

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**What's in a name? Strengths-based
Supervision – Reality or Rhetoric:**

An Analysis of Supervision in an Organisation with
a Vision of Strengths-based Practice

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Social Work, School of Sociology, Social
Policy and Social Work, Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand

Christine Thomas

2005

Abstract

The aim of this research was to explore the impact of a transition to strengths-based practice within a social service organisation. The central consideration within this study was the participants' conceptualisations of what strengths-based practice and supervision might look like; how this connected, or collided with their views around traditional approaches to practice and supervision and whether strengths-based supervision is a distinct model or approach to supervision or a repackaging of traditional approaches to supervision. This research also sought to locate the significance of the transition to strengths-based practice within the participants' experiences of supervision and the nature of the relationship between external supervision and the change process.

The research was informed by participatory action-research methodology, which was utilised because of the requirement that the researcher join a change process being undertaken within the agency and the compatibility between this research methodology and the principles of strengths-based practice.

The need to be clear about what strengths-based practice and the importance of developing shared understanding about what this actually means beyond the rhetoric has been highlighted in this research as a fundamental task for the Organisation, Supervisees and External Supervisors. The research findings presented a variety of constructions and meanings associated with strengths-based practice and continued to highlight the debate in the literature about the validity or otherwise of distinguishing strengths-based practice as a new approach to practice. This research offers a view that continuing to dichotomise strengths and deficits approaches may be less helpful in the long run as this has the continuing potential to alienate and engender defensiveness.

Supervision as one of the critical places for workers to reflect on the fit between their actions and their view of these actions was reinforced within the findings. Although the research question about the existence of strengths-based supervision as a distinct supervision model was not addressed definitively within the research findings a clear theme has emerged within the participants' responses that supports a supervision framework that is clearly linked to the principles of strengths-based practice. The

narrative of the supervisee participants in the research strongly supported the notion of a supervision environment where supervision focuses on strengths and competency and a safe transparent and clearly contracted relationship that encourages supervision to be a supervisee-led and focused process. This research supports the greater ownership of supervision by supervisees and the development of the supervisee voice within the supervision literature.

The importance of engaging external supervision processes in a change process and also the value of connecting up and establishing clear and well-structured three-way contracts between supervisees, external supervisors and the organisation have been highlighted within the research. The findings related to the nature of the relationships between the participants lend weight to the argument for supervision as an important and central tool and resource in a change process and point to the value of ongoing clarification of the expectations and roles of all those involved in supervision.

Acknowledgement

I would particularly like to thank all the participants who took part in the study. I would like to acknowledge the significant amount of time generously given to the research in terms of interview and focus group time, reviewing of transcripts and travel time.

I would like to thank the participants in the research also for sharing their perspectives and wisdom with me. I have gained much in this process.

I would like to acknowledge the ‘super- vision’ that that I have received from Professor Robyn Munford and Kieran O’Donoghue. The support, scholarship and encouragement that I have received has contributed significantly to this research and my development. I have valued the care afforded to me and the research and the modelling of an approach to supervising this thesis that has been based in ‘walking the talk’.

I would like to thank the funding from Disability Support Services at Massey who recognised the impact of a significant arm injury on my ability to complete the thesis and funded the transcription required to undertake the research.

The completion of this research coincided with a number of challenging personal events and a huge acknowledgement goes to my husband John and children Anna and Daniel whose patience, encouragement and belief that this project was indeed possible is something that I will never forget and will probably spend the rest of my life making up for!

I would also like to acknowledge the role of my professional supervisor Merv Hancock who has been a huge support to me in undertaking this research. Merv epitomises the ‘strengths-based’ supervisor and is some one who continues to inspire me to be the best supervisor and supervisee that I can.

Finally I would like to acknowledge my father Frank Thomas who throughout his life encouraged and supported me to take all the opportunities open to me. He also demonstrated what resilience and hope are all about. This thesis is dedicated to his memory.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
Chapter 1 - Introduction	1
Chapter 2 - Literature Review	5
Chapter 3 - Research Methodology	31
Chapter 4 - Constructions of Strengths-based Practice	54
Chapter 5 - Defining Strengths-based Supervision	82
Chapter 6 - Relationships between Supervisors, Supervisees and the Organisation (Current and Future)	99
Chapter 7 - Conclusion-Strengths-based Supervision – rhetoric or reality?	118
References	134
Appendices	148
Appendix A Ethics Application	148
Appendix B Interview Guides	184
Appendix C Interview and Focus Group Sequence	199

Figures and Tables

Table 2.1

Comparison of Pathology and Strengths: Saleebey (1996:298) 14

Figure 2.1

The Location of Problems in a Strengths-based Approach 19

Table 3.1

Comparison of Participatory Action Research and the Strengths-based Approach 33

Table 3.2

Potential and actual research participants 37

Table 3.3

Group Profile of Organisation Participants 39

Table 6.1

Reporting Arrangements in Supervision Relationships 100