supervision within the association. *Social Work Review, 17,* 46-64.

Perry, R. E. (2006). Education and child welfare supervisor performance: Does a social work degree matter? *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*(6), 591-604.

Pilcher, A. J. (1984). The state of social work supervision in Victoria according to the practitioners. *Australian Social Work, 37*(3/4), 33-43.

Preston, M. S. (2004). Mandatory management training for newly hired child welfare supervisors: A divergence between management research and training practice? *Administration in Social Work, 28*(2), 81-97.

Rauktis, M. E., & Koeske, G. F., (1994). Maintaining social work morale: When supportive supervision is not enough. *Administration in Social Work, 18*(1), 39-60.

Rodway, M. R. (1991). Motivation and team building of supervisors in a multi-service setting. *The Clinical Supervisor, 9*(2), 161-169.

Schroffel, A. (1999). How does clinical supervision affect job satisfaction? *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(2), 91-105.

Scott, D., & Farrow, J. (1993). Evaluating standards of social work supervision in child welfare and hospital social work. *Australian Social Work, 46*(2), 33-41.

Shulman, L. (1991). *Interactional social work practice. Toward an empirical theory.* Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Shulman, L., Robinson, E., & Luckyj, A. (1981). *A study of supervision skill: Context, content and process.* Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

York, R.O., & Denton, R. T. (1990). Leadership behavior and supervisory performance: The view from below. *The Clinical Supervisor, 8*(1), 93-108.

Qualitative Research Designs

Autagavaia, M. (2001). A tagata Pasifika supervision process: Authenticating difference. In L. Beddoe & J. Worrall (Eds.), *Supervision conference July 7-8, 2000: From rhetoric to reality. Keynote address and selected papers* (pp.45-52). Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Social Work, Auckland College of Education.

Bibus, A. (1993). In pursuit of a missing link: The influence of supervision on social worker's practice with involuntary clients. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(2), 7-22.

Gibbs, J. A. (2001). Maintaining front-line workers in child protection: A case of refocusing supervision. *Child Abuse Review, 10*, 323-335.

Hensley, P. H. (2002). The value of supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 21*(1), 97-110.

Itzhaky, H., & Rudich, V. (2003/2004). Communication and values in the cross-cultural encounter and their influence on supervision in social work. *Arete, 27*(2), 50-64.

Nelson, D. W. (2000, March). *Advisory report on front line and supervisory practice.* New York: Annie E. Casey Foundation, Special Child Welfare Advisory Panel. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.aecf.org/child/frontline.pdf

Rushton, A., & Nathan, J. (1996). The supervision of child protection work. *British Journal of Social Work, 26*, 357-374.

Smith, M. (2000). Supervision of fear in social work. A re-evaluation of reassurance. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 14*(1), 17-26.

Strong, J., Kavanagh, D., Wilson, J., Spence, S. H., Worrall, L., & Crow, N. (2003). Supervision practice for allied health professionals with a large mental health service: Exploring the phenomenon. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 191-210.

Syrett, V., Jones, M., & Sercombe, N. (1996). Practice supervision: The challenge of definition. *Practice, 8*(3), 53-62.

Tsui, M.-S. (2003). The supervisory relationship of Chinese social workers in Hong Kong. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 99-120.

Tsui, M.-S. (2005). Functions of social work supervision in Hong Kong. *International Social Work, 48*(4), 485-493.

Tsui, M.-S., Ho, W.-S., & Lam, C.-M. (2005). The use of supervisory authority in Chinese cultural context. *Administration in Social Work, 29*(4), 51-68.

Experimental Designs

Harkness, D. (1995). The art of helping in supervised practice: Skills, relationships, and outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 13*(1), 63-76.

Harkness, D. (1997). Testing interactional social work theory: A panel analysis of supervised practice and outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 15*(1), 33-50.

Harness, D. & Hensley, H. (1991). Changing the focus of social work supervision: Effects on client satisfaction and generalized contentment. *Social Work, 36*(6), 506-512.

Research using Mixed Methods

Collins-Carmargo, C. E., & Groeber, C. (2003). Adventures in partnership: Using learning laboratories to enhance frontline supervision in child welfare. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 6*(1/2), 17-31.

Poertner, J. & Rapp, C. (1983). What is social work supervision? *The Clinical Supervisor, 1*, 53-65.

Strand, V., & Badger, L. (2005). Professionalizing child welfare: An evaluation of a clinical consultation model for supervisors. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27*, 865-880.

Dissertations using Surveys/Questionnaires

Jeffreys, J. W. (2001). The impact of supervision on social work perception of self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 63/01, p. 363, Jul 2002. (UMI No. AAT 3039611). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=726315081&sid=4&Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

McCarthy, M. L. (2003). The relationship between supervision and casework retention in county-based child welfare systems *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 65/03, p. 1119, Sep 2004, (UMI No. AAT NQ89697). Retrieved August 17, 2006, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=765404351&sid=3&Fmt &clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Nathanson, A. (1992). New social workers' satisfaction with supervision and with their job overall. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 53/04, p. 1276, Oct 1992. (UMI No. AAT 9222582). Retrieved December 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=746948631&sid=8 &Fmt &clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Dissertations using Qualitative Research Designs

Matheson, J. E. (1999). The process of social work supervision: Women's perspectives. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 60/07, p. 2680, Jan 2000. (UMI No. AAT NQ38453). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=729766701&sid=8 &Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Tsui, M-S. (2001). Towards a culturally sensitive model of social work supervision in Hong Kong. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A* 62/11, p. 3938, May 2002 (UMI No. AAT NQ63801). Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=726077981&sid=4 &Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Tuttle, L. D. (2000). Countertransference within the context of clinical supervision. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A* 60/12, p. 4608, Jun 2000. (UMI No. AAT 9953964). Retrieved December 20, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=730593921&sid=5 &Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Dissertations using Mixed Methods

Fukuyama, K. (1998). Influences of selected characteristics of professional supervision on job satisfaction, productivity and autonomy of professional social workers in Japan. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 60/04, p. 1328, Oct 1999. (UMI No. AAT 9925225). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=734459261&sid=2 &Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

APPENDIX B

Country Locations of Post-degree Supervision Research: 1970-2007

Country	Authors
United States • 31 publications • 4 dissertations	Berger & Mizrahi, 2001 Bibus, 1993 Cearley, 2004 Collins-Carmargo & Groeber, 2003 Drake & Washeck, 1998 Gibelman & Schervish, 1997 Granvold, 1977, 1978 Gray, 1990 Greenspan, Hanfling, Parker, Primm, & Waldfogel, 1991 Harkness, 1995, 1997 Harkness & Hensley, 1991 Hensley, 2002 Jayaratne, Brabson, Gant, Nagda, Singh, & Chess, 1992 Jeffreys, 2001 * Kadushin, 1974, 1992a, 1992b McCarthy, 2003 * Miller & Robb, 1997 Munson, 1979a, 1979b, 1980, 1981 Nathanson, 1992 * Nelson, 2000 Perry, 2006 Poertner & Rapp, 1983 Preston, 2004 Rauktis & Koeske, 1994 Schroffel, 1999 Strand & Badger, 2005 Tuttle, 2000 * York & Denton, 1990

Israel • 8 publications	Cohen & Laufer, 1999 Eisikovits, Meier, Guttman, Shurka, & Levinstein, 1985 Erera & Lazar, 1993, 1994 Itzhaky & Aviad-Hiebloom, 1998 Itzhaky & Rudich, 2003/2004 Landau, 1999 Laufer, 2003
Canada • 4 publications • 1 dissertation	Matheson, 1999 * Melichercik, 1984 Rodway, 1991 Shulman, 1991 Shulman, Robinson, & Luckyji, 1981
Australia • 6 publications	Darlington, Osmond, & Peile, 2002 Gibbs, 2001 Kavanagh, Spence, Strong, Wilson, Sturk, & Crow, 2003 Pilcher, 1984 Scott & Farrow, 1993 Strong, Kavanagh, Wilson, Spence, Worrall, & Crow, 2003
United Kingdom • 3 publications	Rushton & Nathan, 1996 Smith, 2000 Syrett, Jones, & Sercomble, 1996
New Zealand • 2 publications	Autagavaia, 2001 O'Donoghue, Munford, & Trlin, 2005
Hong Kong • 4 publications • 1 dissertation	Ko, 1987 Tsui 2001*, 2003, 2005 Tsui, Ho, & Lam, 2005
Norway • 1 publication	Himle, Jayaratne, & Thyness, 1989
Japan • 1 dissertation	Fukuyama, 1998 *

* indicates dissertation

APPENDIX C

Invitation to Participate in the Web-Survey

June 13, 2007

Greetings!

This is an invitation to Ontario social workers to have a say in the future of supervision practices.

You are invited to complete a web-survey that will take about 15 – 20 minutes. You will be responding to questions and statements about your experience of receiving supervision.

In order to be a participant, you currently reside in Ontario; you have completed a BSW or MSW degree; you have some post-degree social work experience in Ontario; and you have received some post-degree supervision in Ontario.

NOTE: Current engagement in social work practice and receiving supervision is not necessary to participate in this survey. If that is your situation, please recall the most recent time when you received supervision for your social work practice.

In appreciation for your participation, at the end of the survey you will have the option of entering your name in a draw for a $100.00 Indigo Gift Card from Chapters Indigo.

Your responses will help shape the future of supervision for social workers in Ontario.

To access the web-survey click on:

www.wlu.ca/fsw/hhair/swsupervisionsurvey

Once you have completed and submitted this web-survey, please disregard any other invitations for this web-survey that you might receive.

This web-survey has been designed to answer the question: What do Ontario social workers identify as their post-degree supervision needs? This research is part of Heather J. Hair's Doctoral studies in Social Work at Wilfrid Laurier University. If you have any questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact me at hair2080@wlu.ca or (905) 627-2018.

Thanking you in advance for your time and participation,

Heather J Hair
PhD Candidate, Faculty of Social Work
Wilfrid Laurier University

APPENDIX D

Reminder Email to Participate in the Web-Survey

What Do Ontario Social Workers Identify as their Post-Degree Supervision Needs?

Please respond and help shape the future of supervision for social workers!

Thank you if you have already completed the web-survey on supervision. Your participation is valued.

If you have not yet participated, there is still time to complete a web-survey on supervision that will take about 15 – 20 minutes. You will be responding to questions and statements about your experience of receiving supervision. In appreciation for your participation, at the end of the survey you will have the option of entering your name in a draw for a $100.00 Indigo Gift Card from Chapters Indigo. To access the web-survey click on:

www.wlu.ca/fsw/hhair/swsupervisionsurvey

Once you have completed and submitted this web-survey, please disregard any other invitations for this web-survey that you might receive.

This research is part of Heather J. Hair's Doctoral studies in Social Work at Wilfrid Laurier University. If you have any questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact me at hair2080@wlu.ca or (905) 627-2018.

Thanking you in advance,

Heather J Hair
PhD Candidate, Faculty of Social Work
Wilfrid Laurier University

APPENDIX E

SURVEY OF ONTARIO SOCIAL WORKERS' POST-DEGREE SUPERVISION NEEDS

Instructions

As a participant, you currently reside in Ontario; you have completed a BSW or MSW degree; you have some post-degree social work experience in Ontario; and you have received some post-degree supervision in Ontario.

NOTE: Current engagement in social work practice and receiving supervision is not necessary to participate in this survey. If that is your situation, please recall the most recent time when you received supervision for your social work practice.

DEFINITION OF SUPERVISION: Supervision involves meeting with a person, such as a program manager or clinical program supervisor, who is in a senior position compared to your position in your work setting, and who asks about your social work practice. Your conversations with this person could include discussion about your clients, your job skills, and/or work place administrative tasks and expectations.

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to YOU and YOUR CURRENT OR MOST RECENT POST-DEGREE EXPERIENCE of RECEIVING SUPERVISION. For most answers, click on the button most applicable to you or fill in the blanks.

For this survey NEED refers to what you think is ESSENTIAL, NECESSARY, or REQUIRED.

Before you begin, please respond to the following question:

1. In your CURRENT or MOST RECENT POST-DEGREE WORK SETTING, what are the AVERAGE NUMBER OF TIMES PER MONTH that you have had a one-hour scheduled meeting with your supervisor?

(Select only one.)
- ☐ 4 times +
- ☐ 4 times
- ☐ 3 times
- ☐ 2 times
- ☐ 1 time
- ☐ 0 times
- ☐ No response

SECTION A: THE PURPOSE OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

2. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the knowledge and skill development of supervisees.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

3. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the emotional support of supervisees.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

4. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

5. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the professional development of supervisees.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

☐   No response

6. Supervision is my primary forum for talking about ethical issues in my practice.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

7. I need more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

8. Knowing that my supervisor has to complete my staff evaluation/performance appraisal makes it difficult for me to raise practice concerns during supervision.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

9. Supervision is really for surveillance purposes. That is, organizations use supervision to help "keep staff in-line."

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

> **At my work setting one person provides practice/clinical supervision and another person provides administrative supervision.**

Need = what you think is essential, necessary, or required

10. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

11. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

> **At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.**

12. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

13. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: Authority in the Supervision Relationship

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

14. Supervisors have authority over me because of their expert knowledge and skills.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

15. Supervisors have authority over me because of their workplace position.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

16. The Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers should give supervisors the authority to assess my competency as a social worker.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

17. My knowledge and skills have equal value to that of supervisors.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

18. Supervision authority discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions).

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

My supervisor gives me advice about what to do with my clients.

Need = what you think is essential, necessary, or required

19. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ 25% of the time
- ☐ 50% of the time
- ☐ 75% of the time
- ☐ All of the time
- ☐ No response

20. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ 25% of the time
- ☐ 50% of the time
- ☐ 75% of the time
- ☐ All of the time
- ☐ No response

My supervisor and I plan together what I can do for my clients.

21. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Not at all
- ☐ 25% of the time
- ☐ 50% of the time
- ☐ 75% of the time
- ☐ All of the time
- ☐ No response

22. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)

☐   Not at all
☐   25% of the time
☐   50% of the time
☐   75% of the time
☐   All of the time
☐   No response

My supervisor and I have discussions about power differences in the supervision relationship.

---

23. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)

☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

24. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)

☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION: The Timing & Length of Supervision During a Social Worker's Career

---

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

25. A period of supervision after graduation is needed for effective social work practice, even if the work setting does not offer supervision.

(Select only one.)

☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

26. Supervision is needed for new employees.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

27. Ongoing supervision is needed for all social workers no matter how long they have been practicing.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

28. Supervision that lasts for years discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions).

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

29. After a certain period, supervision needs to end.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: The Maximum Time Needed

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

30. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for KNOWLEDGE and SKILL DEVELOPMENT?

(Select only one.)
- ☐   0 time
- ☐   3 – 6 months
- ☐   Up to 1 year
- ☐   Up to 2 years
- ☐   Up to 3 years
- ☐   Over 3 years
- ☐   For the duration of the social worker's career
- ☐   No response

31. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for EMOTIONAL SUPPORT?

(Select only one.)
- ☐   0 time
- ☐   3 – 6 months
- ☐   Up to 1 year
- ☐   Up to 2 years
- ☐   Up to 3 years
- ☐   Over 3 years
- ☐   For the duration of the social worker's career
- ☐   No response

32. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY at their workplace?

(Select only one.)
- ☐   0 time
- ☐   3 – 6 months
- ☐   Up to 1 year
- ☐   Up to 2 years
- ☐   Up to 3 years
- ☐   Over 3 years
- ☐   For the duration of the social worker's career
- ☐   No response

33. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?

(Select only one.)
- ☐   0 time
- ☐   3 – 6 months
- ☐   Up to 1 year

☐   Up to 2 years
☐   Up to 3 years
☐   Over 3 years
☐   For the duration of the social worker's career
☐   No response

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: The Training & Discipline of the Supervisor

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

34. Supervisors need a degree in social work before becoming supervisors of social workers.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

35. Supervisors need years of previous social work practice experience.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐.   No response

36. Supervision from a social worker, as opposed to a professional from another discipline, helps me to better learn and practice social work.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.

Need = what you think is essential, necessary, or required

37. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐   Strongly Disagree
- ☐   Disagree
- ☐   Not sure
- ☐   Agree
- ☐   Strongly Agree
- ☐   No response

38. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐   Strongly Disagree
- ☐   Disagree
- ☐   Not sure
- ☐   Agree
- ☐   Strongly Agree
- ☐   No response

My supervisor has practice knowledge and skills currently relevant to my setting and clients served (for example, knowledge of the DSMIV or the impact of observed violence on children).

---

39. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐   Strongly Disagree
- ☐   Disagree
- ☐   Not sure
- ☐   Agree
- ☐   Strongly Agree
- ☐   No response

40. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐   Strongly Disagree
- ☐   Disagree
- ☐   Not sure
- ☐   Agree
- ☐   Strongly Agree
- ☐   No response

> **My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.**

41. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

42. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

> **My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirements for my social work practice.**

43. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

44. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

SECTION C: THE PLACE IN SUPERVISION FOR THE SOCIAL WORK MISSION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE & SOCIAL CHANGE

Respond to the following statements or questions as they relate to you and your current or most recent post-degree experience of receiving supervision.

A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote social justice and change.

Need = what you think is essential, necessary, or required

45. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

46. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

A purpose of supervision is to promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice.

47. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

48. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure

☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.

49. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

50. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

My supervisor helps me challenge unjust policies and practices.

51. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

52. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
☐   Strongly Disagree
☐   Disagree
☐   Not sure
☐   Agree
☐   Strongly Agree
☐   No response

My supervisor and I talk about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege my clients.

53. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

54. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

My supervisor helps me advocate for my clients during interdisciplinary meetings (if applicable).

55. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ No response

56. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ No response

My supervisor helps me to see how individual change and social justice are possible for my clients.

57. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

58. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ No response

My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

59. I need this to happen.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ No response

60. In my current or recent experience this happens.

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ No response

SECTION D: YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

If any of your written responses are used as sample quotations, all identifying information will be removed. Please indicate at the end of your comments if you do NOT want your written response used as a sample quotation.

61. Do you have any other suggestions for effective social work supervision? (Type in "no" if you have no suggestions.)
(Provide one response only.)

62. What objections or concerns do you have about post-degree supervision for social workers? (Type in "no" if you have no suggestions.)
(Provide one response only.)

SECTION E: YOUR BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This final section explores some aspects of your background that will help me to better understand your responses.

63. Since you graduated from your FIRST SOCIAL WORK DEGREE, how long have you practiced as a social worker?
(Select only one.)
☐   2 years or less
☐   3 – 5 years
☐   6 – 10 years
☐   11 – 15 years
☐   16 – 20 years
☐   21 years +
☐   No response

64. Your highest completed degree in social work is:
(Select only one.)
☐   BSW
☐   MSW
☐   DSW
☐   PhD

65. What is the CURRENT or MOST RECENT PRIMARY WORK SETTING where you have received supervision? (Check one response)

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Child welfare agency/children's aid society
- ☐ Family counselling agency (eg. a family service agency)
- ☐ Hospital
- ☐ Social services (Ontario Works)
- ☐ Children's mental health centre
- ☐ Community development or advocacy organization
- ☐ Community health centre
- ☐ Family health team
- ☐ Primary or secondary school
- ☐ University or college counselling centre
- ☐ Women or men's shelter
- ☐ Government department
- ☐ Private counselling/therapy practice
- ☐ Other:

66. In your current or most recent work setting, you have been supervised most often by a:

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Social worker
- ☐ Psychiatrist
- ☐ Psychologist
- ☐ Nurse
- ☐ Other:

67. In your current or most recent work setting where you received supervision, your primary job has been:

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Community worker and/or advocate
- ☐ Policy planner and/or analyst
- ☐ Child welfare worker
- ☐ School social worker
- ☐ Hospital social worker
- ☐ Counsellor with individuals, families, and/or groups
- ☐ Other:

68. Your current or most recent work setting serves people living in a:

(Select only one.)
- ☐ Rural area outside the commuting zone of towns with 1,000+ people
- ☐ Rural and small town municipality outside the commuting zone of urban centres of 10,000+ people
- ☐ Urban city (pop. of 10,000 or more)
- ☐ Rural and urban area

☐   Metropolitan area (pop. of 100,000 or more)

69. Your current age is between:

(Select only one.)
☐   20 – 29 years
☐   30 – 39 years
☐   40 – 49 years
☐   50 – 59 years
☐   60+ years

70. You are:

(Select only one.)
☐   Female
☐   Male

71. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your self-description:

(Select all that apply.)
☐   Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)
☐   Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)
☐   Aboriginal/First Nations
☐   White/Caucasian
☐   Other:

72. Your CURRENT or MOST RECENT supervisor would be:

(Select only one.)
☐   Female
☐   Male

73. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your current or most recent supervisor:

(Select all that apply.)
☐   Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)
☐   Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)
☐   Aboriginal/First Nations
☐   White/Caucasian
☐   Other:

74. Your comments about the survey content are welcomed. Do you have any information that you would like to add? (Please indicate at the end of your comments if you do NOT want your written response used as a sample quotation.)

(Provide one response only.)

To thank you for your participation, after July 31, 2007 there will be a draw for a $100.00 Indigo Gift Card from Chapters Indigo.

---

75. Do you want to enter the draw?

(Select only one.)
☐   YES
☐   NO

76. If YES, please provide your FIRST NAME, EMAIL ADDRESS, &/or DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER: (Before your survey data is reviewed your name and contact information will be transferred to a secure file and deleted from your survey. This will insure that your survey responses are anonymous as well as confidential. The winner will be contacted following the closing date of the survey; after which all submitted names and contact information will be destroyed.)

(Provide one response only.)

Depending on the results of this survey, focus groups could be organized to provide additional information.

Providing identifying information for the focus groups does not guarantee that you will be contacted. Selection of participants will depend on numbers of responses, locations, and the selection process. If you are contacted, you will not be obligated to participate in a focus group.

77. Are you interested in participating in a focus group about post-degree supervision?

(Select only one.)
☐   YES
☐   NO

78. If YES, please provide your FIRST NAME, EMAIL ADDRESS, &/or DAYTIME PHONE NUMBER: (Before your survey data is

reviewed your name and contact information will be transferred to a secure file and deleted from your survey. This will insure that your survey responses are anonymous as well as confidential.)

(Provide one response only.)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION. YOUR RESPONSES WILL HELP SHAPE THE FUTURE OF POST-DEGREE SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS IN ONTARIO

APPENDIX F

Informed Consent Statement for Participants

**WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT STATMENT FOR PARTICIPANTS**

Perspectives on the Post-Degree Supervision Needs of Ontario Social Workers
Principal Investigator: Heather J Hair, PhD Candidate
Dissertation Research Chairperson: Marshall Fine, EdD

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to find out what Ontario social workers need from post-degree supervision. Supervision involves meeting with a person in a senior position from your employment setting who enquires about your work. Conversations could include discussion about your clients, your job skills, and/or organizational tasks and expectations. Practicum experiences of supervision are not the focus. This research is part of Heather J. Hair's Doctoral studies in Social Work under the supervision of Dr. Marshall Fine at Wilfrid Laurier University.

BENEFITS: The expected outcome is that the survey results will help improve supervision practices for Ontario social workers. For example, the results could be used by (a) Ontario social workers to promote effective practice in the workplace, and (b) social work organizations and university social work programs to develop supervision knowledge and practice.

TO PARTICIPATE: In order to be a participant, you currently reside in Ontario; you have completed a BSW or MSW degree; you have some post-degree social work experience in Ontario; and you have received some post-degree supervision in Ontario. There are approximately 10,000 social workers who could meet these criteria and be eligible to participate. You <u>do not need to be a member</u> of the Ontario Association of Social Workers (OASW) or the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (OCSWSSW).

If you agree to participate, I ask that <u>you complete this web-based survey that will take about 20 minutes.</u> You will be responding to questions and statements about post-degree supervision. Your decision to participate is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without penalty. If you withdraw before the survey is completed your data will not be saved. You have the right to not respond to any question(s) you choose. There are no foreseeable risks, discomforts, or costs to you for participating. There is no use of deception in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Unfortunately, no data transmission over the Internet can be guaranteed 100% secure. However, once you have completed your survey and your data has been sent, your answers will be kept confidential. The survey program has been set up to block any identifying information from your computer. Your answers will be entered into a secure database accessible only by the principle investigator. After the completion of my research, non-identifying survey results will be kept on a secure database for up to five years in preparation for possible journal submissions. If any of your written responses to the three open-ended survey questions are used as sample quotations, any identifying information will be removed. You can indicate at the end of an open-ended survey question if you do not want your written response used as a sample quotation. You will not be identified in my dissertation, or any presentation, publication, or discussion.

In appreciation for your participation, at the end of the survey you will have the option of entering your name in a <u>draw</u> for a $100.00 Indigo Gift Card from Chapters Indigo. If you chose to enter, you will be required to submit your first name, email address, and/or phone number. Before your survey data is reviewed your name and contact information will be transferred to a secure file and deleted from your survey. This will insure that your survey responses are anonymous as well as confidential. The winner will be contacted following the closing date of the survey; after which all submitted names and contact information will be destroyed.

Depending on the results of this survey, <u>focus groups</u> could be organized to provide additional information. At the end of the survey, you will have the option to submit your first name, email address, and/or phone number if you are interested in participating in a possible focus group. Providing this identifying information does not guarantee that you will be contacted. If you are contacted, you will not be obligated to participate. A separate consent process will be used for the focus groups should they occur. Before your survey data is reviewed your name and contact information will be transferred to a secure file and deleted from your survey. This will insure that your survey responses are anonymous as well as confidential.

If you have any questions at any time about the study or the procedures you may contact the principle investigator, Heather J. Hair, at (905) 627-2018 or <u>hair2080@wlu.ca</u> . You may also contact the dissertation chairperson, Marshall Fine, Faculty of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0170, ext. 5223 or <u>mfine@wlu.ca</u> . This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board at Wilfrid Laurier University. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this letter, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Bill Marr, Chair, University Research Ethics Board, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0710, ext. 2468.

The survey will be available for participants until Monday, July 16, 2007. During the fall of 2007, summary results of the survey will be posted on the OASW website at <u>www.oasw.org</u> You may also request a summary of results by contacting the principle investigator.

By clicking on the button below and entering the survey,
you agree to have read and understood the above information.
You also agree to participate in this study.
Completion and submission of the survey
is considered an alternative to your signed consent.

☺

BUTTON

APPENDIX G

Exploratory Factor Analysis: Scales, Subscales, and Items

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13): Four Subscales
- 60.1% of the variance in the data was explained by the four subscales combined.

Subscale One:
- Explained 20% of the variance

Q7 + Q8 + Q9 + Q10 + Q12

Q7 – I need more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice.
Q8 – Knowing that my supervisor has to complete my staff evaluation/performance appraisal makes it difficult for me to raise practice concerns during supervision.
Q9 – Supervision is really for surveillance purposes. That is, organizations use supervision to help "keep staff in-line."
At my work setting one person provides practice/clinical supervision and another person provides administrative supervision.
Q10 – I need this to happen.
At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.
Q12 – I need this to happen.

Subscale Two:
- Explained 16.3% of the variance

Q11 + Q13

At my work setting one person provides practice/clinical supervision and another person provides administrative supervision.
Q11 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.
Q13 – In my current or recent experience this happens.

Subscale Three:
- Explained 15.1% of the variance

Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5

Q2 – I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the knowledge and skill development of supervisees.
Q3 – I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the emotional support of supervisees.

Q4 – I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.
Q5 – I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the professional development of supervisees.

Subscale Four:
- Explained 9.1% of the variance

– Q3 + Q6

Q3 – I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the emotional support of supervisees.
Q6 – Supervision is my primary forum for talking about ethical issues in my practice.

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24): Four Subscales
- 60.1% of the variance in the data was explained by the four subscales combined.

Subscale One:
- Explained 23.5% of the variance

Q19 + Q20 + Q21 + Q22

My supervisor gives me advice about what to do with my clients.
Q19 – I need this to happen.
Q20 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.
My supervisor and I plan together what I can do for my clients.
Q21 – I need this to happen.
Q22 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.

Subscale Two:
- Explained 13.4% of the variance

Q14 + Q16 + Q17

Q14 – Supervisors have authority over me because of their expert knowledge and skills.
Q16 – The Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers should give supervisors the authority to assess my competency as a social worker.
Q17 – My knowledge and skills have equal value to that of supervisors (where 1 = SA; 5 = SD).

Subscale Three:
- Explained 13.3% of the variance

Q23 + Q24

My supervisor and I have discussions about power differences in the supervision relationship.
Q23 – I need this to happen.
Q24 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.

Subscale Four:
- Explained 10.8% of the variance

Q15 - Q18

Q15 – Supervisors have authority over me because of their workplace position.
Q18 – Supervision authority discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions) (where 1 = SA; 5 = SD).

Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33): Three Subscales
- 64.5% of the variance in the data was explained by the three subscales combined.

Subscale One:
- Explained 23.8% of the variance

Q27 + Q28 + Q29

Q27 – Ongoing supervision is needed for all social workers no matter how long they have been practicing.
Q28 – Supervision that lasts for years discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions) (where 1 = SA; 5 = SD).
Q29 – After a certain period, supervision needs to end (where 1 = SA; 5 = SD).

Subscale Two:
- Explained 22.6% of the variance

Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33

Q30 – What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for KNOWLEDGE and SKILL DEVELOPMENT?
Q31 – What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for EMOTIONAL SUPPORT?
Q32 – What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY at their workplace?
Q33 – What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?

Subscale Three:
• Explained 18,1% of the variance

Q25 + Q26

Q25 – A period of supervision after graduation is needed for effective social work practice, even if the work setting does not offer supervision.
Q26 – Supervision is needed for new employees.

Scale 4: Discipline and Training of the Supervisor (Q34 – 44): Three Subscales
• 63.8% of the variance in the data was explained by the three subscales combined.

Subscale One:
• Explained 23.9% of the variance

Q38 + Q40 + Q42 + Q44

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.
Q38 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.
My supervisor has practice knowledge and skills currently relevant to my setting and clients served (for example, knowledge of the DSMIV or the impact of observed violence on children).
Q40 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.
My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.
Q42 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.
My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirements for my social work practice.
Q44 – In my current or most recent experience this happens.

Subscale Two:
• Explained 21.4% of the variance

Q37 + Q39 + Q41 + Q43

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.
Q37 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor has practice knowledge and skills currently relevant to my setting and clients served (for example, knowledge of the DSMIV or the impact of observed violence on children).
Q39 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.
Q41 – I need this to happen.

My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirements for my social work practice.
Q43 – I need this to happen.

Subscale Three:
- Explained 18.5% of the variance

Q34 + Q35 + Q36

Q34 – Supervisors need a degree in social work before becoming supervisors of social workers.
Q35 – Supervisors need years of previous social work practice experience.
Q36 – Supervision from a social worker, as opposed to a professional from another discipline, helps me to better learn and practice social work.

Scale 5: The Place in Supervision for the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change (Q45 – Q60): Three Subscales
- 65.9% of the variance in the data was explained by the three subscales combined.

Subscale One:
- Explained 29.8% of the variance

Q46 + Q48 + Q50 + Q52 + Q54 + Q56 + Q58 + Q60

A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote social justice and change.
Q46 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
A purpose of supervision is to promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice.
Q48 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.
Q50 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me challenge unjust policies and practices.
Q52 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor and I talk about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege my clients.
Q54 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me advocate for my clients during interdisciplinary meetings (if applicable).
Q56 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me to see how individual change and social justice are possible for my clients.
Q58 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.
Q60 – In my current or recent experience this happens.

Subscale Two:
- Explained 24.3% of the variance

Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59

A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote social justice and change.
Q45 – I need this to happen.
A purpose of supervision is to promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice.
Q47 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.
Q49 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor helps me challenge unjust policies and practices.
Q51 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor and I talk about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege my clients.
Q53 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor helps me to see how individual change and social justice are possible for my clients.
Q57 – I need this to happen.
My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.
Q59 – I need this to happen.

Subscale Three:
- Explained 11.7% of the variance

Q55 + Q56 + Q59 + Q60

My supervisor helps me advocate for my clients during interdisciplinary meetings (if applicable).
Q55 – I need this to happen.
Q56 – In my current or recent experience this happens.
My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.
Q59 – I need this to happen.
Q60 – In my current or recent experience this happens.

APPENDIX H

Frequency Tables and Statistics for Background Information: Questions 1 and 63 – 73

Q 1. In your current or most recent post-degree work setting, what are the average number of times per month that you have had a 1 hour scheduled meeting with your supervisor?

	Frequency	Percent
1 4 times +	16	2.5
2 4 times	34	5.3
3 3 times	34	5.3
4 2 times	133	20.9
5 1 time	198	31.1
6 0 times	218	34.3
7 No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.7752
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	1.27288

Q 63. Since you graduated from your FIRST SOCIAL WORK DEGREE, how long have you practiced as a social worker?

	Frequency	Percent
1 2 years or less	56	8.8
2 3 – 5 years	83	13.1
3 6 – 10 years	140	22.0
4 11 – 15 years	88	13.8
5 16 – 20 years	97	15.3
6 21 years +	172	27.0
Total	636	100.0

Q 64. Your highest completed degree in social work is:

	Frequency	Percent
1 BSW	130	20.4
2 MSW	499	78.5
3 DSW	1	.2
4 PhD	6	.9
Total	636	100.0

Q 65. What is the CURRENT or MOST RECENT PRIMARY WORK SETTING where you have received supervision? (Check one response)

		Frequency	Percent
1	Child welfare agency/children's aid society	124	19.5
2	Family counselling agency (e.g. a family service agency)	65	10.2
3	Hospital	146	23.0
4	Social services (Ontario Works)	1	.2
5	Children's mental health centre	111	17.5
6	Community development or advocacy organization	10	1.6
7	Community health or mental health centre	29	4.6
8	Family health team	16	2.5
9	Primary or secondary school	12	1.9
10	University or college counselling centre	8	1.3
11	Women or men's shelter	8	1.3
12	Government department	14	2.2
13	Private counselling/therapy practice	30	4.7
14	Other (e.g., research centre, college)	10	1.6
15	Corrections/criminal justice/legal Services (adult & youth)	12	1.9
16	Addictions	5	.8
17	Community agency or services	7	1.1
18	Other counselling services (e.g. sexual assault centres)	7	1.1
19	Rehabilitation/disability services (adult & children)	3	.5
20	Seniors services	5	.8
21	Adult mental health	13	2.0
	Total	636	100.0

Q 66. In your current or most recent work setting, you have been supervised most often by a:

		Frequency	Percent
1	Social worker	404	63.5
2	Psychiatrist	16	2.5
3	Psychologist	33	5.2
4	Nurse	57	9.0
5	Other (e.g., BA degree, SSW, peers, lawyer, anthropologist)	47	7.4
6	Counsellor/ clinician/ MFT Supervisor with Masters degree	30	4.7
7	Manager or ED	26	4.1
8	CYW	10	1.6
9	Physician, OT, Physiotherapist, or kinestologist	13	2.0
	Total	636	100.0

Q 67. In your current or most recent work setting where you received supervision, your primary job has been:

		Frequency	Percent
1	Community worker and/or advocate	29	4.6
2	Policy planner and/or analyst	11	1.7
3	Child welfare worker	100	15.7
4	School social worker	14	2.2
5	Hospital social worker	129	20.3
6	Counsellor with individuals, families, and/or groups	276	43.4
7	Other (e.g., educator, case manager, custody assessments, trainer/consultant)	18	2.8
8	Manager or Supervisor	59	9.3
	Total	636	100.0

Q 68. Your current or most recent work setting serves people living in a:

	Frequency	Percent
Rural area outside the commuting zone of towns with 1,000+ people	19	3.0
Rural and small town municipality outside the commuting zone of urban centres of 10,000+ people	56	8.8
Urban city (pop. of 10,000 or more)	113	17.8
Rural and urban area	143	22.5
Metropolitan area (pop. of 100,000 or more)	305	48.0
Total	636	100.0

Q 69. Your current age is between:

		Frequency	Percent
1	20 – 29 years	70	11.0
2	30 – 39 years	183	28.8
3	40 – 49 years	176	27.7
4	50 – 59 years	157	24.7
5	60+ years	50	7.9
	Total	636	100.0

Q 70. You are:

	Frequency	Percent
Female	549	86.3
Male	87	13.7
Total	636	100.0

Q 71. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your self-description:

	Frequency	Percent
Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)	40	6.3
Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)	114	17.9
Aboriginal/ First Nations	11	1.7
White/ Caucasian	533	83.8
Other (e.g., Jewish, immigrant)	28	4.4
Total participants (multiple items could be selected)	636	110.14

Q 72. Your current or most recent supervisor would be:

	Frequency	Percent
Female	470	73.9
Male	166	26.1
Total	636	100.0

Q 73. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your current or most recent supervisor:

	Frequency	Percent
Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)	33	5.2
Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)	55	8.6
Aboriginal/ First Nations	6	.9
White/ Caucasian	557	87.6
Other (e.g., Immigrant)	14	2.2
Total	636	100.0

APPENDIX I

Frequency Tables and Statistics for Questions 2 – 60

SECTION A: THE PURPOSE OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS

Q 2. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the knowledge and skill development of supervisees.

	Frequency	Percent
1 Strongly Disagree	3	.5
2 Disagree	12	1.9
3 Not sure	12	1.9
4 Agree	207	32.5
5 Strongly Agree	401	63.1
6 No response	1	.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.5629
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.67635

Q 3. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the emotional support of supervisees.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	.5
Disagree	34	5.3
Not sure	27	4.2
Agree	310	48.7
Strongly Agree	258	40.6
No response	4	.6
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2547
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.81592

Q 4. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on work place administrative tasks, such as monitoring work assignments and carrying out organizational policies and procedures.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	2.2
Disagree	65	10.2
Not sure	45	7.1
Agree	358	56.3
Strongly Agree	151	23.7
No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.9057
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.96256

Q 5. I believe a purpose of supervision needs to focus on the professional development of supervisees.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	.3
Disagree	11	1.7
Not sure	13	2.0
Agree	254	39.9
Strongly Agree	350	55.0
No response	6	.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.5047
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.67227

Q 6. Supervision is my primary forum for talking about ethical issues in my practice.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	42	6.6
Disagree	200	31.4
Not sure	45	7.1
Agree	218	34.3
Strongly Agree	111	17.5
No response	20	3.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.3396
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.33790

Q 7. I need more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	15	2.4
Disagree	222	34.9
Not sure	114	17.9
Agree	161	25.3
Strongly Agree	87	13.7
No response	37	5.8
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.3050
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.29495

Q 8. Knowing that my supervisor has to complete my staff evaluation/performance appraisal makes it difficult for me to raise practice concerns during supervision.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	100	15.7
Disagree	280	44.0
Not sure	44	6.9
Agree	112	17.6
Strongly Agree	64	10.1
No response	36	5.7
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.7925
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.45516

Q 9. Supervision is really for surveillance purposes. That is, organizations use supervision to help "keep staff in-line."

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	205	32.2
Disagree	247	38.8
Not sure	70	11.0
Agree	70	11.0
Strongly Agree	32	5.0
No response	12	1.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.2343
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.25497

At my work setting one person provides practice/clinical supervision and another person provides administrative supervision.

Q 10. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	92	14.5
Disagree	201	31.6
Not sure	72	11.3
Agree	135	21.2
Strongly Agree	111	17.5
No response	25	3.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.0739
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.46858

Q 11. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	211	33.2
Disagree	242	38.1
Not sure	18	2.8
Agree	101	15.9
Strongly Agree	37	5.8
No response	27	4.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.3585
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.43974

At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.

Q 12. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	127	20.0
Disagree	247	38.8
Not sure	54	8.5
Agree	113	17.8
Strongly Agree	76	11.9
No response	19	3.0
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.7186
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.42675

At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.

Q 13. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	210	33.0
Disagree	285	44.8
Not sure	23	3.6
Agree	70	11.0
Strongly Agree	21	3.3
No response	27	4.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.1950
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.32203

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: Authority in the Supervision Relationship

Q 14. Supervisors have authority over me because of their expert knowledge and skills.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	62	9.7
Disagree	270	42.5
Not sure	67	10.5
Agree	192	30.2
Strongly Agree	40	6.3
No response	5	.8
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.8318
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.18853

Q 15. Supervisors have authority over me because of their workplace position.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	10	1.6
Disagree	43	6.8
Not sure	13	2.0
Agree	354	55.7
Strongly Agree	213	33.5
No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.1415
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.87598

Q 16. The Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers should give supervisors the authority to assess my competency as a social worker

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	133	20.9
Disagree	224	35.2
Not sure	164	25.8
Agree	91	14.3
Strongly Agree	18	2.8
No response	6	.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.4575
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.11246

Q17. My knowledge and skills have equal value to that of supervisors. (Reversed responses)

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	160	25.2
Agree	263	41.4
Not sure	65	10.2
Disagree	121	19.0
Strongly Disagree	14	2.2
No response	13	2.0
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.3789
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.2242

Q18. Supervision authority discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions). (Reversed responses)

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	33	5.2
Agree	86	13.5
Not sure	53	8.3
Disagree	333	52.4
Strongly Disagree	126	19.8
No response	5	.8
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.7044
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.11145

My supervisor gives me advice about what to so with my clients.

Q19. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	127	20.0
25% of the time	290	45.6
50% of the time	115	18.1
75% of the time	46	7.2
All of the time	16	2.5
No response	42	6.6
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.4654
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.31870

My supervisor gives me advice about what to so with my clients.

Q 20. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	160	25.2
25% of the time	246	38.7
50% of the time	113	17.8
75% of the time	59	9.3
All of the time	27	4.2
No response	31	4.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.4340
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.33294

My supervisor and I plan together what I can do for my clients.

Q 21. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	114	17.9
25% of the time	246	38.7
50% of the time	96	15.1
75% of the time	81	12.7
All of the time	65	10.2
No response	34	5.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.7469
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.43535

Q 22. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	176	27.7
25% of the time	219	34.4
50% of the time	79	12.4
75% of the time	87	13.7
All of the time	48	7.5
No response	27	4.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.5173
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.42906

My supervisor and I have discussions about power differences in the supervision relationship.

Q 23. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	89	14.0
Disagree	172	27.0
Not sure	94	14.8
Agree	186	29.2
Strongly Agree	57	9.0
No response	38	6.0
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.1006
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.41842

Q 24. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	199	31.3
Disagree	248	39.0
Not sure	33	5.2
Agree	102	16.0
Strongly Agree	14	2.2
No response	40	6.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.3774
Median	2.0000
Std. Deviation	1.43929

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: The Timing & Length of Supervision During a Social Worker's Career.

Q 25. A period of supervision after graduation is needed for effective social work practice, even if the work setting does not offer supervision.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	3	.5
Disagree	2	.3
Not sure	7	1.1
Agree	159	25.0
Strongly Agree	465	73.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.6997
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.55506

Q 26. Supervision is needed for new employees.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	.6
Disagree	8	1.3
Not sure	6	.9
Agree	136	21.4
Strongly Agree	482	75.8
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.7044
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.61533

Q 27. Ongoing supervision is needed for all social workers no matter how long they have been practicing.

		Frequency	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	15	2.4
2	Disagree	33	5.2
3	Not sure	40	6.3
4	Agree	233	36.6
5	Strongly Agree	315	49.5
	Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2579
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.95547

Q. 28. Supervision that lasts for years discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions. (Reversed responses)

		Frequency	Percent
1	Strongly Agree	15	2.4
2	Agree	52	8.2
3	Not sure	70	11.0
4	Disagree	315	49.5
5	Strongly Disagree	181	28.5
6	No response	3	.5
	Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.9497
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.9756

Q 29. After a certain period, supervision needs to end. (Reversed responses)

	Frequency	Percent
1 Strongly Agree	20	3.1
2 Agree	36	5.7
3 Not sure	69	10.8
4 Disagree	297	46.7
5 Strongly Disagree	211	33.2
6 No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0252
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.9846

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS:
The Maximum Time Needed

Q 30. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for knowledge and skill development?

	Frequency	Percent
0 time	1	.2
3 – 6 months	5	.8
Up to 1 year	44	6.9
Up to 2 years	46	7.2
Up to 3 years	60	9.4
Over 3 years	74	11.6
For the duration of the social worker's career	398	62.6
No response	8	1.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	6.1651
Median	7.0000
Std. Deviation	1.35022

Q 31. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for emotional support?

	Frequency	Percent
.00	1	.2
0 time	11	1.7
3 – 6 months	6	.9
Up to 1 year	26	4.1
Up to 2 years	27	4.2
Up to 3 years	14	2.2
Over 3 years	27	4.2
For the duration of the social worker's career	491	77.2
No response	33	5.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	6.5126
Median	7.0000
Std. Deviation	1.38547

Q 32. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for adminstrative accountability at their workplace?

	Frequency	Percent
0 time	8	1.3
3 – 6 months	28	4.4
Up to 1 year	105	16.5
Up to 2 years	43	6.8
Up to 3 years	41	6.4
Over 3 years	36	5.7
For the duration of the social worker's career	335	52.7
No response	40	6.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	5.7186
Median	7.0000
Std. Deviation	1.88263

Q 33. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for professional development?

	Frequency	Percent
0 time	2	.3
3 – 6 months	5	.8
Up to 1 year	27	4.2
Up to 2 years	19	3.0
Up to 3 years	44	6.9
Over 3 years	48	7.5
For the duration of the social worker's career	475	74.7
No response	16	2.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	6.4937
Median	7.0000
Std. Deviation	1.17519

SECTION B: THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION FOR SOCIAL WORKERS: The Training & Discipline of the Supervisor

Q 34. Supervisors need a degree in social work before becoming supervisors of social workers.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	18	2.8
Disagree	101	15.9
Not sure	38	6.0
Agree	131	20.6
Strongly Agree	345	54.2
No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0896
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	1.22692

Q 35. Supervisors need years of previous social work practice experience.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	1.4
Disagree	45	7.1
Not sure	28	4.4
Agree	206	32.4
Strongly Agree	345	54.2
No response	3	.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.3239
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.95512

Q 36. Supervision from a social worker, as opposed to a professional from another discipline, helps me to better learn and practice social work.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	15	2.4
Disagree	80	12.6
Not sure	57	9.0
Agree	165	25.9
Strongly Agree	315	49.5
No response	4	.6
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0959
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	1.14819

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.

Q 37. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	.8
Disagree	25	3.9
Not sure	40	6.3
Agree	260	40.9
Strongly Agree	299	47.0
No response	7	1.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.3270
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.83617

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.

Q 38. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	95	14.9
Disagree	152	23.9
Not sure	118	18.6
Agree	175	27.5
Strongly Agree	79	12.4
No response	17	2.7
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.0660
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.35926

My supervisor has practice knowledge and skills currently relevant to my setting and clients served (for example, knowledge of the DSMIV of the impact of observed violence on children).

Q 39. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	13	2.0
Disagree	28	4.4
Not sure	18	2.8
Agree	248	39.0
Strongly Agree	308	48.4
No response	21	3.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.3726
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	.93125

Q 40. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	53	8.3
Disagree	71	11.2
Not sure	42	6.6
Agree	246	38.7
Strongly Agree	197	31.0
No response	27	4.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.8553
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.31298

My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.

Q 41. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	1.7
Disagree	30	4.7
Not sure	44	6.9
Agree	261	41.0
Strongly Agree	271	42.6
No response	19	3.0
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2704
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.94201

Q 42. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	54	8.5
Disagree	72	11.3
Not sure	108	17.0
Agree	215	33.8
Strongly Agree	164	25.8
No response	23	3.6
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.6792
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.29965

My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirments for my social work practice.

Q 43. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	1.7
Disagree	22	3.5
Not sure	45	7.1
Agree	283	44.5
Strongly Agree	258	40.6
No response	17	2.7
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2673
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.89843

My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirments for my social work practice.

Q 44. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	50	7.9
Disagree	71	11.2
Not sure	113	17.8
Agree	225	35.4
Strongly Agree	156	24.5
No response	21	3.3
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.6745
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.26717

SECTION C: THE PLACE IN SUPERVISION FOR THE SOCIAL WORK MISSION OF SOCIAL JUSTICE & SOCIAL CHANGE

A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote social justice and change.

Q 45. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	12	1.9
Disagree	86	13.5
Not sure	83	13.1
Agree	294	46.2
Strongly Agree	152	23.9
No response	9	1.4
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.8097
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.04992

Q 46. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	80	12.6
Disagree	205	32.2
Not sure	96	15.1
Agree	190	29.9
Strongly Agree	43	6.8
No response	22	3.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	2.9638
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.30666

A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice.

Q 47. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	13	2.0
Disagree	61	9.6
Not sure	40	6.3
Agree	283	44.5
Strongly Agree	230	36.2
No response	9	1.4
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0739
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.02222

Q 48. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	61	9.6
Disagree	139	21.9
Not sure	77	12.1
Agree	248	39.0
Strongly Agree	93	14.6
No response	18	2.8
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.3569
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.30654

My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.

Q 49. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	11	1.7
Disagree	58	9.1
Not sure	27	4.2
Agree	286	45.0
Strongly Agree	234	36.8
No response	20	3.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.1541
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.01710

My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.

Q 50. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	59	9.3
Disagree	98	15.4
Not sure	68	10.7
Agree	264	41.5
Strongly Agree	119	18.7
No response	28	4.4
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.5818
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.32258

My supervisor helps me challenge unjust policies and practices.

Q 51. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	12	1.9
Disagree	50	7.9
Not sure	41	6.4
Agree	299	47.0
Strongly Agree	218	34.3
No response	16	2.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.1148
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	.99020

Q 52. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	83	13.1
Disagree	166	26.1
Not sure	97	15.3
Agree	203	31.9
Strongly Agree	57	9.0
No response	30	4.7
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.1179
Median	3.0000
Std. Deviation	1.36904

My supervisor and I talk about individual and social issues (e.g., racism, sexism) that could oppress or privilege my clients.

Q 53. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	12	1.9
Disagree	67	10.5
Not sure	31	4.9
Agree	297	46.7
Strongly Agree	207	32.5
No response	22	3.5
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0786
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.04849

Q 54. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	71	11.2
Disagree	160	25.2
Not sure	48	7.5
Agree	246	38.7
Strongly Agree	78	12.3
No response	33	5.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.3129
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.39557

My supervisor helps me advocate for my clients during interdisciplinary meetings (if applicable).

Q 55. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	1.4
Disagree	41	6.4
Not sure	22	3.5
Agree	208	32.7
Strongly Agree	227	35.7
Not applicable	87	13.7
No response	42	6.6
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.6226
Median	5.0000
Std. Deviation	1.23813

My supervisor helps me advocate for my clients during interdisciplinary meetings (if applicable).

Q 56. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	46	7.2
Disagree	78	12.3
Not sure	43	6.8
Agree	196	30.8
Strongly Agree	121	19.0
Not applicable	106	16.7
No response	46	7.2
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2107
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.63609

My supervisor helps me to see how individual change and social justice are possible for my clients.

Q 57. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	1.4
Disagree	69	10.8
Not sure	35	5.5
Agree	325	51.1
Strongly Agree	167	26.3
No response	31	4.9
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.0456
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.03610

Q 58. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	60	9.4
Disagree	145	22.8
Not sure	85	13.4
Agree	260	40.9
Strongly Agree	48	7.5
No response	38	6.0
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.3223
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.32387

My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

Q 59. I need this to happen.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	1.4
Disagree	52	8.2
Not sure	36	5.7
Agree	248	39.0
Strongly Agree	246	38.7
Not applicable	25	3.9
No response	20	3.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	4.2972
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.11880

Q 60. In my current or recent experience this happens.

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	67	10.5
Disagree	113	17.8
Not sure	86	13.5
Agree	213	33.5
Strongly Agree	101	15.9
Not applicable	30	4.7
No response	26	4.1
Total	636	100.0

Mean	3.5692
Median	4.0000
Std. Deviation	1.52561

APPENDIX J

T-Test Findings

The following data concerns research question 2: Do Social Workers' Supervision Needs for Specific Aspects of Supervision Differ Significantly Compared to What They have Currently or Recently Experienced?

For each of the four aspects of supervision, there are two tables: (1) the means and standard deviations for each reportable work setting, and (2) the results of the t-tests and confidence intervals.

Administrative Tasks

Employment Setting	Mean Score & SD: Supervision Need	Mean Score & SD: Current or Recent Experience
All settings N=636	$\overline{X}$ = 5.80, SD = 2.65	$\overline{X}$ = 4.55, SD = 2.51
Hospital N=146	$\overline{X}$ = 6.84, SD = 2.49	$\overline{X}$ = 5.00, SD = 2.54
CW/CAS N=124	$\overline{X}$ = 4.73, SD = 2.40	$\overline{X}$ = 3.60, SD = 2.11
CMHC N=111	$\overline{X}$ = 5.11, SD = 2.50	$\overline{X}$ = 4.32, SD = 2.22
FCA N=65	$\overline{X}$ = 5.71, SD = 2.56	$\overline{X}$ = 4.42, SD = 2.41

Table1. Means and Standard Deviations for Administrative Tasks.

Employment Setting	Paired T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
All settings N=636	t = 10.49, df = 635, $p < .001$	1.24 (1.01, 1.47)
Hospital N=146	t = 7.11, df = 145, $p < .001$	1.84 (1.33, 2.35)
CW/CAS N=124	t = 4.82, df = 123, $p < .001$	1.13 (.67, 1.60)
CMHC N=111	t = 2.87, df = 110, $p = .005$	.78 (.24, 1.33)
FCA N=65	t = 3.74, df = 64, $p < .001$	1.29 (.60, 1.98)

Table 2. Paired T-Test Results for Administrative Tasks.

Authority in the Supervision Relationship

Employment Setting	Mean Score & SD: Supervision Need	Mean Score & SD: Current or Recent Experience
All settings N=636	$\overline{X}$ = 8.31, SD = 3.07	$\overline{X}$ = 7.33, SD = 3.26
Hospital N=146	$\overline{X}$ = 7.80, SD = 3.57	$\overline{X}$ = 6.15, SD = 3.33
CMHC N=111	$\overline{X}$ = 8.85, SD = 2.66	$\overline{X}$ = 7.63, SD = 2.55
FCA N=65	$\overline{X}$ = 8.29, SD = 2.91	$\overline{X}$ = 7.46, SD = 2.62
CW/CAS N=124	$\overline{X}$ = 8.69, SD = 2.65	$\overline{X}$ = 8.44, SD = 2.92

Table3. Means and Standard Deviations for Authority in the Supervision Relationship.

Employment Setting	Paired T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
All settings N=636	t = 8.99, df = 635, p < .001	.98 (.77, 1.20)
Hospital N=146	t = 6.34, df = 145, p < .001	1.65 (1.14, 2.17)
CMHC N=111	t = 4.82, df = 110, p < .001	1.22 (.72, 1.72)
FCA N=65	t = 3.37, df = 64, p = .001	.83 (.34, 1.32)
CW/CAS N=124	t = 1.35, df = 123, p = .181	.25 (-.19, .62)

Table 4. Paired T-Test Results for Authority in the Supervision Relationship.

Supervisor Training and Discipline

Employment Setting	Mean Score & SD: Supervision Need	Mean Score & SD: Current or Recent Experience
All settings N=636	$\overline{X}$ = 17.24, SD = 2.74	$\overline{X}$ = 14.28, SD = 4.19
Hospital N=146	$\overline{X}$ = 17.10, SD = 3.10	$\overline{X}$ = 13.16, SD = 5.00
CW/CAS N=124	$\overline{X}$ = 17.39, SD = 2.77	$\overline{X}$ = 14.90, SD = 3.52
CMHC N=111	$\overline{X}$ = 17.42, SD = 2.57	$\overline{X}$ = 14.99, SD = 3.69
FCA N=65	$\overline{X}$ = 17.09, SD = 2.28	$\overline{X}$ = 15.06, SD = 2.85

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Supervisor Training and Discipline.

Employment Setting	Paired T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
All settings N=636	$t = 16.42$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	2.96 (2.61, 3.32)
Hospital N=146	$t = 8.90$, df $= 145$, $p < .001$	3.95 (3.07, 4.82)
CW/CAS N=124	$t = 7.04$, df $= 123$, $p < .001$	2.49 (1.79, 3.19)
CMHC N=111	$t = 5.73$, df $= 110$, $p < .001$	2.43 (1.59, 3.27)
FCA N=65	$t = 5.09$, df $= 64$, $p < .001$	2.03 (1.23, 2.83)

Table 6. Paired T-Test Results for Supervisor Training and Discipline.

The Place in Supervision of the Social Work Mission for Social Justice and Change

Employment Setting	Mean Score & SD: Supervision Need	Mean Score & SD: Current or Recent Experience
All settings N=636	$\overline{X} = 33.20$, SD $= 6.18$	$\overline{X} = 27.44$, SD $= 8.79$
Hospital N=146	$\overline{X} = 32.06$, SD $= 6.64$	$\overline{X} = 24.98$, SD $= 9.84$
CW/CAS N=124	$\overline{X} = 33.47$, SD $= 6.02$	$\overline{X} = 27.60$, SD $= 7.86$
CMHC N=111	$\overline{X} = 33.55$, SD $= 6.34$	$\overline{X} = 28.54$, SD $= 7.40$
FCA N=65	$\overline{X} = 33.20$, SD $= 5.45$	$\overline{X} = 29.03$, SD $= 6.98$

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for Supervision and the Social Work Mission.

Employment Setting	Paired T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
All settings N=636	$t = 15.21$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	5.76 (5.02, 6.50)
Hospital N=146	$t = 7.89$, df $= 145$, $p < .001$	7.08 (5.31, 8.85)
CW/CAS N=124	$t = 7.43$, df $= 123$, $p < .001$	5.86 (4.30, 7.42)
CMHC N=111	$t = 5.67$, df $= 110$, $p < .001$	5.01 (3.26, 6.76)
FCA N=65	$t = 4.77$, df $= 64$, $p < .001$	4.17 (2.42, 5.92)

Table8. Paired T-Test Results for Supervision for the Social Work Mission.

APPENDIX K

Multiple Regression Findings

The following data concerns research question 3: Which demographic variables are significantly related and help to explain social workers' supervision needs?

For the statistically significant results of the 12 regression models, I report the model (F), the significance of the model (p), the proportion of the variance accounted for by the model (R^2), and the significant unstandardized regression coefficients (b) that represent the independent variables of the model.

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2-Q10, Q12)

Participants from All Settings
The Model: $F (7, 628) = 2.09, p = .04, R^2 = .02$
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: $b = .54, t = 3.14, p = .002$

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	Q1	Q66	Q63	Q64	Q70	Q65	Q68
All Settings N = 636	.54*	.02	.12	− .13	.46	.07	.26

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
*$p < .005$

Table 1. Significant Multiple Regression for the Purpose of Supervision Scale.

Scale 1, Subscale 3: The Four-fold Purpose of Supervision (Q2-Q5)

Regression calculations revealed 3 significant models:

Participants from Hospital Settings
The Model: $F (1, 144) = 5.67, p = .02, R^2 = .04$
The Regression Coefficient for Q64: $b = - 1.20, t = 2.38, p = .02$

Participants from CW/CAS settings
The Model: $F (1, 122) = 4.01, p = .05, R^2 = .03$
The Regression Coefficient for Q70: $b = - .85, t = 2.00, p = .05$

Participants from with CMHC settings
The Model: $F (6, 104) = 2.84, p = .01, R^2 = .14$
The Regression Coefficient for Q66: $b = .34, t = 3.01, p = .003$

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	Q1	Q66	Q63	Q64	Q70	Q65	Q68
Hospital N=146				Stepwise – 1.20*		n/a	
CW/CAS N=124					Stepwise – .85*	n/a	
CMHC N=111	– .34	.34**	.20	.08	– .97	n/a	– .03

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
$*p < .05$ $**p < .005$

Table 2. Significant Multiple Regressions for the Four-Fold Purpose of Supervision.

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14-Q19, Q21, Q23)

Regression calculations revealed 2 significant models:

Participants from All Settings
The Model: $F (7, 628) = 2.17, p = .04, R^2 = .02$
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: $b = – .42, t = 3.02, p = .003$

Participants from CW/CAS settings
The Model: $F (1, 122) = 6.88, p = .01, R^2 = .05$
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: $b = – .82, t = 2.62, p = .01$

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	Q1	Q66	Q63	Q64	Q70	Q65	Q68
All Settings N = 636	– .42**	– .15	.12	.32	.28	.01	– .23
CW/CAS N=124	Stepwise – .82*					n/a	

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
$*p < .05$ $**p < .005$

Table 3. Significant Multiple Regressions for the Authority of the Supervisor Scale.

Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25-Q33)

Regression calculations revealed 2 significant models:

Participants from All Settings
The Model: F (7, 628) = 2.30, p = .03, R^2 = .03
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: b = $-$ .60, t = 3.15, p = .002

Participants from Hospital Settings
The Model: F (1, 144) = 7.40, p = .007, R^2 = .05
The Regression Coefficient for Q68: b = $-$ 1.50, t = 2.72, p = .007

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	**Q1**	**Q66**	**Q63**	**Q64**	**Q70**	**Q65**	**Q68**
All Settings N = 636	$-$ .60**	$-$ .19	$-$ .07	$-$ .26	$-$ 1.03	.002	$-$ .24
Hospital N=146						n/a	Stepwise $-$ 1.50*

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
*p < .05   **p < .005

Table 4. Significant Multiple Regressions for the Timing and Length of Supervision Scale.

Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34-Q37, Q39, Q41, Q43)

Regression calculations revealed 1 significant model:

Participants from CW/CAS settings
The Model: F (1, 122) = 4.86, p = .03, R^2 = .04
The Regression Coefficient for Q64: b = 1.72, t = 2.20, p = .03

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	**Q1**	**Q66**	**Q63**	**Q64**	**Q70**	**Q65**	**Q68**
CW/CAS N=124				Stepwise 1.72*		n/a	

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
*p < .05

Table 5. Significant Multiple Regression for Supervisor Training and Discipline Scale.

Scale 5: The Place of the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change (Q45-Q59, odd numbers only)

Regression calculations revealed 3 significant models:

Participants from All Settings
The Model: $F (7, 628) = 2.05, p = .05, R^2 = .02$
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: $b = -.55, t = 2.86, p = .004$, and
The Regression Coefficient for Q68: $b = .44, t = 2.02, p = .05$

Participants from Hospital Settings
The Model: $F (2, 143) = 4.05, p = .02, R^2 = .05$
The Regression Coefficient for Q1: $b = -.76, t = 1.99, p = .05$, and
The Regression Coefficient for Q63: $b = -79, t = 2.30, p = .02$

Participants from CW/CAS settings
The Model: $F (1,122) = 6.92, p = .01, R^2 = .05$
The Regression Coefficient for Q64: $b = 2.58, t = 2.63, p = .01$

Unstandardized Regression Coefficients for Participant Demographics							
Employment Setting	Q1	Q66	Q63	Q64	Q70	Q65	Q68
All Settings N = 636	− .55**	.06	− .10	− .01	.60	− .07	.44*
Hospital N=146	Stepwise − .76*		Stepwise − .79*			n/a	
CW/CAS N=124				Stepwise 2.58*		n/a	

Where Q1 = Number of times per month of one hour scheduled supervision; Q66 = Discipline of the supervisor; Q63 = Practice time since first SW degree; Q64 = Degree of the social worker; Q70 = Gender of the social worker; Q65 = Four dominant work settings; Q68 = Geographical area of service.
*$p < .05$ **$p < .005$

Table 6. Significant Multiple Regressions for the Place of the SW Mission Scale.

APPENDIX L

Demographic Information for Three Work Settings: CW/CASs, Hospitals, and CMHCs
Relevant to Multiple Regression Findings

Q 1. Average Number of Times per Month for a One-Hour Scheduled Meeting of Supervision

Work Setting	4 Times+		4 Times		3 Times		2 Times		1 Time		0 Times	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CW/CAS N = 124	2	1.6	6	4.8	9	7.3	25	20.2	34	27.4	48	38.7
Hospital N = 146	5	3.4	12	8.2	6	4.1	25	17.1	44	30.1	53	36.3
CMHC N = 111	1	.9	4	3.6	5	4.5	23	20.7	37	33.3	40	36.0
Total N = 381	8		22		20		73		115		141	

Q 63. Number of Years Practicing as a Social Worker after First Social Work Degree

Work Setting	2 Years or Less		3-5 Years		6-10 Years		11-15 Years		16-20 Years		21+ Years	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CW/CAS N = 124	16	12.9	16	12.9	34	27.4	9	7.3	20	16.1	29	23.4
Hospital N = 146	9	6.2	10	6.8	28	19.2	24	16.4	28	19.2	47	32.2
CMHC N = 111	9	8.1	14	12.6	26	23.4	21	18.9	17	15.3	24	21.6
Total N = 381	34		40		88		54		65		100	

Q 64. Distribution of BSW and MSW Degrees

Work Setting	BSW		MSW	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**
CW/CAS N = 124	53	42.7	69	55.6
Hospital N = 146	20	13.7	125	85.6
CMHC N = 111	18	16.2	92	82.9
Total N = 381	99		343	

Q 66. Participant Supervisors According to Professional Discipline

Work Setting	Social Worker		Psychiatrist		Psychologist		Nurse		Other	
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
CW/CAS N = 124	107	86.3	0	0	0	0	1	.8	16	20.9
Hospital N = 146	71	48.6	3	2.1	7	4.8	43	29.5	22	15.1
CMHC N = 111	79	71.2	4	3.6	8	7.2	0	0	20	18.0
Total N = 381	257		7		15		44		58	

Q68. Distribution of Participant Work Settings According to Geographical Areas

Work Setting	1		2		3		4		5	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
CW/CAS N = 124	4	3.2	16	12.9	23	18.5	22	17.7	59	47.6
Hospital N = 146	3	2.1	5	3.4	24	16.4	35	24.0	79	54.1
CMHC N = 111	3	2.7	14	12.6	16	14.4	22	19.8	56	50.5
Total N = 381	10		38		80		93		225	

Where: 1 = Rural area outside the commuting zone of towns with 1,000+ people
2 = Rural and small town municipality outside of commuting zone of urban centres of 10,000+ people.
3 = Urban city (pop. of 10,000 or more)
4 = Rural and urban area
5 = Metropolitan area (pop. of 100,000 or more)

Q 70. Distribution of Women and Men

Work Setting	Women		Men	
	N	%	N	%
CW/CAS N = 124	104	83.9	20	16.1
Hospital N = 146	126	86.3	20	13.7
CMHC N = 111	96	86.5	15	13.5
Total N = 381	326		55	

APPENDIX M

Single Sample T-Test Findings

The following data concerns research question 4: Are Ontario social workers' needs similar or different from supervision descriptions offered through the literature?

For each scale, I present narrative themes, the corresponding Subscales, and the equations I constructed that I believe best represents the literature. The summated number of each equation estimates the Ontario social worker population. (Please see Chapter Five for directions on how I determined the equations, the population means, and the effect sizes)

Scale 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2-Q13): Three Narrative Themes

1. *Focus on knowledge and skill.* Constructed from Purpose Subscale 3. The representative equation is:

    Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5
    5 + 1 + 1 + 1   = 8

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 8$	$t = 114.18$, df = 635, $p < .001$	9.23 (9.07, 9.39)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 17.23$ SD = 2.04		Medium $E \geq 8$

Table 1. Means and Analytic Results for Purpose Narrative Equation One.

2. *Knowledge and skill development combined with adminstrative tasks including performance review/staff evaluations can be ethically problematic and undesirable.* Constructed from Purpose Subscale 1. The representative equation is:

    Q7 + Q8 + Q9 + Q10 + Q12
    5 + 5 + 5 + 5   + 5   = 25

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 25$	$t = 57.33$, df = 635, $p < .001$	10.90 (10.50, 11.25)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 14.12$ SD = 4.78		Medium $E \geq 10$

Table 2. Means and Analytic Results for Purpose Narrative Equation Two.

3. *Need for reflective conversations on ethical practice in supervision.* The two representative equations are:

3A. Need for reflection on ethical practice: Constructed from Subscale 1

$$Q7 + Q8 + Q9 + Q10 + Q12$$
$$5 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 5$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 5$	$t = 33.01$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	1.70 (1.60, 1.80)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 3.31$ SD = 1.29		Medium $E \geq 2$

Table 3. Means and Analytic Results for Purpose Narrative Equation Three A

3B. Supervision as a primary forum for talking about ethical issues: Constructed from Subscale 4

$$- Q3 + Q6$$
$$0 + 5 = 5$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 5$	$t = 31.30$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	1.66 (1.60, 1.76)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 3.33$ SD = 1.34		Medium $E \geq 2$

Table 4. Means and Analytic Results for Purpose Narrative Equation Three B

Scale 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14-Q24): Two Narrative Themes

1. *Traditional authority upheld: Expertise and position of the supervisor:* Constructed from Authority Subscales 2 + 4. The representative equations are:

Equation 1A: *Expertise and position of the supervisor*
$$(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r)$$
$$5 + 0 + 0 + 5 + 0 = 10$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 10$	$t = 49.79$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	3.03 (2.91, 3.15)
Sample: **N = 636** $\overline{X} = 6.97$ **SD = 1.53**		Medium $E \geq 4$

Table 5. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1A.

Equation 1B: *Position of the supervisor only*
     (Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r)
       0 + 0 + 0   + 5 + 0   = 5

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 5$	$t = 24.72$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	.86 (.79, .91)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 4.14$ SD = .878		Medium $E \geq 2$

Table 6. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1B.

Equation 1C: *Expertise of the supervisor only*
     (Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r)
       5 + 0 + 0   + 0 + 0   = 5

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 5$	$t = 46.01$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	2.17 (2.08, 2.26)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 2.83$ SD = 1.19		Medium $E \geq 2$

Table 7. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1C

2. *Supervision authority through position and co-creative dialog.* Constructed from Authority Subscales 2 + 4 + 3. The representative equation is:

(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 - Q18r) + (Q23 + Q24)
1   + 0   + 1   + 5 - 0 + 5 + 5   =   17

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: μ = 17	t = 16.06, df = 635, p < .001	2.17 (1.90, 2.44)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X}$ = 14.83 SD = 3.19		Medium $E \geq 10$

Table 8. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation Two.

Scale 3: Timing and Length of Supervision (Q25-Q33): Four Narrative Themes

1. *Knowledge and skill development through supervision is needed througout the career of the social worker.* Constructed from the Timing and Length Subscales 1 + 2. The representative equation is:

(Q27 + Q28r + Q29r) + (Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33)
5   + 0   + 5   + 7 + 7 + 0   + 7 = 31

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: μ = 31	t = 22.10, df = 635, p < .001	3.55 (3.23, 3.86)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X}$ = 27.45 SD = 4.05		Medium $E \geq 12$

Table 9. Means and Analytic Results for Timing & Length of Supervision Narrative Equation 1.

2. *On-going supervision can discourage professional autonomy.* Constructed from the Timing and Length Subscales 1 + 2. The representative equation is:

(Q27 + Q28r + Q29r) + (Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33)
1   + 1   + 1   + 5 + 0 + 0   + 5 = 13

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 13$	$t = 75.78$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	11.89 (11.58, 12.20)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 24.89$ SD = 3.95		Medium $E \geq 10$

Table 10. Means and Analytic Results for Timing & Length of Supervision Narrative Equation 2.

3. *The need for adminstrative supervision for the duration of a social worker's employment with an organization.* Constructed from the Timing and Length Subscales 2. The representative equation is:

Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33
  0 + 0 + 7   + 0 = 7

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 7$	$t = 17.17$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	1.28 (1.13, 1.42)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 5.72$ SD = 1.88		Medium $E \geq 5$

Table 11. Means and Analytic Results for Timing & Length of Supervision Narrative Equation 3.

4. *The need for supervision after graduation and for new employees.* Constructed from the Timing and Length Subscale 3. The representative equation is:

Q25 + Q26
  5 + 5   = 10

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 10$	$t = 14.73$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	.60 (.52, .68)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 9.40$ SD = 1.02		Medium $E \geq 4$

Table 12. Means and Analytic Results for Timing & Length of Supervision Narrative Equation 4.

Scale 4: Training and Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34-Q44): Three Narrative Themes

1. *Supervision training is necessary to provide effective services. Practice experience is not enough.* Constructed from the Training and Discipline Subscale 2. The representative equation is:

$$\frac{Q37 + Q39 + Q41 + Q43}{5 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5} \ = \ 20$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 20$	$t = 25.47$, df = 635, $p < .001$	2.76 (2.55, 2.98)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 17.24$ SD = 2.74		Medium $E \geq 8$

Table 13. Means and Analytic Results for Supervisor Training and Discipline Narrative Equation 1.

2. *A lack of supervisor training is associated with the absence of desirable educative and supportive supervision.* Constructed from the Training and Discipline Subscale 1 + Purpose Subscale 3. The representative equation is:

$$\frac{(Q38 + Q40 + Q42 + Q44) + (Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5)}{1 \ + \ 1 \ + \ 1 \ + \ 1 \ \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5 + \ 0 + \ 5} \ = \ 19$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 19$	$t = 48.08$, df = 635, $p < .001$	8.59 (8.25, 8.95)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 27.60$ SD = 4.51		Medium $E \geq 14$

Table 14. Means and Analytic Results for Supervisor Training and Discipline Narrative Equation 1.

3. *The importance of supervisors being social workers.* Constructed from the Training and Discipline Subscale 3. The representative equation is:

$$\frac{Q34 + Q35 + Q36}{5 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5} \ = \ 15$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: X = 15		
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X}$ = 12.5 SD = 2.74	$t = 22.96$, df = 635, $p < .001$	2.49 (2.28, 2.70) Medium $E \geq 6$

Table 15. Means and Analytic Results for Supervisor Training and Discipline Narrative Equation 3.

Scale 5: The Place in Supervision for the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change (Q45-Q60): Four Narrative Themes

1. *The social work mission of social justice and social change is not encouraged in the dominant supervision literature.* Constructed from Subscale 1. The representative equation is:

$$\frac{Q46 + Q48 + Q50 + Q52 + Q54 + Q56 + Q58 + Q60}{1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1} = 8$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: X = 8		
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X}$ = 27.44 SD = 8.79	$t = 55.79$, df = 635, $p < .001$	19.44 (18.75, 20.12) Medium $E \geq 16$

Table 16. Means and Analytic Results for the Place in Supervision of the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change Narrative Equation 1.

2. *There is an emerging alternative configuration of supervision that proposes the social work mission of social justice and social change needs to be part of supervision.* Constructed from Subscale 2. The representative equation is:

$$\frac{Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59}{5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5} = 35$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 35$	$t = 29.51$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	6.43 (6.00, 6.85)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 28.57$ SD = 5.49		Medium $E \geq 14$

Table 17. Means and Analytic Results for the Place in Supervision of the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change Narrative Equation 2.

3. *Supervisors have a responsibility to explore cultural diversity, and ideas and assumptions that could oppress or privilege clients.*Constructed from Subscale 2. The representative equation is:

$$Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59$$
$$0 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 5 \ \ = \ 20$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 20$	$t = 24.97$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	3.42 (3.16, 3.69)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 16.58$ SD = 3.46		Medium $E \geq 8$

Table 18. Means and Analytic Results for the Place in Supervision of the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change Narrative Equation 3.

4. *The need to include conversations that explore race and gender differences in supervision relationships.* Constructed from Subscale 2. The representative equation is:

$$Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59$$
$$0 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 5 \ + \ 0 \ + \ 0 \ \ = \ 5$$

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 5$	$t = 22.16$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	.92 (.84, 1.00)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 4.08$ SD = 1.05		Medium $E \geq 2$

Table 19. Means and Analytic Results for the Place in Supervision of the SW Mission of Social Justice and Social Change Narrative Equation 4.

A Combination of Scales: The Intersection between Authority of the Supervisor, the Timing and Length of Supervision, and the Place of the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change: One Narrative Theme

Constructed from Three Scales:

1. Process: Authority(Q14-24): By position and social worker knowledge have equal value. Power in the supervision relationship recognized through the need for discussion about power: Subscale 2 + Subscale 4 + Subscale 3
2. Ongoing Timing & Length (Q25-33): Subscale 1 + Subscale 2
3. Place of SW Mission (Q45-60) The need to include the mission of social justice in supervision conversations: Subscale 2

The representative equation is:

(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r) + (Q23 + Q24)

$$1 + 0 + 1 + 5 + 0 + 5 + 0 = 12$$
+
(Q27 + Q28r + Q29r) + (Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33)

$$5 + 0 + 5 + 7 + 7 + 0 + 7 = 31$$
+
Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59

$$5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 = 35$$

Therefore: TOTAL SCORE   =   78

Means	One Sample T-Test Two-tailed	Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
Population: $\mu = 78$	$t = 28.69$, df $= 635$, $p < .001$	9.52 (8.87, 10.17)
Sample: N = 636 $\overline{X} = 68.48$ SD = 8.37		Medium $E \geq 32$

Table 20. Means and Analytic Results for the Intersection between Supervisor Authority, Supervision Timing and Length, and the SW Mission for Social Justice and Change.

APPENDIX N

Assessment of Interpretive Rigor and Inference Transferability

In order to determine the quality of my research findings, I assessed the

interpretive rigor and the inference transferability of my quantitative and qualitative

findings to the population of social workers in Ontario (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003).

Considering the Criteria for Interpretive Rigor

Inference quality includes two notions. The first, design quality, refers to how

well my research design and data collection methods attended to the concepts of internal

validity and credibility. In previous chapters, I discussed these aspects, including the

quality of the design in relationship to the research questions and the rigor of the findings.

The second aspect of inference quality is *interpretive rigor*, which considers the

consistency, compatibility, and differences of my interpretations of the findings

according to internal comparisons and in relationship to external knowledge (Tashakkori

& Teddlie, 2003; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003).

Throughout my research process, I aimed to satisfy the query, can my

"constructions be trusted to provide some purchase on some important phenomenon?"

(Lincoln & Guba, 2000, p. 179). In order to substantiate credibility and validity of my

inferences I addressed the three assessment areas of interpretive rigor posited by Teddlie

and Tashakkori (2003). First, during my considerations of the data and the interpretative

narratives I aimed for conceptual consistency with my research questions and purpose.

Furthermore, I considered both data strands in relationship to the current supervision

literature. Second, when I developed my interpretations I looked for consistencies or

agreement with current literature, as well as interpretive distinctiveness compared to

current knowledge, which is the third and final aspect of interpretive rigor. Therefore, according to the criteria for interference quality (which includes design quality and interpretive rigor), my interpretations of the integrated findings can be considered plausible and trustworthy.

Inference Transferability of Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Inference transferability is a term that describes the generalizability or applicability of interpretations of research findings, and is an essential consideration throughout the research design process. The transferability of research results can be strengthened through a variety of procedures (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007; Rubin & Babbie, 2001). To that end I included the following techniques (Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003): (1) I triangulated data collection using quantitative and qualitative results; (2) I maintained an audit trail of survey results and narrative transcripts; (3) I remained watchful about my own bias and bracketed potential ideas that could unintentionally influence my interpretation of data, particularly while I analysed the qualitative responses; (4) I paid attention to quantitative outliers and exceptional comments; and (5) I collected thick descriptions to potentially increase the richness and variety of meanings for the results (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007; Onwuegbuzie & Teddlie, 2003; Rubin & Babbie, 2001; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003).

REFERENCES

Abbey-Livingston, D., & Abbey, D. S. (1982). *Enjoying research? A 'how-to' manual on needs assessment.* Toronto: ON: Queen's Printer.

Alberta College of Social Workers (2006). *Clinical policies and procedures: Clinical social work registry policies and procedures.* Edmonton, Alberta: Author

Alberta College of Social Workers (2007a, October). *Clinical Registry: Application to be an approved clinical social work supervisor.* Edmonton, Alberta: Author

Alberta College of Social Workers (2007b, December). *Become an RSW: Registration application package.* Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.acsw.ab.ca/

Altschuld, J. W., & Witkin, B. R. (2000). *From needs assessment to action: Transforming needs into solution strategies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (2007a, October). *AAMFT clinical membership evaluative track application.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.aamft.org/resources/application_tree/applications/ Clinical%20Evaluative.pdf

American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (2007b, October). *Approved supervisor designation standards and responsibilities handbook.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Board of Examiners in Clinical Social Work (2004, October). *Clinical supervision: A practice specialty of clinical social work. A position statement.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.abecsw.org/pub-position-papers.php

American Psychological Association (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Antle, B., MacKenzie Davies, J., Baines, D., Angell, B., Dawson Haber, M., Paulekat, P., et al. (2006, December). *OASW Quality of Work Life Survey – Final Report.* Toronto, ON: Ontario Association of Social Workers.

Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Social Workers (1998, May). *Policy statement on supervision by the Education and Training Standing Committee.* Aotearoa New Zealand: Author.

Aoun, S., Pennebaker, D., & Wood, C. (2004). Assessing population need for mental health care: A review of approaches and predictors. *Mental Health Services Research, 6*(1), 33-46.

Aronson, J. & Sammon, S. (2000). Practice and social service cuts and restructuring: Working with the contradictions of "small victories." *Canadian Social Work Review, 17*, 167-187.

Association of Social Work Boards (2000-2008). *Licensing requirements.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.aswb.org/lic_req.shtml

Association of Social Workers in Northern Canada (February 19, 2008). *Message from the President.* Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.socialworknorth.com/

Austin, L. N. (1961). The changing role of the supervisor. Smith College Studies in Social Work, 31(3), 179-195.

Austin, L. N. (1979). Basic principles of supervision. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 56-69). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social*

Casework, 33, December 1952, 411-419).

Austin, M. J. (1981). *Supervisory management in the human services*. Englewood Cliffs,

NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Australian Association of Social Workers (2000, July). *National practice standards of the*

Australian Association of Social Workers: Supervision. Retrieved April 12, 2008,

from http://www.aasw.asn.au/adobe/publications/Practice

Standards_Supervision.pdf

Autagavaia, M. (2001). A tagata Pasifika supervision process: Authenticating difference.

In L. Beddoe & J. Worrall (Eds.), *Supervision conference July 7-8, 2000: From*

rhetoric to reality. Keynote address and selected papers (pp.45-52). Auckland,

New Zealand: Centre for Social Work, Auckland College of Education.

Baldwin, M. (2004a). Conclusions: Optimism and the art of the possible. In N. Gould &

M. Baldwin (Eds.), *Social work, critical reflection and the learning organization*

(pp. 161-176). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Baldwin, M. (2004b). Critical reflection: Opportunities and threats to professional

learning and service development in social work organizations. In N. Gould & M.

Baldwin (Eds.), *Social work, critical reflection and the learning organization* (pp.

41-55). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Barretta-Herman, A. (1993). On the development of a model of supervision for licensed

social work practioners. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(2), 55-64.

Barretta-Herman, A. (2001). Fulfilling the commitment to competent social work practice

through supervision. In L. Beddoe & J. Worrall (Eds.), *Supervision conference*

July 7-8, 2000: From rhetoric to reality. Keynote address and selected papers

(pp.1-9). Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Social Work, Auckland College of Education.

Beddoe, L. (1997, August). A new era for supervision. *Social Work Now, 7*, 10-16.

Behan, C. P. (2003). Some ground to stand on: Narrative supervision. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 22*(4), 29-42.

Beresford, P., & Croft, S. (2001). Service users' knowledges and the social construction of social work. *Journal of Social Work, 1*, 295–316.

Berger, C., & Mizrahi, T. (2001). An evolving paradigm of supervision within a changing health care environment. *Social Work in Health Care, 32*(4), 1-18.

Bibus, A. (1993). In pursuit of a missing link: The influence of supervision on social worker's practice with involuntary clients. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(2), 7-22.

Bisman, C. (2004). Social work values: The moral core of the profession. *British Journal of Social Work, 24*, 109-123.

Board of Registration for Social Workers in British Columbia (2004). *Registrants: Clinical registration: Frequently asked questions.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.brsw.bc.ca/registrants/clinical_registration/faqs.htm

Board of Registration for Social Workers in British Columbia (2005a, January). *Registrants: Clinical registration: Overview.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.brsw.bc.ca/registrants/clinical_registration/overview.htm

Board of Registration for Social Workers in British Columbia (2005b, September). *Standards of practice: Clinical supervision.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.brsw.bc.ca/resources_links/practice_standards/ clinical_supervision.htm

Bourgue, L., & Fielder, E. (2003). *The survey kit* (2nd ed.): *Volume 3: How to conduct self-administered and mail surveys.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Bland, J. M. & Altman, D. G. (1997, February). Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *British Medical Journal, 314,* 572.

Brace, N., Kemp, R., & Snelgar, R. (2006). *SPSS for Psychologists: A guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows* (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brackett, J. R. (1979). Training for work. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision:Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 6-17). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Supervision and education in charity,* J. R. Brackett, 1903, New York: Macmillan).

Bradshaw, J. (1972). The concept of social need. *New Society, 19,* 640-643.

Brashears, F. (1995). Supervision as social work practice: A reconceptualization. *Social Work,40*(5), 692-299.

Brown, J. (1938). Principles, content, and objectives of supervision. In the *Proceedings of the national conference of social work at the sixty-fifth annual session held in Seattle, Washington, June 26-July 2, 1938* (pp. 528-540). Columbus, OH: The University of Chicago Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Brown, J. D. (2002). The Cronbach alpha reliability estimate. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter, 6*(1), 16-18. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.jalt.org/test/bro_13.htm

Brown, A., & Bourne, I. (1996). *The social work supervisor: Supervision in community, day care and residential settings.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Bruce, E. J., & Austin, M., J. (2000). Social work supervision: Assessing the past and mapping the future. *The Clinical Supervisor, 19*(2), 85-107.

Buckingham, A., & Saunders, P. (2004). *The survey methods workbook: From design to analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bunker, D. R., & Wijnberg, M. H. (1988). *Supervision and performance: Managing professional work in human service organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cait, C-A. (2005). Implications of intersubjectivity for supervisory practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 34,* 253-265.

Campbell, D., T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2001). *Toward sector collaboration: A Report on the Social Work Forum,* Montreal, Quebec, October 11-14, 2001. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/ and follow the link Social Work in Canada, then Canadian Social Work Forum.

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2003). *Regulation of social work in Canada.* Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2004). *The impacts of working conditions on social workers and their practice: A CASW review of current literature.* Ottawa, ON: Author.

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2005a). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved April 4,

2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2005b). *Guidelines for ethical practice.*

Retrieved April 4, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

Canadian Association of Social Workers (2008). *About CASW.* Retrieved April 4, 2008,

from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

Capoccia, V. A., & Googins, B. (1982). Social planning in an environment of limited

choice. *New England Journal of Human Services, 11*(2), 31-36.

Carniol, B. (2005). *Case critical: Social services & social justice in Canada* (5th ed.).

Toronto, ON: Between the lines.

Cearley, S. (2004). The power of supervision in child welfare services. *Child & Youth

Care Forum, 33*(5), 313-327.

Chambon, A. S. (1999). Foucault's approach: Making the familiar visible. In A. S.

Chambon, A., Irving, & L. Epstein (Eds.), *Reading Foucault for social work* (pp.

51-81). New York: Columbia University Press.

Clark, C. (1995). Competence and discipline in professional formation. *British Journal of

Social Work, 25*, 563-580.

Clark-Carter, D. (2003). Effect size: The missing piece in the jigsaw. *The Psychologist,

16*(2), 636-638.

Clason, D. L., & Dormody, T. J. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-

type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 35*(4), 31-35. Retrieved April 12,

2008, from http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/toc35.html

Clulow, C. (1994). Balancing care and control: The supervisory relationship as a focus

for promoting organizational health. In A. Obholzer & V. Z. Roberts (Eds.), *The*

unconscious at work: Individual and organizational stress in the human services

(pp. 179-216). London, UK: Routledge.

Cohen, A., & Eastman, N. (1997). Needs assessment for mentally disordered offenders

and others requiring similar services. Theoretical issues and methodological

framework. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 171*, 412-416.

Cohen, B.-Z. (1987). The ethics of social work supervision revisited. *Social Work, 32*(3),

194-196.

Cohen, B.-Z. (1999). Intervention and supervision in strengths-based social work

practice. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 80*,

460-466.

Cohen, B.-Z, & Laufer, H. (1999). The influence of supervision on social workers'

perceptions of their professional competence. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(2),

39-50

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.).

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulliten, 112*(1), 155-159.

Collins-Carmargo, C. E., & Groeber, C. (2003). Adventures in partnership: Using

learning laboratories to enhance frontline supervision in child welfare.

Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work

Education, 6(1/2), 17-31.

Conway, J. M. & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 6,* 147-168.

Cooper, L. (2001). Organizational changes and social work supervision: Analysis and reconstruction. In L. Beddoe & J. Worrall (Eds.), *Supervision conference July 7- 8, 2000: From rhetoric to reality. Keynote address and selected papers* (pp.21-32). Auckland, New Zealand: Centre for Social Work, Auckland College of Education.

Cooper, L. (2002). Social work supervision: A social justice perspective. In M. McMahon & W. Patton (Eds.), *Supervision in the helping professions: A practical approach* (pp. 185-195). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia

Cowley, S., Bergen, A., Young, K., & Kavanagh, A. (2000). A taxonomy of needs assessment, elicited from a multiple case study of community nursing education and practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 31,* 126-134.

Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dallal, G. E. (2003). *Nonparametric statistics.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.tufts.edu/~gdallal/npar.htm

Dallal, G. E. (2006). *The most important lesson you'll ever learn about multiple linear regression analysis.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.tufts.edu/~gdallal/important.htm

Darlington, Y., Osmond, J., & Peile, C. (2002). Child welfare workers' use of theory in working with physical abuse: Implications for professional supervision. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 83*, 54-63.

Dewees, M. (2001). Building cultural competence for work with diverse families: Strategies from the privileged side. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 9*, 33-51.

Drake, B., & Washeck, J. (1998). A competency-based method for providing worker feedback to CPS supervisors. *Administration in Social Work, 22*(3), 55-74.

Edwards, H. P. (2000, January). *Regulatory requirements for registration in psychology across Canada: A comparison of Acts, Regulations, By-Laws and Guidelines in view of the Agreement on Internal Trade.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.cpa.ca/documents/PSWAIT%20Report.PDF

Eisikovits, Z., & Guttmann, E. (1983). Toward a practice theory of learning through experience in social work supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 1*(1), 51-63.

Eisikovits, Z., Meier, R., Guttmann, E., Shurka, E., & Levinstein, A. (1985). Supervision in ecological context: The relationship between the quality of supervision and the work and treatment environment. *Journal of Social Service Research, 8*(4), 37-58.

Engel, D. (1939). Supervision as one method of staff development: In the urban agency. In the *Proceedings of the national conference of social work: Selected papers at the sixty-sixth annual conference, Buffalo, New York, June 18-24, 1939* (pp. 284-294). New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Epstein, L. (1973). Is autonomous practice possible? *Social Work, 18*(2), 5-12.

Erera, I. P., & Lazar, A. (1993). Training needs of social work supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*(1), 83-93.

Erera, I. P., & Lazar, A. (1994). The administrative and educational functions in supervision: Indications of incompatibility. *The Clinical Supervisor, 12*(2), 39-56.

Fabrigar, L., Wegener, D., MacCallum, R., & Strahan, E. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272-299.

Fine, M., & Turner, J. (1997). Collaborative supervision: Minding the power. In T. C. Todd & C. L. Storm (Eds.), The *complete systemic supervisor: Context, philosophy, and pragmatics* (pp. 229-240). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Fink, A. (2003). *The survey kit* (2nd ed.): *Volume 2: How to ask survey questions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1998). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fook, J. (1999). Critical reflectivity in education and practice. In B. Pease & J. Fook (Eds.), *Transforming social work practice: Postmodern critical perspectives* (pp. 195-208). London, UK: Routledge.

Fook, J. (2000). Deconstructing and reconstructing professional expertise. In B. Fawcett, B. Featherstone, J. Fook, & A. Rossiter (Eds.), *Practice and research in social work* (pp. 104-119). New York: Routledge.

Fook, J. (2001). Linking theory, practice and research. *Critical Social Work, 2*(1).

Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.criticalsocialwork.com/

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith,

Trans.).Great Britain: Tavistock Publications Limited (Original work published

1969).

Foucault, M. (1980a).The confession of the flesh. In C. Gordon (Ed.), P*ower/knowledge:*

Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault

(pp.194-228). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980b). The eye of power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), P*ower/knowledge: Selected*

interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault (pp.146-165). New

York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980c). Power and strategies. In C. Gordon (Ed.), P*ower/knowledge:*

Selected interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault

(pp.135-145). New York:Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980d). Prison talk. In C. Gordon (Ed.), P*ower/knowledge: Selected*

interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault (pp.37-54). New

York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980e). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected*

interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault (pp.109-133). New

York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980f). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), P*ower/knowledge: Selected*

interviews & other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault (pp.78-108). New

York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1984a). Docile bodies. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 179-187). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1984b). The means of correct training. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 188-205). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1984c). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1984d).The politics and ethics: An interview. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 373-380). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1984e). What is an author? In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 101-120). New York: Pantheon Books.

Fowler, F. J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Franklin, C. (2001). Coming to terms with the business of direct practice social work. *Research on Social Work Practice, 11*, 235-244.

Fukuyama, K. (1998). Influences of selected characteristics of professional supervision on job satisfaction, productivity and autonomy of professional social workers in Japan. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 60/04, p. 1328, Oct 1999. (UMI No. AAT 9925225). Retrieved March 28, 2006, from http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=734459261&sid=2 &Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Gambrill, E. (2001). Social work: An authority-based profession. *Research on Social Work Practice, 11*, 166-175.

Ganzer, C., & Ornstein, E. D. (2004). Regression, self-disclosure, and the teach or treat dilemma: Implications of a relational approach for social work supervision.

Clinical Social Work Journal, 32(4), 431-449.

Garrett, K., & Barretta-Herman, A. (1995). Moving from supervision to professional

development. *The Clinical Supervisor, 13*(2), 97-110.

Garson, G. D. (2007). *Data levels and measurement.* Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/datalevl.htm

Gebotys, B. (1999). *Handout on validity.* Unpublished manuscript.

Gibelman, M., & Schervish, P. H. (1997). Supervision in social work: Characteristics and

trends in a changing environment. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16*(2), 1-15.

Gibbs, J. A. (2001). Maintaining front-line workers in child protection: A case of

refocusing supervision. *Child Abuse Review, 10*, 323-335.

Giddings, M., Cleveland, P., & Smith, C. H. (2006). Responding to inadequate

supervision: A model promoting integration for post-MSW practitioners. *The*

Clinical Supervisor, 25(1/2), 105-126.

Golden Hills Software (2005, May 1). *SurveyGold: Surveygold.com privacy policy.*

Retrieved September 13, 2007, from http://surveygold.com/privacy.htm

Golden Hills Software (2007). *SurveyGold 8 Software.* Retrieved September 13, 2007,

from http://surveygold.com/surveygold.htm

Gordon, C. (1980). Afterword. In C. Gordon (Ed), P*ower/knowledge: Selected interviews*

& other writings 1972 – 1977 by Michel Foucault (pp.229-259). New York:

Pantheon Books.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1997). Exploratory factor analysis: Its role in item analysis. Journal of

Personality Assessment, 68(3), 532-560.

Granvold, D. (1977). Supervisory style and educational preparation of public welfare

supervisors. *Administration in Social Work, 1*(1), 79-88.

Granvold, D. (1978). Training social work supervisors to meet organizational and worker

objectives. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 14,* 38-45.

Grauel, T. (2002). Professional oversight: The neglected histories of supervision. In M.

McMahon & W. Patton (Eds.), *Supervision in the helping professions: A practical*

approach (pp. 3-15). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.

Gray, M., Coates, J., & Hetherington, T. (2007). Hearing Indigenous voices in

mainstream social work. *Families in Society, 88,* 55-66.

Gray, S. (1990). The interplay of social work licensure and supervision: An exploratory

study.*The Clinical Supervisor, 8*(1), 53-65.

Greenspan, R., Hanfling, S., Parker, E., Primm, S., & Waldfogel, D. (1991). Supervision

of experienced agency workers: A descriptive study. *The Clinical Supervisor,*

9(2), 31-42.

Grillo, T. (1995). Anti-essentialism and intersectionality: Tools to dismantle the master's

house. Berkeley Women's Law Journal, 10(1), 16-30.

Grinberg, L. (1990). The goals of psychoanalysis: Identification, identity, and

supervision. London, UK: Karnac Books Ltd.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). The place of values in needs assessment.

Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4, 311-320.

Guest, D. (1999). *The emergence of social security in Canada* (3rd ed.). Vancouver: UBC

Press.

Hacking, I. (1998). On being more literal about construction. In I. Velody & R. Williams

(Eds.), *The politics of constructionism* (pp. 49-68). London, UK: Sage

Publications.

Harkness, D. (1995). The art of helping in supervised practice: Skills, relationships, and

outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 13*(1), 63-76.

Harkness, D. (1997). Testing interactional social work theory: A panel analysis of

supervised practice and outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 15*(1), 33-50.

Harkness, D. & Hensley, H. (1991). Changing the focus of social work supervision:

Effects on client satisfaction and generalized contentment. *Social Work, 36*(6),

506-512.

Harkness, D., & Poertner, J. (1989). Research and social work supervision: A conceptual

review. *Social Work, 34*(2), 115-119.

Hawthorne, L. (1979). Games supervisors play. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work*

supervision: Classic statements and critical issues (pp. 196-205). New York: The

Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social Work,*

20, May 1975, 179-183).

Healy, K. (2001). Reinventing critical social work: Challenges from practice, context and

postmodernism. *Critical Social Work, 2*(1). Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.criticalsocialwork.com/

Heinonen, T., & Spearman, L. (2006). *Social work practice: Problem solving and beyond*

(2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Nelson Publishers.

Hensley, P. H. (2002). The value of supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 21*(1), 97-110.

Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A

conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. *Measurement and Evaluation in*

Counseling and Development, 34(3), 177-189.

Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2006). Use of exploratory factor analysis in published

research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. *Education*

and Psychological Measurement, 66(3), 393-416

Himle, D. P., Jayaratne, S., & Thyness, P. A. (1989). The buffering effects of four types

of supervisory support on work stress. *Administration in Social Work, 13*(1),

19-34.

Hipp, J., & Munson, C. E. (1995). The partnership model: A feminist

supervision/consulation perspective. *The Clinical Supervisor, 13*(1), 23-38.

Hirst, V., & Lynch, A. (2005). External supervision – good or bad for the organization?

In L. Beddoe, J. Worrall, & F. Howard (Eds.), *Supervision conference 2004:*

Weaving together the strands of supervision (pp.91-97). Auckland, New Zealand:

Faculty of Education, University of Auckland.

Hojat, M., & Xu, Gang (2004). A visitor's guide to effect sizes. *Advances in Health*

Sciences Education, 9, 241-249.

Hollis, F. (1936). Emotional growth of the worker through supervision. In the

Proceedings of the national conference of social work at the sixty-third annual

session held in Atlantic City,New Jersey, May 18-23, 1936 (pp. 167-178).

Columbus, OH: The University of Chicago Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008,

from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at

http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Holloway, S., & Brager, G. (1989). *Supervising in the human services: The politics of practice*. New York: Free Press.

Holosko, M., & Leslie, D. R. (2001). Is social work a profession? The Canadian response. *Research on Social Work Practice, 11*, 201-209.

Hugman, R. (1996). Professionalization in social work: The challenge of diversity. *International Social Work, 39*, 131-147.

Hughman, R. (2003). Professional values and ethics in social work: Reconsidering postmodernism? *British Journal of Social Work, 33*(8), 1025-1041.

Hurlbert, D. F. (1992). Changing the views of socia work supervision: An administrative challenge. *The Clinical Supervisor, 10*(2), 57-69.

Hutchinson, D. (1979). Supervision in social case work. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 35-40). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *The Family*, April 1935, 44-47).

Ife, J. (1999). Postmodernism, critical theory and social work. In B. Pease & J. Fook (Eds.), *Transforming social work practice: Postmodern critical perspectives* (pp. 211-223). London, UK: Routledge.

International Federation of Social Workers & International Association of Schools of Social Work (2004). *Ethics in social work, statement of principles*. Retrieved April 8, 2008 from http://www.ifsw.org/en/p38000324.html

Irving, A. (1999). Waiting for Foucault: Social work and the multitudinous truth(s) of life. In A. S. Chambon, A. Irving, & L. Epstein (Eds.), *Reading Foucault for social work* (pp. 26-50). New York: Columbia University Press.

Itzhaky, H., & Aviad-Hiebloom, A. (1998). How supervision and role stress in social

work affect burnout. *Arete, 22*(2), 29-43.

Itzhaky, H., & Hertzanu-Laty, M. (1999). Application of Martin Buber's dialogue theory

in social work supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(1), 17-31.

Itzhaky, H., & Rudich, V. (2003/2004). Communication and values in the cross-cultural

encounter and their influence on supervision in social work. *Arete, 27*(2), 50-64.

Jayaratne, S., Brabson, H. V., Gant, L. M., Nagda, B. A., Singh, A. K., & Chess, W. A.

(1992). African-American practitioners' perceptions of their supervisors:

Emotional support, social undermining, and criticism. *Administration in Social

Work, 16*(2), 27-43.

Jeffreys, J. W. (2001). The impact of supervision on social work perception of self-

efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 63/01, p. 363, Jul 2002. (UMI

No. AAT3039611). Retrieved March 28, 2006, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=726315081&sid=4

&Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Johnson, B., & Turner, B. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research.

In A.Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social &

behavioral research* (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, M. (2004). Supervision, learning and transformative practices. In N. Gould & M.

Baldwin (Eds.), *Social work, critical reflection and the learning organization*

(pp.11-22). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Kadushin, A. (1974). Supervisor-supervisee: A survey. *Social Work, 19*, 288-297.

Kadushin, A. (1976). *Supervision in social work.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kadushin, A. (1985). *Supervision in social work* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia

University Press.

Kadushin, A. (1992a). Social work supervision: An updated survey. *The Clinical*

Supervisor, 10(2), 9-27.

Kadushin, A. (1992b). *Supervision in social work* (3rd ed.). New York: Columbia

University Press.

Kadushin, A. (1992c). What's wrong, what's right with social work supervision. *The*

Clinical Supervisor, 10(1), 3-19.

Kadushin, A. & Harkness, D. (2002). *Supervision in social work,* (4th ed.). New York:

Columbia University Press.

Kaiser, T. L., & Barretta-Herman, A. (1999). The Supervision Institute: A model for

supervisory training. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(1), 33-46.

Karvinen-Niinikoski, S. (2004). Social work supervision: Contributing to innovative

knowledge production and open expertise. In N. Gould & M. Baldwin (Eds.),

Social work, critical reflection and the learning organization (pp. 23-39).

Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Kauffman, M. (1938). Supervision of case-work staffs. In the *Proceedings of the national*

conference of social work at the sixty-fifth annual session held in Seattle,

Washington, June 26-July 2, 1938 (pp. 222-232). Columbus, OH: The University

of Chicago Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National Conference on

Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Kavanagh, D. J., Spence, S. H., Strong, J., Wilson, J., Sturk, H., & Crow, N. (2003).

Supervision practices in allied mental health: Relationships of supervision

characteristics to perceived impact and job satisfaction. *Mental Health Services Research, 5*(4), 187-195.

Kemper, E. A., Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Mixed methods sampling strategies in social science research. In A.Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 273-296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ko, G. (1987). Casework supervision in voluntary family service agencies in Hong Kong. *International Social Work, 30*, 171-184.

Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions,* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kutzik, A. J. (1977). The social work field. In F. W. Kaslow (Ed.), *Supervision, consultation,and staff training in the helping professions* (pp.25-60). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Laird, J. (1998). Theorizing culture: Narrative ideas and practice principles. In M. McGoldrick (Ed.), *Re-visioning family therapy: Race, culture, and gender in clinical practice* (pp. 20-36). New York: Guilford Press.

Landau, R. (1999). Ethical judgement, code of ethics and supervision in ethical decision making in social work: Findings from an Israeli sample. *Journal of Applied Social Sciences, 23*(2), 21-29.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern* (C. Porter, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (Original work published 1991).

Laufer, H. (2003). Long-experienced social workers and supervision: Perceptions and implications. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 153-171.

Law, I. & Madigan, S. (1998). Discourse not language: The shift from a modernist view

of language to a post-structural analysis of discourse in family therapy. In S.

Madigan & I. Law (Eds.), *Praxis: Situating discourse, feminism and politics in*

narrative therapies (pp.1-12). Yaletown Family Therapy, Vancouver: The

Cardigan Press.

Lawler, J. (2006). *Factor analysis*. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from

http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/Ent-Fac/Factor-Analysis.html

Levin, J. R., & Robinson, D. H. (1999). Further reflections on hypothesis testing and

editorial policy for primary research journals. *Educational Psychology Review,*

11, 143-155.

Levy, C. S. (1973). The ethics of supervision. *Social Work, 18*(2), 14-21.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and

emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of*

qualitative research (2nd ed.) (pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Litwin, M. (2003). *The survey kit* (2nd ed.): *Volume8: How to assess and interpret survey*

psychometrics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Lloyd, C., King, R., & Chenoweth, L. (2002). Social work, stress and burnout: A review.

Journal of Mental Health, 11(3), 255-265.

Lowry, F. (1936). A philosophy of supervision in social case work. In the *Proceedings of*

the national conference of social work at the sixty-third annual session held in

Atlantic City, New Jersey, May 18-23, 1936 (pp. 108-118). Columbus, OH: The

University of Chicago Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National

Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at

http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Lowy, L. (1983). Social work supervision: From models toward theory. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 19*(2), 55-62.

Lundy, C. (2004). *Social work and social justice: A structural approach to practice.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, Ltd.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press (Original work published 1979).

MacDonald, A., & Adachi, R. (2001). *Regulation of social work practice in Canada.* Paper presented at the Social Work Forum, Montreal, Quebec, October 11-14, 2001. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

MacDougall, G. (2001). *Social work practice: Another look.* Paper presented at the Social Work Forum, Montreal, Quebec, October 11-14, 2001. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/

MacKenzie, M. (1999). Historical overview and current issues in social work regulation. In F. J. Turner (Ed.), *Social work practice: A Canadian perspective* (pp. 492-504). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada.

Mandell, B. (1973). The "equality" revolution and supervision. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 9,* 43-54.

Margolin, L. (1997). *Under the cover of kindness: The invention of social work.* Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Martin, U., & Schinke, S. P. (1998). Organizational and individual factors influencing job

satisfaction and burnout of mental health workers. *Social Work in Health Care,*

28(2), 51-62.

Masterman, M. (1970). The nature of a paradigm. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.),

Criticism and the growth of knowledge (p. 59-89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge

University Press.

Matheson, J. E. (1999). The process of social work supervision: Women's perspectives.

Dissertation Abstracts International-A, 60/07, p. 2680, Jan 2000. (UMI No.

AATNQ38453). Retrieved December 15, 2005, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=729766701&sid=8

&Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Maxcy, S. J. (2003). Pragmatic threads in mixed methods research in the social sciences:

The search for multiple modes of inquiry and the end of the philosophy of

formalism. In A .Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in*

social & behavioral research (pp. 51-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCarthy, M. L. (2003). The relationship between supervision and casework retention in

county-based child welfare systems *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 65/03,

p. 1119, Sep 2004, (UMI No. AAT NQ89697). Retrieved August 17, 2006, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=765404351&sid=3

&Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD C-W NEW

Melichercik, J. (1984). Social work supervision in transition: An exploration of current

supervisory practice. *The Social Worker, 52*(3), 108-112.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate-Dictionary (10th ed.) (2000). Springfield, MA: Merriam

Webster, Inc.

Middleman, R. R. , & Rhodes, G. B. (1985). *Competent supervision: Making imaginative*

judgements. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Miller, R., & Robb, J. R. (1997). New professionals'preparedness for clinical social

work: Supervisors' perspectives. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 25,* 351-363.

Millstein, K. (2000). Confidentiality in direct social-work practice: Inevitable challenges

and ethical dilemmas. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human*

Services, 81, 270-282..

Ministry of Children and Family Development (2004, July). *Child and youth mental*

health plan for British Columbia. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.mcf.gov.bc.ca/mental_health/mh_publications/

cymh_plan.htm#summary

Mizrahi, T. (2001). The status of community organizing in 2001: Community practice,

context, complexities, contradictions, and contributions. *Research on Social Work*

Practice, 11, 176-189.

Moore, D. S., & McCabe, G. P. (1999). *Introduction to the practice of statistics* (3rd ed.).

New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Morrell, M. (2001). External supervision: Confidential or accountable? An exploration of

the relationship between agency, supervisor, and supervisee. In L. Beddoe & J.

Worrall (Eds.), *Supervision conference July 7-8,2000: From rhetoric to reality.*

Keynote address and selected papers (pp.149-157). Auckland, New Zealand:

Centre for Social Work, Auckland College of Education.

Morrison, T. (1997). Learning, training, and change in child protection work: Towards reflective organizations. *Social Work Education, 16*(2), 20-43.

Munson, C. (1979a). Authority and social work supervision: An emerging model. In C. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 336-346). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing.

Munson, C. (1979b). An empirical study of structure and authority in social work supervision. In C. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 286-296). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing.

Munson, C. (1979c). Evaluation of male and female supervisors. *Social Work, 24,* 104-110.

Munson, C. (1979d). Part I historical perspectives: Introduction. In C. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 2-5). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing.

Munson, C. (1979e). Professional autonomy and social work supervision. In C. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 227-237). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Journal of Education for Social Work, 12,* Fall 1976, 95-102).

Munson, C.(1980). Differential impact of structure and authority in supervision. *Arete, 6*(1),3-15.

Munson, C. E. (1981). Style and structure in supervision. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 17*(1), 65-72.

Munson, C. E. (1983). Editors comments. *The Clinical Supervisor, 1*(1), 1-3.

Munson, C. E. (1983b). *Introduction to clinical social work supervision.* New York:

Haworth Press.

Munson, C. E. (1993). *Clinical social work supervision* (2nd ed.). New York: Haworth

Press.

Munson, C. E. (1997). Gender and psychotherapy supervision: The partnership model. In

C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of pyschotherapy supervision* (pp. 549-569.

New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Munson, C. E. (2000). Supervision standards of practice in an era of societal

restructuring. In P. Allen-Meares & C. Garvin (Eds.), *The handbook of social*

work direct practice (pp. 611-632). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Munson, C. E. (2002). *Handbook of clinical social work supervision* (3rd ed.). New York:

Haworth Press.

Munson, C. E. (2004). The evolution of protocol-based supervisory practice. In M. J.

Austin & K. M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Supervision as collaboration in the human*

services: Building a learning culture (pp. 85-96). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Narhi, K. (2002). Transferable and negotiated knowledge: Constructing social work

expertise for the future. *Journal of Social Work, 2,* 317–336

Nathanson, A. (1992). New social workers' satisfaction with supervision and with their

job overall. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*, 53/04, p. 1276, Oct 1992.

(UMI No. AAT 9222582). Retrieved March 28, 2006, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=746948631&sid=8

&Fmt&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Nelson, D. W. (2000, March). *Advisory report on front line and supervisory practice.*

New York: Annie E. Casey Foundation, Special Child Welfare Advisory Panel.

Retrieved April 12, 2008 from

http://web.archive.org/web/20051226003447/http://www.aecf.org/child/

frontline.pdf

Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Social Workers (2003, January). *Standards*

for clinical supervision for social workers. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.nlasw.ca/ then go to "Standards and Policies"

Newman, I., Ridenour, C. S., Newman, C., & DeMarco, Jr., G. M. (2003). A typology of

research purposes and its relationship to mixed methods. In A. Tashakkori & C.

Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*

(pp. 167-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY:

McGraw-Hill.

Nova Scotia Association of Social Workers (n.d.). *Membership: Registration as a Social*

Worker Candidate. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from

http://www.nsasw.org/membership.html

O'Donoghue, K. (2001). The future of social work supervision within New Zealand.

Social Work Review, 13(1), 29-35.

O'Donoghue, K. (2002). Global-vision, local-vision, personal-vision and social work

supervision. *Social Work Review, 14*(4), 20-25.

O'Donoghue, K. (2003). *Restorying social work supervision*. Palmerston North, New

Zealand: Dunmore Press.

O'Donoghue, K. (2004). Social workers and cross-disciplinary supervision. *Social Work*

Review, 16(3), 2-7.

O'Donoghue, K., Munford, R., & Trlin, A. (2005, Summer). Mapping the territory:

Supervision within the association. *Social Work Review, 17*, 46-64.

Ontario Association of Social Workers (2007). *About OASW*. Retrieved April 12, 2008,

from http://www.oasw.org/en/communitysite/about/default.asp

Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (2000). *Code of ethics*

and standards of practice, 1ˢᵗ Ed. Toronto, ON: Author.

Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (2004, November).

Continuing competence program pilot project. Retrieved April 4, 2008, from

http://206.221.245.198/sections/membership_info/current_members/competency.

html

Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers (2007). *Annual report*

2006. Retrieved April 12, 2008 from http://www.ocswssw.org/index.asp

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daniel, L. G. (2002). A framework for reporting and interpreting

internal consistency reliability estimates. *Measurement and Evaluation in*

Counseling and Development, 35(2), 89-103.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. (2007). Validity and qualitative research: An

oxymoron? *Quality & Quantity, 41*, 233-249.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed

methods research. In A.Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed*

methods in social & behavioral research (pp.351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Parton, N. (2000). Some thoughts on the relationship between theory and practice in and

for social work. *British Journal of Social Work, 30*, 449-463.

Parton, N. (2003). Rethinking professional practice: The contributions of social

constructionism and the feminist 'ethics of care'. *British Journal of Social Work,

33*, 1-16.

Pathak, S. H. (1975). Supervision in social work: Historical development and current

trends. *The Indian Journal of Social Work, 35*(4), 317-323.

Payne, M. (1994). Personal supervision in social work. In A. Connor & S. Black (Eds.),

Performance review and quality in social care (pp. 43-58). London, UK: Jessica

Kingsley.

Payne, M. (1999). The moral bases of social work. *European Journal of Social Work,

2,*247-258.

Payne, M. (2001). Social work's changing identities. Unpublished manuscript. (English

version of Det sociale arbejdes identitet under forandring, in *Tidsskrift for social

forskning, 2*(3), 4-18.)

Pease, B. (2002). Rethinking empowerment: A postmodern reappraisal for emancipatory

practice. *British Journal of Social Work, 32*(2), 135-147.

Pease, B., & Fook, J. (1999). Postmodern critical theory and emancipatory social work

practice. In B. Pease & J. Fook (Eds.), *Transforming social work practice:

Postmodern critical perspectives* (pp. 1-22). London, UK: Routledge.

Perry, R. E. (2006). Education and child welfare supervisor performance: Does a social work degree matter? *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*(6), 591-604.

Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(2), 381-391.

Pilcher, A. J. (1984). The state of social work supervision in Victoria according to the practitioners. *Australian Social Work, 37*(3/4), 33-43.

Poertner, J., & Rapp, C. A. (1983). What is social work supervision? *The Clinical Supervisor, 1*(2), 53-65.

Poulin, J. E. (1994). Job task and organizational predictors of social worker job satisfaction change: A panel study. *Administration in Social Work, 18*, 21-38

Preston, M. S. (2004). Mandatory management training for newly hired child welfare supervisors: A divergence between management research and training practice? *Administration in Social Work,28*(2), 81-97.

Rauktis, M. E., & Koeske, G. F. (1994). Maintaining social work morale: When supportive supervision is not enough. *Administration in Social Work, 18*(1), 39-60.

Razak, N. (2002). *Transforming the field: Critical antiracist and anti-oppressive perspectives for the human services practicum.* Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Reamer, F. G. (1994). Social work values and ethics. In F. G. Reamer (Ed.), *The foundations of social work knowledge* (pp. 195-230). New York: Columbia University Press.

Reid, W.J. (2002). Knowledge for direct social work practice: An analysis of trends. *Social Service Review, 2,* 6-33.

Ringel, S. (2001). In the shadow of death: Relational paradigms in clinical supervision. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 29*(2), 171-179.

Robinson, D. H., & Levin, J. R. (1997). Reflections on statistical and substantive significance, with a slice of replication. *Educational Researcher, 26*(5), 21-26.

Robinson, V. P. (1936). *Supervision in social case work: A problem in professional education*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Robinson, V. P. (1949). *The dynamics of supervision under functional controls: A professional process in social casework*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rodway, M. R. (1991). Motivation and team building of supervisors in a multi-service setting. *The Clinical Supervisor,9*(2), 161-169.

Rondeau, G. (2001). *Challenges that confront social education in Canada*. Paper presented at the Social Work Forum, Montreal, Quebec, October 11-14, 2001. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from http://www.casw-acts.ca/ and follow the link Social Work in Canada, then Canadian Social Work Forum.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and social hope*. London, UK: Penguin Books.

Rosenau, P. M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences: Insights, inroads, and intrusions*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rosenthal, J. A. (1996). Qualitative descriptors of strength of association and effect size. *Journal of Social Service Research, 21*(4), 37-59.

Rossiter, A. (2001). Innocence lost and suspicion found: Do we educate for or against

social work? *Critical Social Work, 2*(1). Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.criticalsocialwork.com/

Rossiter, A. (2005). Discourse analysis in critical social work: From apology to question.

Critical Social Work, 6(1). Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.criticalsocialwork.com/

Rossiter, A., Walsh-Bowers, R., Prilleltensky, I., (1996). Learning from broken rules:

Individualism, bureaucracy, and ethics. *Ethics & Behavior, 6*, 307-320.

Royall, R. M. (1986). The effect of sample size on the meaning of significance tests. *The

American Statistician, 40*, 313-315.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research methods in social work*. Belmont, CA:

Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Rushton, A., & Nathan, J. (1996). The supervision of child protection work. *British

Journal of Social Work, 26*, 357-374.

Saleebey, D. (1990). Philosophical disputes in social work: Social justice denied. *Journal

of Sociology & Social Welfare, 17*, 29-40.

Saleebey, D. (1994). Culture, theory, and narrative: The intersection of meanings in

practice. *Social Work, 39*(4), 351-359.

Scherz, F. H. (1979). A concept of supervision based on definitions of job responsibility.

In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical

issues* (pp. 70-82). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan

Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social Casework 39,* October 1958, 435-443).

Schroffel, A. (1999). How does clinical supervision affect job satisfaction? *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(2), 91-105.

Scott, D., & Farrow, J. (1993). Evaluating standards of social work supervision in child welfare and hospital social work. *Australian Social Work, 46*(2), 33-41.

Shulman, L. (1991). *Interactional social work practice. Toward an empirical theory.* Itasca, IL: Peacock.

Shulman, L. (1992). *The skills of helping individuals, families, groups, and communities,* (3rd ed.). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Shulman, L. (1993). *Interactional supervision.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Shulman, L., Robinson, E., & Luckyj, A. (1981). *A study of supervision skill: Context, content and process.* Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

Skerrett, D., (2000). Social work – a shifting paradigm. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 14,* 63-73.

Smith, M. (2000). Supervision of fear in social work. A re-evaluation of reassurance. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 14*(1), 17-26.

Smith, Z. D. (1884). Volunteer visiting: The organization necessary to make it effective. In I.C. Barrows (Ed.), *Proceedings of the national conference of charities and correction at the eleventh annual session held at St. Louis, October 13-17, 1884* (pp.69-72). Boston, MA: Press of Geo. H. Ellis. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Spence, S. H., Wilson, J., Kavanagh, D., Strong, J., & Worrall, L. (2001). Clinical

supervision in four mental health professions: A review of the evidence.

Behaviour Change, 18(3), 135-151.

Stalker, C., Mandell, D., Frensch, K., Harvey, C., & Wright, M. (2007). Child welfare

workers who are exhausted yet satisfied with their jobs: How do they do it? *Child

and Family Social Work, 12*, 182-191.

Stephenson, M., Rondeau, G., Michaud, J. C., & Fiddler, S. (2000). *In critical demand:

Social work in Canada. Volume 1- Final report.* Ottawa, Ontario: Social Work

Sector Study, CASSW-ACESS.

Strand, V., & Badger, L. (2005). Professionalizing child welfare: An evaluation of a

clinical consultation model for supervisors. *Children and Youth Services Review,

27*, 865-880.

Streiner, D. L. (2003). Starting at the beginning: An introduction to coefficient alpha and

internal consistency. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 80*(1), 99-103.

Strong, J., Kavanagh, D., Wilson, J., Spence, S. H., Worrall, L., & Crow, N. (2003).

Supervision practice for allied health professionals with a large mental health

service: Exploring the phenomenon. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 191-210.

Stiles. E. (1979). Supervision in perspective. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work

supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 83-93). New York: The

Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social

Casework 44,* January 1963, 19-25).

Syrett, V., Jones, M., & Sercombe, N. (1996). Practice supervision: The challenge of

definition. *Practice, 8*(3), 53-62.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). The past and future of mixed methods research: From data triangulation to mixed model designs. In A.Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp.671-701). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences. In A.Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 3-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomlison, B. (1999). Supervision and consultation. In F. J. Turner (Ed.), *Social work practice:A Canadian perspective* (pp. 505-517). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada.

Todman, J., & Dugard, P. (2007). *Approaching multivariate analysis: An introduction for psychology.* New York: Psychology Press.

Tosone, C. (1997). Countertransference and clinical social work supervision: Contributions and considerations. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16*(2), 17-32.

Tsui, M.-S. (1997a). Empirical research on social work supervision: The state of the art (1970-1995). *Journal of Social Service Research, 23*(2), 39-54.

Tsui, M.-S. (1997b). The roots of social work supervision: An historical review. *The Clinical Supervisor, 15*(2), 191-198.

Tsui, M-S. (2001). Towards a culturally sensitive model of social work supervision in Hong Kong. *Dissertation Abstracts International-A* 62/11, p. 3938, May 2002

(UMI No. AAT NQ63801). Retrieved August 26, 2006, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=726077981&sid=4

&Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Tsui, M.-S. (2003). The supervisory relationship of Chinese social workers in Hong

Kong. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(2), 99-120.

Tsui, M.-S. (2004). Charting the course of future research on supervision. In M. J. Austin

& K.M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Supervision as collaboration in the human services:*

Building a learning culture (pp. 272-280). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tsui, M.-S. (2005a). Functions of social work supervision in Hong Kong. *International*

Social Work, 48(4), 485-493.

Tsui, M.-S. (2005b). *Social work supervision: Contexts and concepts*. Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage.

Tsui, M.-S., & Ho, W-S. (1997). In search of a comprehensive model of social work

supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16*(2), 181-205.

Tsui, M.-S., Ho, W.-S., & Lam, C.-M. (2005). The use of supervisory authority in

Chinese cultural context. *Administration in Social Work, 29*(4), 51-68.

Turner, J., & Fine, M. (1997). Gender and supervision: Evolving debates. In T. C. Todd

& C. L. Storm (Eds.), The *complete systemic supervisor: Context,philosophy, and*

pragmatics (pp. 72-82). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Tuttle, L. D. (2000). Countertransference within the context of clinical supervision.

Dissertation Abstracts International-A, 60/12, p. 4608, Jun 2000. (UMI No. AAT

9953964). Retrieved March 28, 2006, from

http://proquest.umi.com.remote.libproxy.wlu.ca/pqdweb?did=730593921&sid=5

&Fmt=2&clientId=27850&RQT=309&VName=PQD

University of Sydney, Australia (2008). *Faculty of Education and Social Work: Graduate*

Certificate in Professional Practice Supervision Retrieved April 12, 2008, from

http://www.edsw.usyd.edu.au/future_students/postgraduate/deg_gcsw_pps.shtml

Veeder, N. W. (1990). Autonomy, accountability, and professionalism: The case against

close supervision in social work. *The Clinical Supervisor, 8*(2), 33-47.

Walsh, J. (1999). Incorporating existential themes into the supervision of social work

practitioners. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*(1), 1-16.

Walsh-Bowers, R., Rossiter, A., & Prilleltensky, I. (1996). The personal is the

organizational in the ethics of hospital social workers. *Ethics & Behavior, 6*,

321-335.

Wasserman, H. (1979). The professional social work in a bureaucracy. In C. E. Munson

(Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues*

(pp. 206-215). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing.

(Reprinted from *Social Work, 16,* January 1971, 89-95).

Wax, J. (1979). Time-limited supervision. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work*

supervision: Classic statements and critical issues (pp. 111-121). New York: The

Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social Work, 8,*

July 1963, 37-43).

Webb, S. (1996). Forgetting ourselves? Social work values, liberal education and

modernity. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 28*, 224-240.

White, M. (1997). *Narratives of therapists' lives.* Adelaide, South Australia: Dulwich

Centre Publications.

Williams, A. B. (1997). On parallel process in social work supervision. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 25*(4), 425-435.

Witkin, B. R. (1984). *Assessing needs in educational and social programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Witkin, B. R., & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). *Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wolfe, C. H. (1958). Basic components in supervision. *The Social Welfare Forum, 1958: Official proceedings, 85[h] National Conference on Social Welfare, Chicago, Illinois, May 11-16, 1958* (pp. 177-189). New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from the National Conference on Social Welfare Proceedings (1874-1982) at http://www.hti.umich.edu/n/ncosw/

Wuenschel, P. C. (2006). The diminishing role of social work adminstrators in social service agencies: Issues for consideration. *Adminstration in Social Work, 30*(4), 5-18.

York, R. O., & Denton, R. T. (1990). Leadership behavior and supervisory performance: The view from below. *The Clinical Supervisor, 8*, 93-108.

Zetzel, E. R. (1979). The dynamic basis of supervision. In C. E. Munson (Ed.), *Social work supervision: Classic statements and critical issues* (pp. 35-40). New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing. (Reprinted from *Social Casework, 34*, April 1953, 143-149).