To think about what is meant by the “supervisory relationship?”

To look at what research tells us?

To consider issues of power and difference.

To reflect upon and practise ways of being in supervision.
In pairs (or threes)

Think of the word “Supervisor” (out of the context of today!) – Think of ten associated concepts / words / pseudonyms

Do the same for the word “Relationship”

What does this tell you / suggest to you about the diadic process we are talking about.
A naïve construction of “supervision”? 

Looks over people
Boss
Examiner
Takes care of people
Checking on you
Ryde (2000) defines different “powers” that may be active in supervision


**Role Power** - inherent power differential between supervisor and supervisee

**Cultural Power** - power specific to a perceived dominant ethnic grouping

**Individual Power** - associated with the characteristics / “personality” of the supervisor
Raheim, White, Denborough, Waldegrave, Tamasese, Tuhaka, Franklin, Fox and Carey.

An invitation to address privilege and dominance.

“...the word ‘privilege’ is used...to describe unearned rights, benefits, immunity and favours that are bestowed on individuals and groups solely on the basis of their race, culture, religion, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability, or other key characteristic.”

“some of us experience privilege in a wide range of domains (e.g. white, professional heterosexual men experience privilege in relation to race, class, gender and sexual orientation), while others may experience privilege in very few, if any, domains of life. Responsibilities for addressing privilege are therefore not equal.”
Privilege and Prejudice

Exercise
The concept of “privilege” and talking about it...Cheryl White et al, 2012

“unless we routinely examine the operations of power and our place within these operations, we fail to notice how we are liable to inadvertently impose our expectations, our cultural ways, our ways of thinking, on the people with whom we work.” Salome Raheim (2012)

Restraints upon talking about privilege...

(1) Making things equivalent
(2) Confusing experience of individual hardship with considerations of privilege
(3) Dividing from others – somebody else is worse at this than us
(4) Fear of addressing it being divisive
(5) All talk and no action
(6) Changing the focus of the conversation
(7) Undermining the messenger – you are not talking about “it” in the right way
(8) Having to pretend you “know” about experiences/issues you do not know about.
THE SOCIAL GRRAACCCCESS (Burnham, 2005)

Power and Privilege in relation to:

- Gender
- Race
- Religion
- Age
- Ability
- Class
- Culture
- Creed
- Ethnicity
- Sexuality
- Sexual Orientation
In pairs, identify a situation where you have been supervised by OR have supervised somebody you consider similar to yourself.

Working through the Social GGRRAACCEESS, talk about the way in which power/privilege may have featured. Pay particular attention to:

(1) The GGRRAACCEESS that may not seem immediately relevant in that relationship
(2) Your understanding of why you had not thought them relevant
“The fish in the bowl cannot see the water”

Vikki Reynolds (2012)
"Supervision" is a concept inherent in many spheres of life. The following is borrowed from a textbook for Curates. Interestingly, the relationship defined is informed by health service supervision guidance.

“A curate will hope to receive inspiration, guidance, support and advice from their training incumbent, but they will also know that they should expect some degree of discipline….However, power is not all on one side in this partnership: the incumbent is also looking for support, for a colleague, for fresh vision and for some affirmation of their own skills and experience.”

John Witcombe, 2005.
So... what do we do with our “taken for granted” knowledge power or privilege in supervision?

Give an example of a time when you have been cognisant of such issues in supervision.

What did you do?

What could you have done?

What would the other person have liked you to have done?

What would you have liked them to do?
What is a “good” supervisory relationship

(1) Discuss a supervisory relationship that you would define as “good”
(2) Looking back, what are the features of the relationship that makes you define it in this way?
(3) How did your experience of it at the time differ from that which you now describe?

In pairs:
Each person speaks without interruption - answering questions (1) to (3).
What is a “negative” supervisory relationship

(1) Discuss a supervisory relationship (or experience) that you would define as “negative”
(2) Looking back, what are the features of the relationship that makes you define it in this way?
(3) How did your experience of it at the time differ from that which you now describe?

(4) What do the previous two slides tell you about the nature of the supervisory relationship?

In pairs:
Each person speaks without interruption - answering questions (1) to (3).
Then answer (4) in dialogue
Hirons and Velleman (1993) ‘Factors which might contribute to effective supervision’ *Clinical Psychology Forum 57:11-13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct guidance on clinical work</td>
<td>Telling the trainee what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint problem solving</td>
<td>Lack of direction in therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance</td>
<td>Talking to trainee as though they are client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory-practice linking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliciting ideas from trainee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do trainees report as helpful in supervision?
Cushway & Knibbs (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELPFUL</th>
<th>NOT HELPFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport &amp; Safety</td>
<td>• Unbalanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• affirming &amp; safe, emotional support, supervisor qualities, supervisor self-disclosure</td>
<td>• Developmentally inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Focus and Challenge</td>
<td>• Intolerant of differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• e.g. challenge and direction, introducing new ideas, reflection, direct learning</td>
<td>• Poor model of personal/professional attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Untrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professionally apathetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do trainees report as helpful in supervision?
A grounded theory of effective SR’s
(Beinart, 2002;2004)

FRAMEWORK OF THE SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

BOUNDARIED

Respectful Open Supportive Committed

PROCESS OF SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

COLLABORATIVE

Sensitive to need Educative Evaluative
Supervisory Relationship Questionnaire (Palomo 2004)

- Building on the work of Beinhardt
- 284 trainee clinical psychologists
- Good reliability and validity
- 6 principal components
- Safe base/structure/commitment/reflective education/role model/formative feedback
SAFE BASE

Trainee feels able to raise difficult issues (valued/respected/safe)

Supervisor is supportive/trustworthy and responsive to supervisee needs

Collaborative environment

Shared goals and expectations of supervision

Similarities to qualities of therapeutic relationship
STRUCTURE

Practical boundaries set up and protected by the supervisor

   Time

   Structure of session

   Regular

   Scheduled in advance

   Uninterrupted

   Not regularly cut short
COMMITMENT

Supervisor is interested in and committed to task of supervision

Does not see trainee as a burden

Higher for elective placements
REFLECTIVE EDUCATION

Able to use and facilitate learning about a range of models

Makes theory practice links

Reflects on the supervisory process (incl. power differential)

Enables reflection

Sensitive to unspoken anxieties
ROLE MODEL

Supervisor perceived as:

Skilled and knowledgeable

Respectful of clients

Respectful of colleagues

Respectful of trainee

Viewed as possessing special knowledge, credibility and integrity
Formative feedback

Constructive

Balanced

Regular

Positive and negative

Developmentally appropriate

Helps supervisee develop a sense of their own strengths and weaknesses
Grounded theory study of supervisors’ perspectives on their SRs, Clohessy (2008)

Sought to:

- Understand how supervisors perceive SR with trainee Clinical Psychologists
- The ways in which they contribute positively to such relationships
- How they identify and resolve problems in this context
Clohessy (2008) RESULTS

Grouped as follows:

1. Contextual influences on the SR

   (a) Integration with the team
   (b) Influence of the Course
   (c) What trainee and supervisor bring (prior experience, values, models of therapy)
2. The flow of supervision

(a) The reciprocity of perceived “investment” (supervisor) and “openness to learning” (trainee) demonstrated through:

i. Good beginnings
ii. Establishing boundaries and expectations
iii. Spending time together
iv. Being enthusiastic
v. Being proactive
3. Core Relational Factors

(a) Interpersonal connection and emotional tone
(b) Creating and maintaining safety and trust
(c) Being open and honest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems in Supervision</th>
<th>Attempts at Resolving Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can be in any domain: i.e.</td>
<td>Supervisors talked about the importance of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Context</td>
<td>(a) Noticing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flow</td>
<td>(b) Gathering Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship</td>
<td>(c) Formulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Intervening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROBLEMS IN THE SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP
Managing problems in the SR

- Explore problem collaboratively
- Clarify misunderstandings
- Re-establish boundaries
- Spending more time together
- Building on positive experiences
- Maintaining positive non-blaming stance
- Importance of commitment to change
- Resolution vs remaining concerned
Feedback – noticing / reflecting

Supervisor: Your trainee is in his/her second year and has been on placement with you for two months of a six month placement. You have noticed that staff in your team appear, “cool” towards him/her and that your trainee has a slightly “patronising” tone towards them in contrast to quite a deferential tone with you. However, you have no concerns about the way in which your trainee communicates with clients.

Trainee: Your supervisor is always incredibly positive and supportive with you. Previous experience of another placement has made you anxious about receiving negative feedback. You felt criticised in the past for using “colloquial language” with your supervisor. You are really enjoying your placement so far.

In Groups of 3:

(1) Identify: Observer (advisor), Supervisor, Trainee
(2) Observer reflect for 5 mins upon how the supervisor might approach discussion about this with the trainee (provide framework for doing so)
(3) Trainee and Supervisor play out scenario (passive observer) using advice given
Feedback – noticing / reflecting

**Observer** – make observations / note points of curiosity about the process – i.e., “I noticed that...” “I wonder if...”

**Supervisor and Trainee** – reflect together upon the process – supervisor noting how observer’s advice contributed to their own style of feedback.

Any learning points?
References