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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.
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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 clients¹ (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 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
- 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 burnout, 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 (1 dissertation). 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 workplace 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 workplace 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).

Supervision and Social Work: A Potentially Beneficial Relationship

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,
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 practices 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,
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,

---

1991; Shulman, Robinson, & Luckyji, 1981), and one dissertation (Matheson, 1999). 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.
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).
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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 area(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
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(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,
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?

**Supervision, Social Justice, and Social Change**

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.

**Recognition of Diversity by the Founding Fathers of Supervision**

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 ongoing 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 authoritative 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 authoritative 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,
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

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. 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

Choosing a Mixed Model Research Design

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.
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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 unretrieved 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 inquiries 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. 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).

**Analysis of the Quantitative Data**

*Assessing for Practical Significance*

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)\textsuperscript{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).

\textit{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

\textsuperscript{10} The \textit{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:

\[ d = \frac{\bar{X}_a + \bar{X}_b}{S_{pooled}} \]

where: \( S_{pooled} = \frac{S_a + S_b}{2} \) and \( \bar{X} \) 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)
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:

1. 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.

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: $5 \times 4 \text{ (number of items with scores of 1 or above)} = 20$
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 $\geq 8$. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE NUMBER &amp; ASPECT OF SUPERVISION</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCALE 1: Purpose of Supervision (Q2 – Q13)</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE 2: Authority in the Supervision Relationship (Q14 – Q24)</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE 3: Timing &amp; Length of Supervision (Q25 – Q33)</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE 4: Training &amp; Discipline of the Supervisor (Q34 – Q44)</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE 5: The Place in Supervision for the SW Mission of Social Justice &amp; Social Change (Q45 – Q60)</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-Survey Item</th>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>Subscale 4</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-7.96E-005</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>19.944</td>
<td>16.308</td>
<td>15.102</td>
<td>9.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Communalities 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-Survey Item</th>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>Subscale 4</th>
<th>( h^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-.593</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>23.476</td>
<td>13.402</td>
<td>13.321</td>
<td>10.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-Survey Item</th>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>$h^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>23.916</td>
<td>21.377</td>
<td>18.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-Survey Item</th>
<th>Subscale 1</th>
<th>Subscale 2</th>
<th>Subscale 3</th>
<th>( h^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 quantization 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
endorse 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 workplace 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, ongoing 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile Characteristics</th>
<th>Web-Survey Participants</th>
<th>Ontario Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender – Women</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree – MSW</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30s</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 40s</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50s</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6-10 years</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11-15 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 16-20 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 21 years +</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metropolitan area</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Urban city</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural-urban area</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health settings*</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child &amp; family services**</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individuals, families, groups***</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW supervisor</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Job Responsibilities</th>
<th>Web-Survey Participants N=636</th>
<th>OASW Study N=1,114</th>
<th>OCSWSSW Members N=10,289</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct/clinical practice</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/administration, Policy planning/analysis, Program design/evaluation, Consultation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development and organization</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and training</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 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
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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-Survey Item</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q69</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = -.152$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63</td>
<td>$r = -.096$</td>
<td>$r = -.160$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p = .016$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
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 (\( p < .001 \)). Results for participants from CW/CAS employment settings were not significant (\( t = 1.35, \text{df} = 123, p = .181 \)).

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).

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).

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>All settings N=636</th>
<th>Hospital N=146</th>
<th>CW/CAS N=124</th>
<th>CMHC N=111</th>
<th>FCA N=65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>$d = .80$ Large</td>
<td>$d = .91$ Large</td>
<td>$d = .84$ Large</td>
<td>$d = .73$ Med/large</td>
<td>$d = .70$ Med/large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 workplace 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 $\geq 2$.

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.

An Integration of the Quantitative Data Narratives

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.

The Purpose of Supervision

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 workplace, (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:

- “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 policies 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 like 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 online 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 ongoing 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).

Disciplinary Matrix Element Two:

Shared Ideas about the Purpose and Process of Supervision

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.

Disciplinary Matrix Element Three:

Shared Value about the Place in Supervision for the Social Work Mission of Social Justice and Social Change

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).
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granvold, 1977, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gray, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenspan, Hanfling, Parker, Primm, &amp; Waldfogel, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harkness, 1995, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harkness &amp; Hensley, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hensley, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jayaratne, Brabson, Gant, Nagda, Singh, &amp; Chess, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffreys, 2001 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadushin, 1974, 1992a, 1992b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCarthy, 2003 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller &amp; Robb, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathanson, 1992 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perry, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poertner &amp; Rapp, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rauktis &amp; Koeske, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schroffel, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strand &amp; Badger, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuttle, 2000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>York &amp; Denton, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>8 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4 publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1 publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1 dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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/fswwhair/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
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
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
My supervisor helps me recognize 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
69. Your current age is between:
(Select only one.)
\[ \square \quad 20-29 \text{ years} \\
\square \quad 30-39 \text{ years} \\
\square \quad 40-49 \text{ years} \\
\square \quad 50-59 \text{ years} \\
\square \quad 60+ \text{ years} \]

70. You are:
(Select only one.)
\[ \square \quad \text{Female} \\
\square \quad \text{Male} \]

71. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your self-description:
(Select all that apply.)
\[ \square \quad \text{Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)} \\
\square \quad \text{Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)} \\
\square \quad \text{Aboriginal/First Nations} \\
\square \quad \text{White/Caucasian} \\
\square \quad \text{Other:} \]

72. Your CURRENT or MOST RECENT supervisor would be:
(Select only one.)
\[ \square \quad \text{Female} \\
\square \quad \text{Male} \]

73. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your current or most recent supervisor:
(Select all that apply.)
\[ \square \quad \text{Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)} \\
\square \quad \text{Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)} \\
\square \quad \text{Aboriginal/First Nations} \\
\square \quad \text{White/Caucasian} \\
\square \quad \text{Other:} \]
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 STATEMENT 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 do not need to be a member 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 you complete this web-based survey that will take about 20 minutes. 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 draw 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, focus groups 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 hair2080@wlu.ca. You may also contact the dissertation chairperson, Marshall Fine, Faculty of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University, (519) 884-0170, ext. 5223 or mfine@wlu.ca. 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 www.oasw.org. 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.
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 times +</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 times</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 63. Since you graduated from your FIRST SOCIAL WORK DEGREE, how long have you practiced as a social worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years +</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 64. Your highest completed degree in social work is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 65. What is the CURRENT or MOST RECENT PRIMARY WORK SETTING where you have received supervision? (Check one response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare agency/children's aid society</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counselling agency (e.g. a family service agency)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services (Ontario Works)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's mental health centre</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development or advocacy organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health or mental health centre</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family health team</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary or secondary school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or college counselling centre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women or men’s shelter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government department</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private counselling/therapy practice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., research centre, college)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections/criminal justice/legal Services (adult &amp; youth)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addictions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community agency or services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other counselling services (e.g. sexual assault centres)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation/disability services (adult &amp; children)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult mental health</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>636</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q 66.** In your current or most recent work setting, you have been supervised most often by a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Social worker</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Psychiatrist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Psychologist</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nurse</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other (e.g., BA degree, SSW, peers, lawyer, anthropologist)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Counsellor/clinician/MFT Supervisor with Masters degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Manager or ED</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CYW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Physician, OT, Physiotherapist, or kinestologist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>636</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q 67.** In your current or most recent work setting where you received supervision, your primary job has been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community worker and/or advocate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Policy planner and/or analyst</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Child welfare worker</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 School social worker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hospital social worker</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Counsellor with individuals, families, and/or groups</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other (e.g., educator, case manager, custody assessments, trainer/consultant)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Manager or Supervisor</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>636</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 68. Your current or most recent work setting serves people living in a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural area outside the commuting zone of towns with 1,000+ people</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and small town municipality outside the commuting zone of urban centres of 10,000+ people</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban city (pop. of 10,000 or more)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and urban area</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan area (pop. of 100,000 or more)</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 69. Your current age is between:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 70. You are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 71. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your self-description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal/ First Nations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/ Caucasian</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Jewish, immigrant)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participants (multiple items could be selected)</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>110.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 72. Your current or most recent supervisor would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 73. From the following options, please select those items that best fit your current or most recent supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of a racialized group (e.g., Person of Color, Black, Visible Minority)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a minoritized group (e.g., by beliefs, ableness, gender preference, SES, ethnicity)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal/ First Nations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/ Caucasian</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., Immigrant)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not sure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 supervises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 4.5047  Median: 5.0000  Std. Deviation: .67227

Q 6. Supervision is my primary forum for talking about ethical issues in my practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.3396  Median: 4.0000  Std. Deviation: 1.33790

Q 7. I need more time during supervision to reflect on ethical practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 9. Supervision is really for surveillance purposes. That is, organizations use supervision to help “keep staff in-line.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At my work setting one person provides practice/clinical supervision and another person provides administrative supervision.

Q 10. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 11. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At my work setting one person provides supervision and another person completes staff evaluations/performance appraisals.

Q 12. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                | 2.8318 |
Median              | 2.0000 |
Std. Deviation      | 1.18853|

Q 15. Supervisors have authority over me because of their workplace position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                | 4.1415 |
Median              | 4.0000 |
Std. Deviation      | 0.87598|

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                | 2.4575 |
Median              | 2.0000 |
Std. Deviation      | 1.11246|
Q17. My knowledge and skills have equal value to that of supervisors. (Reversed responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q18. Supervision authority discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions). (Reversed responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My supervisor gives me advice about what to do with my clients.

Q19. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of the time</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of the time</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor gives me advice about what to so with my clients.

Q 20. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of the time</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of the time</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


My supervisor and I plan together what I can do for my clients.

Q 21. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of the time</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of the time</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Q 22. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of the time</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of the time</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of the time</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor and I have discussions about power differences in the supervision relationship.

Q 23. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 24. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 26. Supervision is needed for new employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7044</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>.61533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 27. Ongoing supervision is needed for all social workers no matter how long they have been practicing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not sure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2579</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.95547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 28. Supervision that lasts for years discourages my professional autonomy (for example, my ability to make independent practice decisions. (Reversed responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not sure</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Disagree</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9497</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.9756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 29. After a certain period, supervision needs to end. (Reversed responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Not sure</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Disagree</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the duration of the social worker's career</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 31. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for emotional support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the duration of the social worker's career</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 32. What is the maximum length of time after graduation that social workers need supervision for administrative accountability at their workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the duration of the social worker's career</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 3 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the duration of the social worker's career</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 4.0896  Median 5.0000  Std. Deviation 1.22692
Q 35. Supervisors need years of previous social work practice experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 4.0959  
Median | 5.0000  
Std. Deviation | 1.14819

Supervisors have specific training to provide supervision.

Q 37. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 40. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor has knowledge of the Ontario Social Work Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.

Q 41. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.2704</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.94201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 42. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.6792</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.29965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirements for my social work practice.

Q 43. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.2673</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.89843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor has current knowledge about legal requirements for my social work practice.

Q 44. In my current or most recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 46. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A purpose of supervision is to help social workers promote anti-racist, anti-oppressive social work practice.

Q 47. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0739</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.02222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 48. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3569</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.30654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My supervisor helps me recognise and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.

Q 49. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1541</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.01710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor helps me recognize and respect the cultural diversity of the communities in which I practice.

Q 50. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 51. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 52. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | 4.0786  
Median | 4.0000  
Std. Deviation | 1.04849  

Q 54. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.2107</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.63609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.2107</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.63609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My supervisor helps me to see how individual change and social justice are possible for my clients.

**Q 57. I need this to happen.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4.0456</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.03610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.0456</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.03610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q 58. In my current or recent experience this happens.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.3223</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.32387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3223</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>1.32387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My supervisor helps me find ways in my social work practice to ethically balance care with control.

Q 59. I need this to happen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 60. In my current or recent experience this happens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Supervision Need</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Current or Recent Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 5.80, SD = 2.65 )</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 4.55, SD = 2.51 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 6.84, SD = 2.49 )</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 5.00, SD = 2.54 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 4.73, SD = 2.40 )</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 3.60, SD = 2.11 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 5.11, SD = 2.50 )</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 4.32, SD = 2.22 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 5.71, SD = 2.56 )</td>
<td>( \overline{X} = 4.42, SD = 2.41 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Administrative Tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Paired T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>( t = 10.49, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.24 (1.01, 1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>( t = 7.11, df = 145, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.84 (1.33, 2.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>( t = 4.82, df = 123, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.13 (.67, 1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>( t = 2.87, df = 110, p = .005 )</td>
<td>.78 (.24, 1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>( t = 3.74, df = 64, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.29 (.60, 1.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Paired T-Test Results for Administrative Tasks.
Authority in the Supervision Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Supervision Need</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Current or Recent Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.31$, SD = 3.07</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.33$, SD = 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.80$, SD = 3.57</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 6.15$, SD = 3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.85$, SD = 2.66</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.63$, SD = 2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.29$, SD = 2.91</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.46$, SD = 2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.69$, SD = 2.65</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.44$, SD = 2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Authority in the Supervision Relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Paired T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; 95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$t = 8.99$, df = 635, $p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$.98 (.77, 1.20)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$t = 6.34$, df = 145, $p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$1.65 (1.14, 2.17)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$t = 4.82$, df = 110, $p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$1.22 (.72, 1.72)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$t = 3.37$, df = 64, $p = .001$</td>
<td>$.83 (.34, 1.32)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$t = 1.35$, df = 123, $p = .181$</td>
<td>$.25 (-.19, .62)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Paired T-Test Results for Authority in the Supervision Relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Supervision Need</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Current or Recent Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 17.24$, SD = 2.74</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.28$, SD = 4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 17.10$, SD = 3.10</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 13.16$, SD = 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 17.39$, SD = 2.77</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.90$, SD = 3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 17.42$, SD = 2.57</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 14.99$, SD = 3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 17.09$, SD = 2.28</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 15.06$, SD = 2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Supervisor Training and Discipline.
### Table 6. Paired T-Test Results for Supervisor Training and Discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Paired T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$t = 16.42, \text{df} = 635, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$2.96 (2.61, 3.32)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$t = 8.90, \text{df} = 145, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$3.95 (3.07, 4.82)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$t = 7.04, \text{df} = 123, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$2.49 (1.79, 3.19)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$t = 5.73, \text{df} = 110, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$2.43 (1.59, 3.27)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$t = 5.09, \text{df} = 64, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$2.03 (1.23, 2.83)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Supervision Need</th>
<th>Mean Score &amp; SD: Current or Recent Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$X = 33.20, \text{SD} = 6.18$</td>
<td>$X = 27.44, \text{SD} = 8.79$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$X = 32.06, \text{SD} = 6.64$</td>
<td>$X = 24.98, \text{SD} = 9.84$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$X = 33.47, \text{SD} = 6.02$</td>
<td>$X = 27.60, \text{SD} = 7.86$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$X = 33.55, \text{SD} = 6.34$</td>
<td>$X = 28.54, \text{SD} = 7.40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$X = 33.20, \text{SD} = 5.45$</td>
<td>$X = 29.03, \text{SD} = 6.98$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Paired T-Test Results for Supervision for the Social Work Mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Paired T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All settings N=636</td>
<td>$t = 15.21, \text{df} = 635, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$5.76 (5.02, 6.50)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>$t = 7.89, \text{df} = 145, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$7.08 (5.31, 8.85)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td>$t = 7.43, \text{df} = 123, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$5.86 (4.30, 7.42)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N=111</td>
<td>$t = 5.67, \text{df} = 110, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$5.01 (3.26, 6.76)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCA N=65</td>
<td>$t = 4.77, \text{df} = 64, p &lt; .001$</td>
<td>$4.17 (2.42, 5.92)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: \( b = .54, t = 3.14, p = .002 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q66</th>
<th>Q63</th>
<th>Q64</th>
<th>Q70</th>
<th>Q65</th>
<th>Q68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Settings N = 636</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q66</th>
<th>Q63</th>
<th>Q64</th>
<th>Q70</th>
<th>Q65</th>
<th>Q68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q66</th>
<th>Q63</th>
<th>Q64</th>
<th>Q70</th>
<th>Q65</th>
<th>Q68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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    |        |        |        |        |        |

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    |
| 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.
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: $b = 2.58, t = 2.63, p = .01$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Setting</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q66</th>
<th>Q63</th>
<th>Q64</th>
<th>Q70</th>
<th>Q65</th>
<th>Q68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Settings N=636</td>
<td>- .55**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N=146</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td>- .76*</td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td>- .79*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N=124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepwise</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>4 Times+</th>
<th>4 Times</th>
<th>3 Times</th>
<th>2 Times</th>
<th>1 Time</th>
<th>0 Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 146</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 381</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q 63. Number of Years Practicing as a Social Worker after First Social Work Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>2 Years or Less</th>
<th>3-5 Years</th>
<th>6-10 Years</th>
<th>11-15 Years</th>
<th>16-20 Years</th>
<th>21+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 124</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 146</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 111</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 381</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 64. Distribution of BSW and MSW Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>BSW</th>
<th></th>
<th>MSW</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 66. Participant Supervisors According to Professional Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>Social Worker</th>
<th>Psychiatrist</th>
<th>Psychologist</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q68. Distribution of Participant Work Settings According to Geographical Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N = 124</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N = 146</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N = 111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N = 381</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Setting</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW/CAS N = 124</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital N = 146</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC N = 111</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N = 381</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

\[
\frac{Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5}{5 + 1 + 1 + 1} = 8
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 8 )</td>
<td>( t = 114.18, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>9.23 (9.07, 9.39) Medium ( E \geq 8 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 ) ( \bar{X} = 17.23 ) ( SD = 2.04 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Means and Analytic Results for Purpose Narrative Equation One.

2. **Knowledge and skill development combined with administrative tasks including performance review/staff evaluations can be ethically problematic and undesirable.** Constructed from Purpose Subscale 1. The representative equation is:

\[
\frac{Q7 + Q8 + Q9 + Q10 + Q12}{5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5} = 25
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 25 )</td>
<td>( t = 57.33, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>10.90 (10.50, 11.25) Medium ( E \geq 10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 ) ( \bar{X} = 14.12 ) ( SD = 4.78 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[ Q7 + Q8 + Q9 + Q10 + Q12 \]
\[ 5 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 5 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 5 )</td>
<td>( t = 33.01, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.70 (1.60, 1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: N = 636</td>
<td>( X = 3.31 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.31 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[ - Q3 + Q6 \]
\[ 0 + 5 = 5 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 5 )</td>
<td>( t = 31.30, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.66 (1.60, 1.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: N = 636</td>
<td>( X = 3.33 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 3.33 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*

\[ (Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r) \]
\[ 5 + 0 + 0 + 5 + 0 = 10 \]
### Table 5. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1A.

**Equation 1B: Position of the supervisor only**

\[
(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r) = 5
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 10 )</td>
<td>( t = 49.79, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>3.03 (2.91, 3.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 ) ( \bar{X} = 6.97 ) SD = 1.53</td>
<td>( t = 24.72, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>.86 (.79, .91) Medium ( E \geq 2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1B.

**Equation 1B: Position of the supervisor only**

\[
(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r) = 5
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 5 )</td>
<td>( t = 46.01, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>2.17 (2.08, 2.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 ) ( \bar{X} = 2.83 ) SD = 1.19</td>
<td>( t = 46.01, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>2.17 (2.08, 2.26) Medium ( E \geq 2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Means and Analytic Results for Authority Narrative Equation 1C

**Equation 1C: Expertise of the supervisor only**

\[
(Q14 + Q16 + Q17r) + (Q15 + Q18r) = 5
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 5 )</td>
<td>( t = 46.01, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>2.17 (2.08, 2.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 ) ( \bar{X} = 2.83 ) SD = 1.19</td>
<td>( t = 46.01, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>2.17 (2.08, 2.26) Medium ( E \geq 2 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. *Supervision authority through position and co-creative dialog.* Constructed from Authority Subscales 2 + 4 + 3. The representative equation is:

\[(Q_{14} + Q_{16} + Q_{17r}) + (Q_{15} - Q_{18r}) + (Q_{23} + Q_{24}) = 17\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu = 17)</td>
<td>(t = 16.06, df = 635, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.90, 2.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X} = 14.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 throughout the career of the social worker.* Constructed from the Timing and Length Subscales 1 + 2. The representative equation is:

\[(Q_{27} + Q_{28r} + Q_{29r}) + (Q_{30} + Q_{31} + Q_{32} + Q_{33}) = 31\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu = 31)</td>
<td>(t = 22.10, df = 635, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>3.55 (3.23, 3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X} = 27.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

\[(Q_{27} + Q_{28r} + Q_{29r}) + (Q_{30} + Q_{31} + Q_{32} + Q_{33}) = 13\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 13 )</td>
<td>( t = 75.78, \text{df} = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>11.89 (11.58, 12.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 24.89 )</td>
<td>Medium ( E \geq 10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Means and Analytic Results for Timing & Length of Supervision Narrative Equation 2.

3. *The need for administrative 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:

\[
Q_{30} + Q_{31} + Q_{32} + Q_{33} \\
0 + 0 + 7 + 0 = 7
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 7 )</td>
<td>( t = 17.17, \text{df} = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>1.28 (1.13, 1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 5.72 )</td>
<td>Medium ( E \geq 5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

\[
Q_{25} + Q_{26} \\
5 + 5 = 10
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: ( \mu = 10 )</td>
<td>( t = 14.73, \text{df} = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>.60 (.52, .68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: ( N = 636 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 9.40 )</td>
<td>Medium ( E \geq 4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

\[
\frac{Q37 + Q39 + Q41 + Q43}{5 + 5 + 5 + 5} = 20
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu = 20 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N = 636 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X = 17.24 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = 25.47, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>2.76 ( 2.55, 2.98)</td>
<td>Medium ( E \geq 8 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

\[
\frac{(Q38 + Q40 + Q42 + Q44) + (Q2 + Q3 + Q4 + Q5)}{1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 5 + 5 + 0 + 5} = 19
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu = 19 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N = 636 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X = 27.60 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = 4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = 48.08, df = 635, p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>8.59 ( 8.25, 8.95)</td>
<td>Medium ( E \geq 14 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 | \( t = 22.96, \text{df} = 635, p < .001 \) | 2.49 (2.28, 2.70)
Sample: N = 636 |  | Medium \( E \geq 6 \)
X = 12.5 | SD = 2.74

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:

\[ Q46 + Q48 + Q50 + Q52 + Q54 + Q56 + Q58 + Q60 \]

\[ 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 8 \]

Means | One Sample T-Test Two-tailed | Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
--- | --- | ---
Population: X = 8 | \( t = 55.79, \text{df} = 635, p < .001 \) | 19.44 (18.75, 20.12)
Sample: N = 636 |  | Medium \( E \geq 16 \)
X = 27.44 | SD = 8.79


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:

\[ Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59 \]

\[ 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 = 35 \]
Means | One Sample T-Test Two-tailed | Mean Difference & (95% Confidence Intervals)
---|---|---
Population: \( \mu = 35 \) | \( t = 29.51, \text{df} = 635, p < .001 \) | 6.43 (6.00, 6.85)
Sample: \( N = 636 \) | \( \bar{X} = 28.57 \) | Medium \( E \geq 14 \) | \( \text{SD} = 5.49 \)

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: \( \mu = 20 \) | \( t = 24.97, \text{df} = 635, p < .001 \) | 3.42 (3.16, 3.69)
Sample: \( N = 636 \) | \( \bar{X} = 16.58 \) | Medium \( E \geq 8 \) | \( \text{SD} = 3.46 \)

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: \( \mu = 5 \) | \( t = 22.16, \text{df} = 635, p < .001 \) | .92 (.84, 1.00)
Sample: \( N = 636 \) | \( \bar{X} = 4.08 \) | Medium \( E \geq 2 \) | \( \text{SD} = 1.05 \)

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) + (Q27 + Q28r + Q29r) + (Q30 + Q31 + Q32 + Q33) + Q45 + Q47 + Q49 + Q51 + Q53 + Q57 + Q59

Therefore: TOTAL SCORE = 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>One Sample T-Test Two-tailed</th>
<th>Mean Difference &amp; (95% Confidence Intervals)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population: (\mu = 78)</td>
<td>(t = 28.69, df = 635, p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>9.52 (8.87, 10.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: (N = 636)</td>
<td>(\bar{X} = 68.48)</td>
<td>Medium (E \geq 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD = 8.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
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