

2008

An exploratory study of social work supervisors' supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes

Michelle Elise Chevallier

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chevallier, Michelle Elise, "An exploratory study of social work supervisors' supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes" (2008). *LSU Master's Theses*. 2240.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/2240

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF SOCIAL WORK SUPERVISORS' SUPERVISORY
STYLES, MOTIVATIONS, AND EVALUATIVE PROCESSES**

A Thesis

**Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Social Work**

in

The School of Social Work

**by
Michelle Elise Chevallier
B.S., Louisiana College, 2006
May 2008**

dedicated to my husband,
Jeramy Wayne Dickson;
along with both of our families
for all of their love, support, and understanding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of several individuals and express my sincere appreciation for their efforts in making this project into a reality. First, I would like to thank all of the participants who took time out of their busy schedules to help a future colleague. This project would not have been possible without your cooperation. I would also like to remember a participant who passed away earlier this year. It was an honor to have had the opportunity to meet this person and I am grateful to be among one of the many lives they touched throughout their own life. Second, I would like to thank my committee: Dr. Timothy Page (chair), Dr. Elaine Maccio, and Dr. Pamela Monroe for their support and guidance throughout this process. You truly made this an experience of enlightenment and I am honored to have had the chance to work with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Importance of Supervision	1
Internal Factors.....	3
External Factors.....	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Supervisory Styles.....	8
Motivation	8
LABSWE Supervision Requirements	10
Supervision Concerns.....	11
METHODOLOGY	14
Participants	14
Materials/Measurements/Instruments	14
Design and Procedure.....	15
Data Analysis	15
RESULTS	17
Participants.....	17
Quantitative Analysis: The SSI-S	17
Qualitative Analysis: Supervisory Styles.....	18
Motivation	21
LABSWE Supervision Requirements	24
Supervision Concerns.....	25
Final Thoughts.....	26
CONCLUSION.....	29
Limitations/Recommendations.....	30
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX A: SUPERVISION AGREEMENT	35
APPENDIX B: SUPERVISORY STYLES INVENTORY-SUPERVISOR VERSION	41
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	43
APPENDIX D: INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION	44
VITA.....	57

ABSTRACT

While many factors influence the quality of social work supervision, the purpose of this qualitative study was to explore social work supervisors' supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes and its impact on the social work profession. Quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from 10 Board Approved Clinical Supervisors (BACSs) during a one-time session in which a questionnaire on supervisory styles was administered and an interview covering supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes was conducted. This project was undertaken to better understand some of the perceptions, values, beliefs, and problems involved in the supervisory process and its impact on the profession. Major findings indicated some social workers were motivated by altruistic factors to obtain their BACS credential whereas others were motivated by prestige and self-interest. Results from the SSI-S indicated that, as a group, the participants tended to embody attractive supervisory styles more so than interpersonally sensitive or task-oriented. Also, many BACS reported having to adapt their preferred supervisory style to comply with agency requirements and/or the requirements of the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners (LABSWE).

INTRODUCTION

Importance of Supervision

Supervision in social work is an essential element in producing competent and ethical social workers. Unfortunately, the actual practice of supervision often falls short of its ideals. Too familiar are the war stories of hostile supervisors, superficial supervisees, and uncomfortable working conditions. Disconnect between the aspirations and frequent reality of supervision in the human services can lead to serious consequences in the future. Fortunately, the social work profession recognizes the importance of a quality supervisory experience. This ideal is evidenced by the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners definition of supervision within an agency as:

the professional relationship between a supervisor and a social worker that provides evaluation and direction over the services provided by the social worker and promotes continued development of the social worker's knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide social work services in an ethical and competent manner. (*Professional & occupational standards*, 2003, p.14)

For the social work profession to continue to grow in a healthy manner, it is imperative that new social workers are prepared to practice autonomously and follow best practices. Not only are social workers required to take courses as prescribed by the Council on Social Work Education, they are also required to successfully complete 960 hours of field placement training in graduate school. The field experience is necessary in order to expose students to real life situations as opposed to only learning about concepts through textbooks. As important as exposing new social workers to the field is, it is equally, if not more, important to ensure that social workers practice ethically, effectively, and in accordance with best practices before they are allowed to practice autonomously. The agency in charge of overseeing this important task is the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners (LABSWE). The Board's origins began in

1950 when the Louisiana State Legislature, under the Louisiana Social Work Practice Act, created the Louisiana State Board of Board Certified Social Work Examiners within the Department of Health and Hospitals. (*Louisiana Social Work Practice Act*, 1999).

In 1995, members of an Inter-Organizational Committee, including but not limited to, the Louisiana State Board of Board Certified Social Work Examiners, National Association of Social Workers (NASW), National Association of Black Social Workers-New Orleans, and the Louisiana Society of Clinical Social Workers, began working on a series of proposed amendments to the Louisiana Social Work Practice Act. Included in these amendments were evaluative criteria for social work supervision. From this committee, six major criteria were created that Board Approved Clinical Supervisors (BACS) would be required to use when evaluating social work skills. These included ethics, professional growth, relationships, social work process/intervention process, evaluation, and communication. By identifying these evaluative criteria, the committee made a clear statement about the six skill areas considered essential for competent social work practice.

In 1999, the Inter-Organizational Committee filed their proposals (Senate Bill 903 & House Bill 1848) with the Louisiana State Legislature. The passage of these proposals amended the Louisiana Social Work Practice Act, and the title of the Board was changed from the Louisiana State Board of Board Certified Social Work Examiners to the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners. (*NEWS*, 1999) It is important to note that LABSWE is not only accountable to the state but also the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). The fact that the LABSWE supervision requirements are mandated by law and reviewed by NASW indicates that there are high professional standards for social workers in Louisiana.

In addition, it is important to recognize that quality supervision is influenced by many internal and external factors. Internal factors include BACS's preferred supervisory styles, their motivations to supervise professional social workers, and their own beliefs as to what skills social workers need. External factors include the supervisory requirements of the state licensing board and agency policies and procedures.

Internal Factors

Although personality styles per se are not being studied here, they can have an impact on the type of supervisory style a supervisor is inclined to possess, especially when personality styles of the supervisor and the supervisee conflict. Sometimes, when people realize there is a personality conflict, they try to distance themselves from those with whom they have a conflict. But what happens when that person is a BACS's supervisee? One can imagine the impact this can have on the quality of supervision. Friedlander and Ward (1984) wrote,

[t]his is especially interesting because the supervisor's orientation seems to influence his or her style considerably, and the supervisor's predominant style may, in turn, be predictive of not only a trainee's willingness to work with him or her but also the trainee's eventual satisfaction with supervision. (p. 556)

In addition, supervisory styles vary by individual and can be comprised of a single style or a combination of styles. However, some agencies may not take into account personal preference of styles and may overtly or covertly demand that all supervisors follow a certain style. The supervisor who is not able to utilize his or her preferred style of supervision might experience inner dissonance. "Professional dissonance is conceptualized as a feeling of discomfort arising from the conflict between professional values and expected or required job tasks" (Taylor & Bentley, 2005, p.470). But what can be done to avoid this conflict?

One possible approach to achieving a good match of supervisory style to supervisee could involve a system similar to what many universities use to ensure students have a positive

dorm life experience. Many universities send questionnaires to incoming students in order to match them with other students who share the same lifestyle habits. LABSWE could send BACS social workers a questionnaire to evaluate their style, and potential supervisees could take an online questionnaire to see which style of supervision they prefer. If BACS social workers agreed, LABSWE could post their individual styles along with their contact information in the searchable database for potential supervisees to look over when choosing a BACS for their supervision.

Goals are important to have in any profession, and motivation can be a powerful driving force in the pursuit of goals. Nevertheless, people can be motivated to attain the same goals for very different reasons. For example, a social worker may want to become a BACS for altruistic reasons such as giving back to the profession that successfully prepared them to be a social worker. Conversely, a more self-interested reason could include a desire to become a BACS to earn more money, prestige, or power. Either way, the motivating factors that influenced their decision to pursue the BACS designation could impact the quality of their supervision.

External Factors

LABSWE's supervisory requirements are embodied in the six criteria listed in the Supervision Agreement. Ethics "refers to the supervisee's ability to apply social work values and ethics in carrying out professional responsibilities". Professional growth "refers to the supervisee's acceptance of responsibility for personal learning and professional growth, to include but is not limited to, continuing education, supervision and consultation." Relationships "refers to the supervisee's ability to develop, maintain and terminate appropriate professional relationships with clients, colleagues and other disciplines." Social work process/Intervention process "refers to the supervisee's ability to formulate assessment of clients and to implement

effective interventions resulting in resolution of problems/issues”. Evaluation “refers to the supervisee’s ability to monitor and evaluate his/her own professional practice.” Communication “refers to the supervisee’s ability to communicate effectively with others orally and in writing” (*Supervision Agreement*, n.d.a.).

All BACSs may not agree that LABSWE’s six major criteria are the complete and exhaustive elements of social work competence. While the LABSWE’s supervisory requirements and individual agency policies and procedures appear straightforward, they may also be experienced as confining to the extent that they restrict the full range of possible supervisory encounters. Some supervisors may agree with all, some, or none of the criteria. Some may have their own criteria they feel are important but have never had the opportunity to express these beliefs. As a secondary issue, this study sought to give BACS the opportunity to share their views on criteria necessary for social work competence.

While those new to social work may not fully understand what supervision entails, those who have experienced quality supervision realize the pivotal role it plays in their professional development. Hensley (2002), addressing this exact topic, wrote, “...clinical social workers valued their supervision experiences and found supervision to be an essential ingredient in their clinical and professional self-esteem and ability” (p. 109).

It is also important to emphasize that supervision is not supposed to fulfill the therapeutic needs of the supervisee. Actually, many supervisees tend to process and reflect on issues they are learning about. Sometimes these reflections either resurrect or create dissonance for the supervisee, and some will approach their supervisor with their concerns and ask for assistance. Severinsson and Hallberg (1996) illustrated this concept well by writing, “...it is relevant to highlight the fact that for the supervisee the primary function in clinical supervision is not

therapy, but to 'reflect-on-practice' ... in order to gain a deeper understanding of both oneself and the patient, and to improve the quality of care” (p.160). In cases where the supervisee may be using supervision for therapy more so than for professional growth, the supervisor should direct the supervisee to an appropriate mental health specialist.

In summary, supervisors’ perceptions of their roles and motivations are an important aspect of this study because they can impact the quality of supervision and “assuming there are different effects of clinical supervision, depending on different leadership styles, it is therefore important to explore and systematically develop knowledge of these styles...” (Severinsson & Hallberg, 1996, p. 152). It is important to study supervisory styles because they have much to do with the quality of the supervisory process. By understanding supervisory styles better, we may be able to better understand elements of the supervisory process that can promote high quality social work practice.

This study sought to understand the impact of various factors on the quality of supervision. Accordingly, the major research questions were as follows:

1. What types of supervisory styles do BACS endorse or describe themselves as possessing?
2. Are supervisory styles consistent with the views and perceptions of supervision reported by BACS?
3. To what extent (if any) does dissonance exist if there is a difference between a supervisors' preferred supervisory style versus a supervisory style that is imposed by an outside organization (e.g., the licensing board, government, private agency)?
4. What are the motivations of BACSS? In particular, are they committed to the improvement of professionalism (altruistic) or are they oriented towards compliance with regulatory requirements or acquisition of status (self interest)?

5. To what extent do BACS endorse and adhere to the structure and goals of supervision as provided in state board (LABSWE) policies?
6. To what extent (if any) are supervisory styles associated with maladaptive outcomes?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Supervisory Styles

There are many different supervisory styles, models, and combinations thereof, and these styles can impact the supervisory process greatly. “Beyond trainee’s developmental level, the empirical literature has demonstrated that supervisory style is related to many supervision-relevant process and outcome variables” (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001, p.264).

Three supervisory styles utilized by Friedlander and Ward (1984) include attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented. Attractive supervisory styles refer to supervisors who consider themselves “warm, supportive, friendly, and open (flexible).” (p. 545) Interpersonally sensitive styles refer to supervisors who consider themselves “invested, committed, therapeutic, and perceptive.” (p.545) Task oriented supervisory styles refer to supervisors who consider themselves “goal oriented, thorough, focused, practical, and structured” (pp. 545-546). Tsui and Ho (1997) wrote “A variety of supervisory models should be provided as options to meet the needs of staff members instead of using only one of them” (p.192). LABSWE’s recommended style of supervision, as reflected in the Supervision Agreement, (see Appendix A for form) seems to follow the task oriented style interwoven into the general casework model of social work practice. It should be noted that despite the appearance of significant overlap among these three styles of supervision, Friedlander and Ward report research showing that these styles are discrete and independent.

Motivation

Motivation can be a valuable tool to achieve our goals. Then again, the reasons behind obtaining these goals can vary. Spence and Helmreich (as cited in Hyde & Kling, 2001) uncovered three dimensions of achievement motivation: work (“I like to work hard”), mastery

(“Once I undertake a task, I persist”), and competitiveness (“I feel that winning is important in both work and games” (p. 365). Contemporary research on achievement motivation now generally focuses on two types of goals: “mastery goals (also called intrinsic goals) and performance goals (or extrinsic goals).” (p. 366) Another important consideration is how much the supervisor values a certain goal and his or her expectations for himself or herself.

The BACS title is the highest credential a social worker can obtain from LABSWE. If the social work profession as a whole values the BACS in status and a social worker is a high achiever, then it makes sense that the social worker may be motivated to achieve the credential solely to be the best he or she can be in that profession. If the BACS credential also has a pay increase attached with it, the same individual may also desire to achieve that credential for monetary gain. Therefore, altruistic and/or self-interest motives may impact a BACS supervisor’s quality of supervision. That is why it is imperative for the social work profession to communicate the importance of the BACS designation in an effort to attract social workers who are equally committed to improving the profession as a whole.

Erik Erikson’s concept of generativity vs. stagnation in middle-age seems especially relevant to this study. According to this concept, adults are faced with a decision they must make regarding which direction they will pursue. “Generativity, then is primarily the concern in establishing and guiding the next generation...the concept is meant to include...productivity and creativity” (Erikson, 1950, p. 267). Motivation based on generativity includes a sense of giving back and helping others. This could be interpreted as an altruistic tendency. According to Erikson, when generativity is not achieved or not valued, there is a tendency to become interested only in the self and stagnation occurs. Stagnation means individuals are focused only on their own needs without regard to the desires of the next generation. Motivation based on

stagnation implies staying in the same place or not pressing forward. This could be interpreted as a self-interested tendency.

LABSWE Supervision Requirements

LABSWE defines a supervisee as “any person under the supervision of a credentialed social worker” (*Professional & occupational standards*, 2003, p.14). LABSWE recognizes four credentials which include the Registered Social Worker (RSW), Graduate Social Worker (GSW), Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW), and Board Approved Clinical Supervisor (BACS).

The present study focused on BACSS. According to LABSWE, to qualify for the BACS designation, a social worker must:

1. Hold the LCSW license;
 2. Verify at least 3 years of full-time social work experience at the LCSW level;
 3. Submit two letters of reference to the board from other professionals (one of whom should be a LCSW) who are familiar with the licensee's work, including supervision skills;
 4. Participate in a Board Orientation Workshop;
 5. Participate in a board pre-approved workshop on the theory and techniques of supervision as well as procedures used in supervision toward licensure of at least 10 hours duration;
 6. All requirements must be met before the social worker becomes a BACS.
- B. To continue the BACS designation in good standing, the social worker must:
1. Maintain LCSW licensure;
 2. Appropriately conduct all supervisory duties explicated in Rule No. 503. Failure to comply with all regulations may result in the board lifting the BACS designation from the LCSW License.
 3. Participate in a board pre-approved workshop on the theory and techniques of supervision as well as procedures used toward licensure of at least ten (10) hours duration once every five (5) years effective July 1, 1995. This means those BACS supervisors who achieved their BACS status before July 1, 1995 must attend another supervision workshop before June 30, 2000 and every five year period thereafter. (*Professional & occupational standards*, 2003, p. 32)

Seemingly, LABSWE's stringent criteria were set with the hopes that BACS social workers entrusted with the responsibility of supervising others are adequately prepared to do so.

In addition, BACS are required by LABSWE to meet with their supervisees and together complete the Supervision Agreement form. Two years before this form was developed, Tsui and Ho (1997) explained the importance of such a form.

A supervisory contract can serve as a plan, an agreement and a standard for evaluation.

For the format of supervision, a choice will be made according to the level of professional autonomy allowed by the agency, the supervisory styles and skills of the supervisor and the level of experience and the needs of the supervisee (p.198).

LABSWE seems to be following best practices by utilizing this form. This form must be turned in to LABSWE within 60 days after the first session in order to be counted towards hours of supervision. The Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners' Supervision Agreement form utilizes both individual and group supervision; however, only one-half of supervision requirements of 96 hours can be met through group supervision. The Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners' Evaluation of Supervision form is comprised of six criteria with which social work supervisors must rate their supervisees using a 6-item Likert scale followed by a short narrative section after each item to support the given rating. The purpose of evaluating the supervisee's ethics, professional growth, relationships, social work process/intervention process, evaluation, and communication skills reflects LABSWE's desire for professional and ethical social workers.

Supervision Concerns

In addition to providing services to their clients, social workers in agency settings are increasingly required to engage in administrative functions. Some social workers feel burdened by too much paperwork and feel they do not have enough time for their clients. According to both Middleman & Rhodes and Payne, (as cited in Tsui & Ho, 1997) "there is a gap between the

ideal and the real; between what supervisors actually spend most of their time doing and what they consider to be most important” (p.185). It is possible to conceive that some supervisors may look at supervision as just one more task to be crossed off a list and not give it the attention it deserves.

Another concern is the amount of time a social worker has been supervising others. Accordingly, one of the interview questions used in this study asks the social worker how long ago he or she obtained his or her BACS credential. This is important because the amount of time a supervisor has been supervising others can impact his or her style of supervision as well as how he or she relates to his or her supervisees. Heid (1997) demonstrates this concept well in the following:

For example, novice supervisors struggle with the intrapsychic issue of identity formation as a supervisor and experience anxiety and identity diffusion. Mid-career supervisors' interpersonal issues focus on the satisfactions and tensions in the supervisory relationship, such as the opportunity to mentor and to work through their own separation and individuation issues. Late career supervisors are typically free of administrative constraints and socio-political pressures, while enjoying esteem and status based on their wisdom and experience. (p. 142)

The insight and maturity of the supervisor is also an important consideration. If they are lacking in these areas, “[s]upervisors may over-attribute the poor performance of a supervisee to internal causes (incompetence) rather than to examine other external variables” (Matthews, 1986, p. 54). Mitchell and Wood (as cited in Matthews, 1986) wrote, “...supervisors may too frequently take the credit when things go well and be too quick to blame the supervisee when things go wrong.” (p. 54) These concerns should not be overlooked, so it is imperative they are researched in order to better understand how to improve the supervision process.

There have been many scholarly articles concerning supervisory styles and motivation that highlight the significance of these issues. However, there is still a need for additional studies

on the myriad of supervision concerns that can arise out of a poor experience. This study will contribute to the literature as well as to challenge future researchers to explore social work supervision with the goal of improving the profession. We know quite a lot about these individual issues separately but not as much about their interaction and impact on the supervisory process in social work. It is important to have an in-depth understanding in order to ensure our profession continues to grow in a healthy manner.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Ten Board Approved Clinical Supervisors from Rapides Parish, Louisiana, were asked to participate in this study. After explaining the purpose of the study, participants were asked to sign an informed consent form prior to the start of the interview. Participants were also advised that they would receive a copy of the final research report, but otherwise would not be compensated for participation in the study.

Materials/ Measures/Instruments

One survey instrument, the Supervisory Styles Inventory-Supervisor Version (SSI-S) developed by Friedlander and Ward (1984), was used to gather quantitative data (see Appendix B for a copy of the instrument). The SSI-S uses a 7-point Likert scale and consists of three sub-scales corresponding to supervisory styles. The authors report the instrument's reliability to be between .76-.93 and to have convergent validity "because of the strong relationships between the empirically derived SSI scales and a measure of supervisory role behavior" (Friedlander & Ward, pp. 546-547). The SSI-S also has good discriminant and predictive validity, supporting the orthogonal nature of the three styles of attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented supervision. The total instrument has 25 items and it is scored by calculating three separate scores for the three sub-scales. Scores are calculated by dividing the total number by the number of items for each sub-scale. It is important to note that "higher ratings indicate stronger endorsement of each supervisory style" (Friedlander & Ward, p. 551). Supervisors are then assigned to one of the three supervisory styles based on their scores on the SSI-S.

Following administration of the SSI-S, an interview was conducted in order to gather qualitative data. The interview questions were organized and focused on the major study

questions of supervisory styles and supervisor motivations. There were 11 interview questions relating to supervisory styles, motivation, agency requirements, and supervisory concerns (see Appendix C for complete questions).

Design and Procedure

This study only captured one observation of participants. Participants were selected from Rapides Parish, a centrally located parish in the state of Louisiana. After excluding subjects the investigator was familiar with, invitations to participate in the study were sent to all BACS located in Rapides parish. The goal was to interview a minimum of 10 BACS, but interviews would be conducted with any and all BACS who responded affirmatively to the request. Interview times and locations were conducted at the participants' convenience. Nineteen requests were initially mailed out. Of those 19, only one subject responded. The remaining 18 subjects were contacted by phone approximately one month after the mailing. Of those, ten agreed to participate, five did not return phone messages, two refused to participate, one was willing to be interviewed but subsequently did not return phone messages, and one was willing to participate but was unable due to medical reasons.

Data Analysis

Findings for the quantitative data were compared with qualitative data for each subject. Each participant was assigned to one group of supervisory styles as indicated by their scores on the SSI-S. In addition, each participant was located on a continuum of motivation to supervise, ranging from highly altruistic to highly self-interested. The core of the data analysis, however, consisted of narrative accounts provided by the supervisors about their experiences as supervisors. Narrative accounts were organized by their relevance to supervisory styles, motivations, and other unexpected data volunteered during the course of the interview.

Thematic content analysis can be helpful when looking for specific data. In her article on supervision, Strong et al. (2003) used "...thematic content analysis of each transcript...by extracting patterns or themes in the data" (p. 195). The data were organized and analyzed around the types of supervisory styles and supervisor motivations. It was expected that supervisors would fit into one of the three supervisory styles outlined earlier and that the nature of their motivations would span a range from more self-interest to more altruistic motives.

RESULTS

The 10 interviews that were conducted resulted in 238 minutes and 3 seconds of qualitative data. It took approximately 3 hours to transcribe each interview. The interview sessions ranged from 7 minutes and 15 seconds to 33 minutes and 45 seconds, with an average session lasting approximately 24 minutes. The interview data yielded from the participants were rich and in-depth. In addition, the quantitative data gathered from the SSI-S were used to supplement the qualitative data. Participants were asked questions regarding their supervisory styles, motivations, LABSWE requirements and supervisory concerns. In addition, they were also given the opportunity to volunteer information they felt would be pertinent to the study. Responses to specific research questions are presented in the following sections.

Participants

Participants were between the ages of 42 and 63, with an average age of 56.8. There were 5 female and 5 male participants. The ethnic composition of the participants was homogenous, with nine identifying as White, and one identifying as Caucasian-Cajun.

Quantitative Analysis: The SSI-S

Research Question #1: “What types of supervisory styles do BACS endorse or describe themselves as possessing?” To answer this question, participants were surveyed on their supervisory style. Prior to the interview, participants were asked to fill out the SSI-S, which numerically measured the participants’ self-perception of their preferred supervisory style. The SSI-S measures three different styles: attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented. It is important to note the participants never saw the categorization, they only responded to a number of adjectives and rated the degree to which they felt each adjective described their style.

Interestingly, as a group, the participants tended to report their preferred style as more attractive and interpersonally sensitive rather than task oriented. In fact, none of the participants' scores were highest on the task-oriented subscale. Specifically, 6 participants scored highest on the attractive subscale and 4 participants scored highest on the interpersonally sensitive subscale. Of the 6 participants who scored highest on the attractive subscale, 3 were male and 3 were female. Of the 4 participants who scored highest on the interpersonally sensitive subscale, 2 were male and 2 were female. Given that LABSWE's criteria for supervision are highly specific and structured, it would seem that LABSWE's criteria follow a more task-oriented approach. The SSI-S's three sub-scales each had high to moderate alpha reliabilities. The attractive sub-scale was highly interrelated with an alpha reliability of .92 followed by task-oriented at .83 and then interpersonally sensitive at .60.

Qualitative Analysis: Supervisory Styles

Research Question #2: "Are supervisory styles consistent with the views and perceptions of supervision reported by BACSS?" Initially, the responses to the SSI-S were meant to be compared with the participants' self-reported responses from the interview. The comparison would serve two purposes:

- 1.) To detect any incongruence between participants' quantitative and qualitative responses.
- 2.) To detect any incongruence between LABSWE's preferred supervision format and the participants preferred supervision.

However, no meaningful comparisons were able to be drawn between the two sets of data due to a design flaw in the interview regarding prompts. Specifically, when participants were asked to describe their preferred supervisory style, many hesitated and/or asked for clarification. For those

who hesitated, the prompt, “Well, do you see yourself as more facilitative or task-oriented?” was used. Subsequently, some participants seemed to choose one of the words used in the prompt to describe their supervisory style instead of using their own words. Furthermore, this prompt may have limited the variety of participants’ responses. It also did not fully fit the descriptive of the SSI-S. The lack of variability in word choice made it virtually impossible to infer whether or not participants’ self-responses matched their quantitative data.

Therefore, the research question, “Are supervisory styles consistent with the views and perceptions of supervision reported by BACS?” was not able to be answered. In hindsight, comparisons may have been more conducive if the participants were given descriptive prompts that corresponded with the three subscales (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented).

Participants were first asked to report when they obtained their BACS in order to supervise others. It soon became apparent after just a few interviews that most people had years of agency supervisory experience before they obtained their BACS. Therefore, all years of supervision were taken into account for the length of supervisory experience and follow-up questions were used to distinguish between LABSWE supervision and agency supervision. It is also important to note that while all of the participants had obtained their BACS, not all participants had supervised social workers preparing for their LCSWs. In regards to the question on how long ago participants obtained their BACS credential, 8 of the 10 participants responded numerically. Of those 8, 3 participants had not supervised social workers preparing for the LCSW. The responses regarding length of time participants held their BACS ranged from 3 years to 37 years. The average number of years of total supervisory experience was 18.25. The average number of years of LABSWE supervisory experience was 20.4.

Research Question #3: “To what extent (if any) does dissonance exist if there is a difference between a supervisors’ preferred supervisory style versus a supervisory style that is imposed by an outside organization (e.g., the licensing board, government, private agency, etc.)?”

The responses indicated that some participants did recognize a difference between their preferred supervisory style and what was required by their agencies and/or LABSWE. When asked how their style had changed over the years, some participants thought their style was more focused than it had been in the past, which some attributed to agency policies and procedures as well as LABSWE’s criteria. For example, the following participants had this to say about how his or her supervisory style compared with external agency requirements:

8004-I think that it’s gotten maybe a little bit more um, specific, we are probably getting more goal oriented and specific as I do supervision...it’s still open but it has a little bit more structure to it, I think.

8009-I tend to be very fairly laid back and easy going but with the rules and regulations... I would say I’ve had to become more structured.

8010- I probably couldn’t be quite as free-flowing with it, it would be much more structured in terms of what it was we had to accomplish to satisfy the Board...so most likely it would be more structured and goal-focused because of the venue that we have now as opposed to in the old days we didn’t’ have it quite so structured and I could do it however I wanted.

Some participants felt their supervisory styles evolved over time with experience.

8008-I probably have become more comfortable with supervising...Um, after learning supervisory skills, um, you relax some over time and are not quite as uptight and anxious maybe about your own ability.

8005-I guess from the beginning [I] was more reactive to situations and now I tend to try and be more proactive...before problems actually occur especially supervising someone...I tend to be more goal oriented and task focused.

Another participant, who had not supervised anyone for several years, was unsure if his style had changed but surmised that he would probably have less patience with supervisees than he had in the past.

8006-Um, I would probably expect the student to be well informed before we start and not have to depend on me for some of their resources.

One participant's response transcended typical responses.

8007- I've probably um, I've probably moved more towards seeing the people I supervise as in a role as people that I serve as opposed to uh people who might work for me. I see the people I supervise more as I'm working for them as opposed to them working for me so I'm accountable to them on something.

The richness and diversity of the responses are important in understanding the many different nuances of supervisory style that these supervisors embody and how this could impact supervisees who come into contact with them.

Motivation

Research Question #4: "What are the motivations of BACS, in particular, are they committed to the improvement of professionalism (altruistic) or are they oriented towards compliance with regulatory requirements or acquisition of status (self interest)?"

Overall, 4 participants responded with altruistic motives, 3 with self-interest motives, and 3 participants' answers were ambiguous. Interestingly, 3 of the 4 participants who responded altruistically were female and those who responded with self-interest were all male. However, one must not jump to conclusions. Perhaps the women in the study were cognizant of what a socially "correct" response might be and decided to filter their responses in order to be seen favorably. Nevertheless, one would expect social workers to embody at least some altruistic traits.

The altruistic responses centered on helping the social work profession. For example, according to this woman, there was no other alternative but to help others and the profession:

8002-I never ever thought about not doing it. Because one of the things is I always wanted to promote social work... and you know, I've never been a big person that ever wanted to make a lot of money, you know, I made a nice living and everything like that and that was fun to see people grow. And I saw a lot of young people grow tremendously into mature people, you know, that really could do a fantastic job and that was positive, my reward for doing it.

Another not only wanted to help the profession but felt it was her responsibility to help other social workers obtain their licensure just as someone else had done for her.

8004-Pretty much what I said [earlier] that I wanted to be able to provide that service to the people who were working for it. It was provided to me...and I just kind of feel like it's one of the those things that I give back to my profession, you know, I want to make sure that, you know, that I am helping other people.

One participant, who had many years of administrative experience, was motivated to not only help other social workers, but also to help clients and the agency he oversees:

8007-So, you know, I feel it's something we offer our employees. The other thing is that it benefits our agency and the clients we serve to get the best quality services they can receive. It also helps to retain, I think, professionals within the agency if they feel like we've done something for them and we help them move up the ladder professionally and help them get their license. It helps the agency out in terms of hopefully having better qualified people overall who are committed to the agency and willing to stay there.

For many participants, their individual job responsibilities dictated whether or not they could supervise others regardless of their motivational desires. One woman's response reflected this:

8008-Well, I um, I guess I never sought out doing that for the first few years because I was really too busy, um, in my own work to do that. Then, after I retired, I was asked to do it and so I got my certification a few years ago and started doing supervision after that. And that's the only reason I didn't, I just didn't have time.

Still another was motivated by her own experiences with other low quality social work professionals and a strong desire to teach others.

8010-Very, very much because I was always dismayed over the quality of social workers, the quality of training I've had, and just knowledge...and a long time ago I was embarrassed by a lot of social workers so, as I increased my own skills and ...as I moved into more other positions, I really took on...teaching people about things so between those two things, two drives, wanting to ensure more really good social workers and training them and teaching them what I thought they needed to know and at the same time, teaching those two things were my primary impetus.

Most of the participants who responded that their motivation was driven by self-interest were cognizant of what a "socially acceptable" response should be and were quick to offer explanations. Some even clarified that their views changed greatly after supervising others.

8003-When I first did it, it was probably more a prestige kick than anything um, I just liked the additional level of at least assumed expertise and I did not supervise anyone for a long time.

Later on, after being asked to supervise, he began to see other benefits to supervision:

8003-I found I enjoyed working with people since I'm not so involved in clinical practice myself right now, it allows me to continue to at least see the clinical aspects of social work, and um, kind of stay fresh there, it also gives me some substance to take back into the classroom and I enjoy that.

Another participant felt his current job was too demanding for him to supervise others for licensure but he also felt it was important to retain his BACS since he had had it for so long. On the reason he obtained it, he responded:

8009-...selfishly it was just because I wanted to have it and... I said 'Hey, I'm eligible for this and I want to have it and I know what's required as far as supervising the person for...towards licensure', but it was just because it was offered and I wanted to have it but I haven't done justice to it in terms of not supervising more MSWs, you know...

Still, another participant found supervising to be a positive experience and enjoyed the challenge of developing his skill set.

8006-Because I enjoyed doing it and it was fun. It makes you think, it makes you structure more than you might and you always learn something so I just did it because I wanted to. It contributed to my development as a clinician.

Motivations can be a strong driving force in the pursuit of goals. However, once an individual achieves that goal and is in a position to influence others, his or her performance may be reflective of the reasons behind his or her initial motivators. It is important for members of LABSWE, supervisors, and supervisees to keep this in mind when discussing supervisory issues.

LABSWE Supervision Requirements

Research Question #5: “To what extent do BACS endorse and adhere to the structure and goals of supervision as provided in state board (LABSWE) policies?” The results indicated that some supervisors seemed to follow LABSWE’s format strictly and be hesitant to supplement the learning process by utilizing their own unique supervisory styles. For example, one participant stated:

8001-Well, I certainly don’t think my supervisory style is not consistent with what the Board expects but I don’t think the Board really encourages a lot of creativity, I think they’re rather rigid in some ways and umm, I think they need to loosen up a little bit.

Others used LABSWE’s criteria as a basic guide and then used aspects of their supervisory style to enhance the learning experience.

8008-You know other areas you could be a little bit more um individualized with your employees or supervisees...you know, some are not as skilled in those areas, so it’s just different with different workers, with different supervisees.

Still others felt LABSWE’s criteria were too in-depth and unnecessary. They reported,

8006-I know that supervision is important, um the first two years out of graduate school...[b]ut I’m not so sure that all the process we get is worth it and necessary. I would make it probably a little more informal than it is...it doesn’t have to be so hard...

8009-[t]here is a lot of paperwork involved with the supervision for the LCSW and the license and documentation of performance, of course, it doesn’t have to be as complicated... but we were following exact forms and format and it was a little cumbersome.

One participant was surprised by LABSWE’s specific criteria. This particular person was in an administrative position and had supervised many employees over the course of several years.

Upon applying for the BACS credential, she reported seeing criteria listed that in which she did not feel particularly skilled in.

8010-I was thinking, 'Boy I'd have to really study up on that myself to be able to help the person learn that stuff.'

She then vacillated between feelings of indignation at being told how to supervise and feelings of obligation for her development as a supervisor. Eventually, she decided that it was best if she followed LABSWE's criteria.

8010-Well, this helps me too, you know, it's not a problem, it shouldn't be a problem... to help the social worker to learn to be a better social worker, then I need to be better at what I do too.

Supervision Concerns

Research Question #6: "To what extent (if any) are supervisory styles associated with maladaptive outcomes?" To answer this, participants were asked if they had ever had an experience where their supervisory style conflicted with the personality style of a supervisee. If participants answered "Yes," then they were asked to elaborate and explain how they handled the situation. Maladaptive outcomes included cases where there was conflict between the supervisee and supervisor and cases in which the supervisee quit, was fired, or changed supervisors. In some cases, the issue was resolved when supervisors addressed their concerns with the supervisee. In other cases, the issue was only able to be resolved when the supervisee was fired, quit, or changed supervisors.

8005-What comes to my mind is where somebody I was supervising um tended to personalize too much with the clientele he was working with and any type of constructive criticism was taken too personal...and also with the patients he was working with, he almost enmeshed with them so it took a lot of re-direction and trying to get him to see how what he was doing was detrimental to his well-being and also the population he was dealing with...He was eventually fired.

8010-One particular person...I wanted to just murder (laughing)... she just had a bit of histrionics in her and she would just overdramatize things and um, I got very impatient

with that and so it really came down to an issue of me having to be very clear with her in terms of ...it was important for us to resolve this in our relationship...She finally decided to go somewhere else but it was over a long period of time.

One male supervisor had a strange experience with a female supervisee that only resolved itself when she switched to a female supervisor in a different setting.

8006-She was very reclusive, quiet, it was like pulling teeth to get anything out of her. I think she felt like I was judging her or something...and of course I wasn't...so it helped to have her work with a female supervisor. ...it kind of split her up in terms of her field placement but she did fine.

In other cases, supervisors were able to sit down and discuss the issues with the supervisees and salvage the relationship.

8003-Once I recognized that conflict I talk about it upfront to supervisees and talk about the tension and we talked that through and I haven't had that problem since then.

For those that had not experienced any problems with supervisees, they attributed their success with good communication and/or being highly selective of people they chose to supervise.

8007- I really can't say that I've had [problems] directly...I think part of that is keeping lines of communication open, talking a lot about the process, being sure the person knows that open discussion is welcome; that it is not discouraged so that you're able to deal with the issues on a day to day basis.

8004-I've been a little picky in who've I taken on so I don't think I've really had too many problems.

Several participants noted their supervisees were deficient at writing quality assessments and had to spend more time working on documentation rather than on developing other skills.

Final Thoughts

At the end of the interview, participants were given an opportunity to add anything they felt would be relevant to the study and important for social workers to understand. The following are some of the responses which varied considerably in scope from lighthearted to serious.

8005-I guess something interesting that as a supervisor, I've supervised different professionals at one time, social workers, nursing staff, direct care staff; and I found that social workers were easier to supervise. (Laughing)

8008-I like to give anybody an opportunity if they're got some really neat ideas or whatever you know to be able to get credit for that because anything that they do that makes our work look better, then it makes me look good. If I have good workers, then our department is good.

8009- I think it's important to keep learning and growing and knowing new information and not getting stagnated in what you do.

8004-Well I don't charge my supervisees and um, I do feel like sometimes...some of our new social work trainees are being taken advantage of being forced to pay pretty high amounts to get supervision...I've heard that and I don't think that's a very good thing.

Some participants felt very strongly that supervision should not be taken lightly.

8007-The last thing we want to do is be a therapist to people we are supervising, but there are a lot of social work skills that are useful in the supervision process, not from a therapeutic standpoint but from the standpoint of how you establish rapport with people and the importance of the relationship, the importance of encouragement, and support you know. And it kind of strikes me that sometimes supervisors just put all of that aside when really we have a whole lot of skills.

8010- Real quality supervision is untradeable; you cannot trade that for anything. I think that quality supervision is an experience between the supervisee and the supervisor that is so valuable and so enriching that it can't do anything but make us better social workers. I think that poor supervision is unconscionable. I think that agencies that don't provide supervision and supervisory support to their social workers are...they're committing a crime...and I feel that strongly about it! Having had really good supervisory experiences myself I know that that's what has been important for a) making me a good social worker but also b) enabling me to keep an open mind and always be ready to learn and ready to...it helped me learn how to accept criticism, so that I can be better at what I do and I think that truly good quality supervision prepares a social worker to be able to do that throughout their career not just for that segment of time.

Overall, the results were encouraging for the social work profession. The majority of the responses seemed to indicate a general concern for quality supervision. Furthermore, the willingness of individuals to simply participate in this research project illustrates the desire to help others in the profession. However, it is important to keep in mind that the willingness of the individuals to participate in this study is likely an indicator of a selection bias in favor of

supervisors with generally positive attitudes and experiences. Thus, these findings cannot be interpreted to be generalizable to the experiences of the larger population of social work supervisors.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore social work supervisors' supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes. This study found rich qualitative data that highlights the myriad number of factors and nuances that shape social work supervision. This study illustrated that supervisory styles can vary greatly by individual. Friedlander and Ward's Supervisory Styles Inventory-Supervisor version was used to measure the various styles that supervisors embody and measured particularly attractive and interpersonally sensitive. Specifically, 6 participants scored highest on the attractive subscale and 4 participants scored highest on the interpersonally sensitive subscale. Of the 6 participants who scored highest on the attractive subscale, 3 were male and 3 were female. Interestingly, LABSWE's criteria seem to follow a more task-oriented approach but the SSI-S scores indicated that none of the participants scored highest for the task-oriented supervisory style. Whether or not this dissonance has any actual impact on social work supervision still remains to be seen.

For the most part, motivations to obtain their BACS were altruistic. Even in the cases where participants first responded with self-interest motives, they later acknowledged and expressed more altruistic motives after actually supervising social workers. Additionally, it did not seem that participants who responded with self-interest motives had any more maladaptive experiences with supervisees than participants who responded with altruistic motives. As previously stated, 3 of the 4 participants who responded altruistically were female and those who responded with self-interest were all male. However, this possible filtering bias highlights another issue of gender socialization. Why would women seem to think it was inherently bad to admit to being motivated by self-interest? Perhaps it is because they are aware of social nuances in which women who are nurturers are praised whereas women who are competitive are

disparaged. Perhaps, it is 'more safe' for men to acknowledge self-interest traits because it is socially acceptable for men to strive for power and prestige. Future research should try to distinguish between these two factors and explore the impact on the social work profession.

Responses varied on LABSWE's requirements. The results indicated that some supervisors seemed to follow LABSWE's format strictly and be hesitant to supplement the learning process by utilizing their own unique supervisory styles. Others used LABSWE's criteria as a basic guide and then used aspects of their supervisory style to enhance the learning experience. Still others felt LABSWE's criteria were too in-depth and unnecessary. Specifically, some participants felt the formal style was too rigid, discouraged creativity, and the paperwork was cumbersome. However, most participants did not see any major problems with LABSWE's criteria and felt their views were mostly consistent with LABSWE's requirements.

By far, supervisory concerns garnered the richest feedback. Seemingly all of the participants could relate to at least one instance in which they encountered difficulties with a supervisee and most agreed proper communication was important and effective in resolving the conflicts. Additionally, differences in personality and supervisory style seemed to be the primary reasons that participants experienced problems with their supervisees. This suggests that both supervisors and supervisees would benefit by having the opportunity to match supervisory styles through LABSWE's website before beginning supervision to ensure that both had a quality supervisory experience.

Limitations/Recommendations

This study had several limitations. One, there was a small sample size of only 10 participants. Two, there was a lack of ethnic diversity as evidenced by all participants identifying as White or Caucasian/Cajun. Three, there was only one observation session per participant

which eliminated any time for follow-up clarification and/or elaboration. Four, the investigator was a novice interviewer which contributed to a design flaw that rendered potential data unusable. Last, the data was not generalizable to other populations. Originally, this study sought to encompass a greater geographic area by selecting a total of 10 BACS from five cities across the state of Louisiana including Shreveport, Monroe, Alexandria, Lake Charles, and Baton Rouge. Having a diversified geographic sample might also have increased the chances that the sample size might be more ethnically diverse. However, in order to conduct extended interviews and have adequate time to analyze the large amount of qualitative data generated, 10 BACS from Rapides Parish were selected.

The main limitation of this study was the small sample size; therefore, increasing the sample size could provide an area for future research and may also increase the ethnic diversity. Multiple observations of participants could increase volume and quality of data. Future research would also benefit by utilizing an experienced interviewer. Also, in addition to developing more follow-up interview questions, future research on this study could explore the following research questions:

1. In what areas do BACS believe social workers should be skilled?
2. To what extent do BACS believe the structure of the LABSWE Plan of Supervision to be effective in providing high quality supervision?
3. To what extent (if any) does dissonance stemming from a difference between a supervisors' preferred supervisory style and a supervisory style that is imposed by an outside organization have on the supervisory process?

Conclusions were unable to be conclusively drawn about these questions due to the fact that 3 of the 10 participants had never supervised social workers working towards licensure. Therefore,

future researchers may wish to include previous supervisory experience as an additional requirement of BACS participants.

This project was undertaken to better understand some of the perceptions, values, beliefs, and problems involved in the supervisory process and its impact on the profession. While more is now known than before, it is important to continue researching this subject in order to improve the social work profession. Hopefully, these findings will be useful to LABSWE members and supervisors as they navigate the complex yet vital task of developing competent and ethical social workers.

REFERENCES

- Baker, D. R., & Smith, S. L. (1987). A comparison of field faculty and field student perceptions of selected aspects of supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 5(4), 31-42.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the supervisory styles inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 541-557.
- Heid, L. (1997). Supervisor development across the professional lifespan. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 16(2), 139-166.
- Hensley, P. H. (2002). The value of supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 21(1), 97-110.
- Hyde, J. S., & Kling, K. C. (2001). Women, motivation, and achievement. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 364-378.
- Ladany N., Walker J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40(4), 263-275.
- Evaluation of supervision*. (n.d.a). (Available from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners, 18550 Highland Road, Suite B, Baton Rouge, LA 70809)
- NEWS (1999, April). (Available from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners, retrieved February 24, 2008, from <http://labswe.org/news9904.htm#Welcome>)
- Supervision agreement*. (n.d.a). (Available from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners, 18550 Highland Road, Suite B, Baton Rouge, LA 70809)
- Louisiana social work practice act: Act 1309 of the 1999 regular session of the louisiana legislature*. (Available from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners, retrieved September 30, 2007, from http://www.labswe.org/practice_act_99.pdf)
- Matthews, G. (1986). Performance appraisal in the human services: A survey. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 3(4), 47-61.
- Professional & occupational standards: Rules, standards, & procedures for louisiana social work practice act*. (2003). (Available from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners, retrieved September 30, 2007, from <http://www.labswe.org>)
- Severinsson, E.I., & Hallberg, I. R. (1996). Clinical supervisors' views of their leadership

- role in the clinical supervision process within nursing care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 24(1), 151-161.
- Strong, J., Kavanagh, D., Wilson, J., Spence, S. H., Worrall, L., & Crow, N. (2003). Supervision practice for allied health professionals within a large mental health service: Exploring the phenomenon. *The Clinical supervisor*, 22(1), 191-210.
- Taylor, M. F., & Bentley, K. J. (2005). Professional dissonance: Colliding values and job tasks in mental health practice. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 41(4), 469-480.
- Tsui, M., & Ho, W. (1997). In search of a comprehensive model of social work supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 16(2), 181-205.

Appendix A

Supervision Agreement

Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners
18550 Highland Road, Suite B
Baton Rouge, LA 70809
Telephone: 225-756-3470 or Toll-free (LA only) 800-521-1941

SUPERVISION AGREEMENT

Supervisee: _____ GSW Certification # _____
(please print)

Employing Agency of Supervisee: _____

Address of Employing Agency: _____

While employed at the aforementioned agency, I will be supervised by the LCSW-BACS supervisor designated below. I am employed _____ hours per week. My job title is _____.

Supervisee's Signature _____ Date

LCSW-BACS Supervisor: _____ LCSW-BACS # _____
(please print)

____ LCSW-BACS Supervisor is employed by the supervisee's employing agency.

____ LCSW-BACS Supervisor is off-site* (Section for Agency Supervisor must be completed.)

I agree to supervise the GSW named above for the purpose of licensure. I will assume responsibility for his/her social work practice. In addition to regularly scheduled in-person supervisory sessions, I will formulate a plan to provide supervision for case emergencies during my absences.

The first supervisory session was held on _____ (month, day, year).

LCSW-BACS Supervisor's Signature _____ Date

Agency Supervisor: _____
(please print)

I agree to this Supervision Agreement and subsequent Plan of Supervision. I agree to quarterly contact with the licensing supervisor.

Agency Supervisor's Signature

Date

Daytime phone number (include area code): _____

Structure of Supervision

Number of individual sessions per month _____ Length of session _____ hours(s)

Number of group sessions per month _____ Length of session _____ hours(s)

Number of supervisees in group _____

Site of supervision sessions _____

Note: Only one-half (48 hours) of the supervision requirement (96 hours) can be met through group supervision.

Job Description (list the main responsibilities, duties and tasks)

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____
- 4. _____
- 5. _____

Plan of Supervision begins on next page

PLAN OF SUPERVISION

Learning Objectives for Supervision (progress towards objectives will be reflected in evaluation)

Ethics (refers to the supervisee's ability to apply social work values and ethics in carrying out professional responsibilities.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Professional Growth (refers to the supervisee's acceptance of responsibility for personal learning and professional growth, to include but is not limited to, continuing education, supervision and consultation.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Plan of Supervision

Relationships (refers to the supervisee's ability to develop, maintain and terminate appropriate professional relationships with clients, colleagues and other disciplines.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Intervention Process (refers to the supervisee's ability to formulate assessment of clients and to implement effective interventions resulting in resolution of problems/issues.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Plan continued on next page.

Evaluation (refers to the supervisee's ability to monitor and evaluate his/her own professional practice.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Communication (refers to the supervisee's ability to communicate effectively with others orally and in writing.)

Goals/Objectives:

Learning Experiences:

Indicators of Achievement:

Plan of Supervision→

This form is to be submitted within 60 days of the first supervision session. The original shall be mailed to the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners and a copy shall be maintained in the supervisee's personal supervision file.

Changes in the supervision arrangements such as employment change of the supervisee, change in LCSW-BACS supervisor or substantial change in job description require a new Supervision Agreement and updated Plan of Supervision. This documentation is required within 60 days of the change.

_____ Supervisee's Signature	_____ Date
_____ LCSW Supervisor's Signature	_____ Date
_____ *Agency Supervisor's Signature	_____ Date

Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners
18550 Highland Road, Suite B
Baton Rouge, LA 70809

Appendix B

Supervisory Styles Inventory - Supervisor Version

Please indicate your perception of your style on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of your style.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	<u>not very</u>						<u>very</u>	
1. goal-oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. perceptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. concrete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. explicit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. committed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. affirming	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. practical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9. collaborative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
10. intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
11. reflective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
12. responsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
13. structured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
14. evaluative		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
16. flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
17. prescriptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
18. didactic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
19. thorough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
20. focused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
21. creative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
22. supportive		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. open	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
24. realistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
25. resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
26. invested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
27. facilitative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

28. therapeutic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. trusting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. humorous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

mfla

Appendix C

Interview Questions

1. How long ago did you obtain your BACS?
2. Since obtaining this certification, how many social workers have you supervised?
3. Are you currently supervising any social workers?
4. How would describe your preferred supervisory style? (If the respondent has problems in answering, suggest the dimensions of more task-oriented vs. more laissez-faire.)
5. How has your style changed over the years?
6. Do you see your supervisory style to be consistent with the requirements of LABSWE?
Do you perceive any inconsistencies between your style and LABSWE requirements?
7. Do you alter your style of supervision to fit the supervisee or do you expect the supervisee to conform to your style of supervision?
8. Do you complete a new Plan of Supervision for each new supervisee do you have a set plan that seems to work well for everyone?
9. Have you ever experienced problems between your supervisory style and the personality style or needs of a supervisee? If so, please describe, etc.
10. Please describe experiences you have had where a supervisee was in need to strong supervisory guidance due to some practice deficiency. How did you provide supervision in these cases?
11. What motivated you to become a BACS?

Appendix D

Internal Review Board Application

LSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) 05/12/2006

IRB APPLICATION: APPROVAL OF PROJECTS WHICH USE HUMAN SUBJECTS

The IRB uses this form to obtain succinct answers to questions it must consider. If incomplete, your application will be returned! You can download this form and all other IRB documents from <http://www.lsu.edu/irb> & complete it with your word processor. Call Robert Mathews for assistance, 225-578-8692, or e-mail him at: irb@lsu.edu.

When this application is submitted to the IRB please include:

- Two copies of this completed form.
- A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects)
- Copies of all instruments to be used. If this proposal is a part of a grant application include a copy of the grant proposal, the investigative brochure (if one exists) and any recruitment materials including advertisements intended to be seen or heard by potential subjects.
- The consent form that you will be using. A copy of the Waiver of Signed Informed Consent is attached and must be completed only if you do not intend to use a signed consent form.
- Copies of your IRB stamped consent form must be used in obtaining consent.
- Certificate of Completion for Human Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project (including students who are involved with testing and handling data) at <http://cme.cancer.gov/clinicaltrials/learning/humanparticipant-protections.asp> (Unless already on file with the IRB.)

(IRB Use: IRB# _____ Review Type: Expedited ___ Full ___)

Part 1: General Information

1. Principal Investigator: Timothy Page Rank: Associate Professor of Social Work
Dept.: Social Work Ph: 225-578-1358 E-mail: tpage2@lsu.edu

Co-investigators*: Michelle Chevallier

*Student? Y/N Y Thesis/dissertation/class project? Y/N Y

Dept.: Social Work Ph: 318-664-0347 E-mail: mcheval@lsu.edu

2. Project Title: An Exploratory Study of Social Work Supervisors' Supervisory Styles'
Motivations, and Evaluative Processes

3. Proposed duration (months): 11 months Start date: 8/27/07

4. Funding sought from: N/A

5. LSU Proposal #: N/A Number of subjects requested: 10

6. Are you obtaining any health information from a health care provider that contains any of the identifiers listed below?

A. Names

B. Address: street address, city, county, precinct, ZIP code, and their equivalent geocodes.

Exception for ZIP codes: The initial three digits of the ZIP Code may be used, if according to current publicly available data from the Bureau of the Census: (1) The geographic unit formed by combining all ZIP codes with the same three initial digits contains more than 20,000 people; and (2) the initial three digits of a ZIP code for all such geographic units containing 20,000 or fewer people is changed to '000'. (Note: The 17 currently restricted 3-digit ZIP codes to be replaced with '000' include: 036, 059, 063, 102, 203, 556, 692, 790, 821, 823, 830, 831, 878, 879, 884, 890, and 893.)

C. Dates related to individuals

i. Birth date

ii. Admission date

iii. Discharge date

iv. Date of death

v. And all ages over 89 and all elements of dates (including year) indicative of such age. Such ages and elements may be aggregated into a single category of age 90 or older.

D. Telephone numbers;

E. Fax numbers;

F. Electronic mail addresses;

G. Social security numbers;

H. Medical record numbers; (including prescription numbers and clinical trial numbers)

I. Health plan beneficiary numbers;

J. Account numbers;

K. Certificate/license numbers;

L. Vehicle identifiers and serial numbers including license plate numbers;

M. Device identifiers and serial numbers;

N. Web Universal Resource Locators (URLs);

O. Internet Protocol (IP) address numbers;

P. Biometric identifiers, including finger and voice prints;

Q. Full face photographic images and any comparable images; and

R. Any other unique identifying number, characteristic, or code; except a code used for re-identification purposes; and

S. The facility does not have actual knowledge that the information could be used alone or in combination with other information to identify an individual who is the subject of the information.

YES Your study falls under the HIPAA (Health Information Privacy and Accountability Act) and you must obtain either a limited data set use agreement or a HIPAA authorization agreement from the health care provider. This agreement must be submitted with your IRB protocol.

NO You do not need a HIPAA agreement.

A. ASSURANCE: PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (named above)

I accept personal responsibility for the conduct of this study (including ensuring compliance of co-investigators/co-workers in accordance with the documents submitted herewith and the following guidelines for human subject protection: The Belmont Report, LSU's Assurance with OPRR, and 45 CFR 46 (Available from OSP or at <http://www.lsu.edu/irb>)

Signature of PI _____ Date _____

B. ASSURANCE OF STUDENT/PROJECT COORDINATOR named above

I agree to adhere to the terms of this document and am familiar with the documents referenced above.

Signature _____ Date _____

Part 2: Project Abstract – The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine Board Approved Clinical Supervisor Social Workers’ Supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes and the implications for social work supervision. Data will be gathered from 10 Board Approved Clinical Supervisors in an interview that will last approximately 1-1 ½ hours. This project hopes

to better understand some of the perceptions, values, beliefs, and problems involved in the supervisory process and any impact it may have on the profession.

Part 3: Research Protocol

A: Describe study procedures- Subjects will be chosen from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiner public database that is available on the internet. Subjects must be a Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners Board Approved Clinical Supervisor (BACS), have a current license, and be in good standing with the Board. Subjects that are known to the investigator will be excluded, to lessen any potential bias on the part of the investigator or subject. The study will be conducted in two phases during one session. In the first phase, subjects will spend approximately 10 minutes completing questionnaires on supervisory styles. In the second phase, subjects will spend approximately 1 hour answering interview questions on supervision. Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of research records. Subjects will be assigned a number and only the investigator will know the identity of the subject. Any other person working on the project will only see a number identifying any subject information. Paper files will be kept secure in a locked box to which only the investigator has access and any computer files will be password protected.

*Please see attachment titled “Interview Questions” for script of interview and questionnaire.

B: Answer each of the following questions.

1. Why is the use of human subjects necessary? (v.s. animals/in vitro) The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine Board Approved Clinical Supervisor Social Workers’ Supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes and the implications for social work supervision. To do this, I will need to interview human subjects; specifically Board Approved Clinical Supervisors Social Workers.

2. Specify sites of data collection.- Study will be conducted at subjects' convenience since interviews will be conducted in-person and in different cities throughout the state of Louisiana.

3. If surgical or invasive procedures are used, give name, address, and telephone number of supervising physician and the qualifications of the person(s) performing the procedures.

Comparable information when qualified participation or supervision is required or appropriate.-

N/A

4. Provide the names, dosage, and actions of any drugs or other materials administered to the subjects and the qualifications of the person(s) administering the drugs.-N/A

5. Detail all the physical, psychological, and social risks to which the subjects may be exposed.-I do not believe the subjects will be exposed to any physical risks. The risk for psychological harm in this study is extremely minimal. Interview questions target supervision styles only. Subjects may be hesitant or uncomfortable discussing problematic supervisory issues they have experienced related to ethical or legal concerns. Participants will be completely free to decline to discuss any topic they wish.

6. What steps will be taken to minimize risks to subjects? The potential risk for inadvertent release of sensitive information will be protected by identifying collected data only by number. Subject participation in the study is completely voluntary and they may terminate an interview any time they wish.

7. Describe the recruitment pool (community, institution, group) and the criteria used to select and exclude subjects. Subjects will be chosen from the Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiner public database that is available on the internet. Subjects must be a Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners Board Approved Clinical Supervisor (BACS), have a

current license, and be in good standing with the Board. Because this study will require face to face interviews and to lessen any potential bias on the part of the investigator or subject, subjects that are known to the investigator will be excluded.

8. List any vulnerable population whose members are included in this project (e.g., children under the age of 18; mentally impaired persons; pregnant women; prisoners; the aged.)- N/A. The subjects are not from a vulnerable population. They are professionals who are aware they can refuse to participate in this research at any time.

9. Describe the process through which informed consent will be obtained.(Informed consent usually requires an oral explanation, discussion, and opportunity for questions before seeking consent form signature.)-I will send a detailed message concerning my research when I ask for subjects to participate in this research. After I receive replies and upon meeting the subjects for the interview, I will go over the research again and ask if there are any questions. At that time, I will ask them to sign the consent form.

10. (A) Is this study anonymous or confidential? (Anonymous means that the identity of the subjects is never linked to the data, directly, or indirectly through a code system.) (B) If a confidential study, detail how the privacy of the subjects and security of their data will be protected.-The study is confidential. I, the student researcher, will know their identity because I am interviewing them face-to-face. However, each subject will each be assigned a number and any communication with or by them will utilize this number to ensure that anyone else working on this project (tape transcriptionist, proof-reader, etc.) will not know their identity. Data will be kept confidential unless release is legally compelled.

*Please see attached consent form.

*Note: Items 15-19 are not required for this study.

Attachments:

1. Attach copies of all instruments and questionnaires used.
2. Any Relevant Grant Applications.
3. The investigative brochure (if one exists) and any recruitment materials, including advertisements intended to be seen or heard by potential subjects.
4. Attach documentation of application to IRB of collaborating institutions: (Documentation of application to the IRB of collaborating institution is required by LSU IRB before work begins on the study.)

Send original and 2 copies of application form & all attachments to IRB

Office at 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall, (225) 578-8692, FAX 578-6792.

Expedited review usually takes 1-2 weeks. Full reviews are held at the bimonthly IRB meetings 2nd week of Feb. Apr, June, Aug, Oct, Dec. Carefully completed applications should be submitted 2 weeks before a meeting to ensure a prompt decision.

Contact Dr. Robert Mathews, 225-578-8692, irb@lsu.edu if you need assistance. Additional important guidance and documents are at <http://www.lsu.edu/irb>

irbapp.wpd 05/12/2006

Questionnaire

Before the interview, I would like the subjects to answer one questionnaire. The quantitative data gathered from this instrument will supplement the qualitative data I receive from the interview. I plan on using the Supervisory Styles Inventory-Supervisor Version (SSI-S) (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). I have received permission from the author to use this instrument in my study.

Interview Questions

How long ago did you obtain your BACS?

Since obtaining this certification, how many social workers have you supervised?

Are you currently supervising any social workers?

Please list 6 skills you believe social workers should possess and why. Are these exhaustive?

Are you aware of the LABSWE Plan of Supervision? Do you use this?

Do you complete a new Plan of Supervision for each new supervisee, or do you rely more on a “boiler-plate” plan that fits almost anyone?

How would describe your preferred supervisory style? (If the respondent has problems in answering, suggest the dimensions of more task-oriented vs. more laissez-faire.)

Do you see your supervisory style to be consistent with the requirements of LABSWE? Do you perceive any inconsistencies between your style and LABSWE requirements?

Have you ever experienced problems between your supervisory style and the personality style or needs of a supervisee? If so, please describe, etc.

How well do you feel the current plan of supervision from LABSWE prepares young social workers to practice autonomously and ethically? Do you feel that the 6 areas for professional

growth contained in the Plan of Supervision adequately reflect the needs of supervisees? If not, what else is needed?

Please describe experiences you have had where a supervisee was in need of strong supervisory guidance due to some practice deficiency. How did you provide supervision in these cases?

Do you feel supervisees utilize supervision effectively?

I have no further questions. Do you have anything more you want to bring up, or ask about before we finish the interview?

The following are probes taken directly from Patton, 2002, pp. 373-374.

- Detailed oriented probes:
 - Who, What, When, Where, How?
- Elaboration probes:
 - Would you elaborate on that?
 - Could you say some more about that?
- Clarification probes:
 - I'm not sure what you meant by that. Would you elaborate please?
 - I want to make sure I understand what you're saying. I think it would help me if you could say some more about that.

Informed Consent Form

1. Study Title: An Exploratory Study of Social Work Supervisors' Supervisory Styles, Motivations, and Evaluative Processes
2. Performance Sites: Study will be conducted at subjects' convenience since interviews will be conducted in-person and in different cities throughout the state of Louisiana.
3. Contacts: The following investigators are available for questions about this study.

Dr. Timothy Page, Associate Professor of Social Work at Louisiana State University

Phone: 225-578-1358

Hours Available: Monday thru Friday-9:30 a.m.-4:30 p.m.

Michelle Chevallier, Master of Social Work Student, Louisiana State University

Phone: 318-448-5189

Hours Available: Monday thru Friday-8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.

4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine Board Approved Clinical Supervisor Social Workers' supervisory styles, motivations, and evaluative processes and the implications for social work supervision.
5. Subjects: Subjects must be a Louisiana State Board of Social Work Examiners' Board Approved Clinical Supervisor (BACS), have a current license, and be in good standing with the Board. Subjects that are known to the investigator will be excluded from the study in order to lessen any potential bias on the part of the investigator or subject.
 - C. Maximum number of subjects: 10
6. Study Procedures: The study will be conducted in two phases during one session. In the first phase, subjects will spend approximately 10 minutes completing a questionnaire on supervisory styles. In the second phase, subjects will spend approximately 1 hour answering interview questions on supervision.
7. Benefits: The study may yield valuable information about supervision which could later be used to improve the social work profession. In addition, this study may raise the level of awareness on differing supervisory styles and which styles work best in social work settings.
8. Risks/Discomforts: I believe there could be extremely minimal psychological harm simply due to the fact I am interviewing subjects on their supervision styles. Subjects may be

hesitant or uncomfortable discussing maladaptive supervisory issues they have experienced due to ethical and legal concerns.

9. Measures taken to reduce risk: Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your research records. Subjects will be assigned a number and only the investigator will know the identity of the subject. Any other person working on the project will only see a number identifying any subject information. Paper files will be kept secure in a lock box to which only the investigator has access and any computer files will be password protected.
10. Right to Refuse: Participation in the study is voluntary and subjects may change their mind and withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they may otherwise be entitled.
11. Privacy: This study is confidential. Subjects will be assigned a number and only the investigator will know the identity of the subject. Any other person working on the project will only see a number identifying any subject information. Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity and data will be kept confidential unless release is legally compelled.
12. Financial Information: There will be no compensation for participation in this study or any remuneration for uncompensated costs incurred by the subjects.
13. Withdrawal: Participation in the study is voluntary and subjects may change their mind and withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they may otherwise be entitled. If subject withdraws during interview, the tape will be stopped and no further questions will be asked.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about

subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225)578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the researchers' obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me.

Subject Signature

Date

VITA

Michelle Chevallier was born in Alexandria, Louisiana in 1984. At age 11, her family moved to Spring, Texas where they resided for six years before moving back home to Deville, Louisiana. She credits her time spent in Texas for instilling the importance of cultural diversity and competence which is paramount in the social work profession. Michelle graduated from Buckeye High School in 2002. She received her Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice from Louisiana College in May of 2006. While at Louisiana College, she was involved in many activities and organizations. Michelle was a proud member of the Louisiana College Lady Wildcat Basketball Team from 2002 through 2004. She also held officer positions in Alpha Chi, Omicron Delta Kappa, Alpha Lambda Delta, and Gamma Beta Phi. Following graduation from Louisiana College, Michelle began graduate school at Louisiana State University in August of 2006. In the School of Social Work, Michelle served as Treasurer for the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. In April of 2008, she was inducted into the Social Work Honor Society, Alpha Delta Mu.

Michelle's areas of interest include social work supervision, end of life care decisions, and social justice for minorities and other oppressed populations. Michelle is a candidate for the Master of Social Work degree from the School of Social Work at Louisiana State University Agricultural and Mechanical College in Baton Rouge in May, 2008.