Study on the Current State of Supervision for Social Workers in Hong Kong

Social Workers Registration Board
2006

Title

Study on the Current State of Supervision for Social Workers in Hong Kong

Author

Working Group on Supervised Practice

Social Workers Registration Board

Researcher

Dr Sandra WONG

Publisher

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BOARD

11/F Heng Shan Centre,

145 Queen's Road East,

Wan Chai,

Hong Kong

Telephone : 2591 1955

Fax : 2591 1411

E-mail address : info@swrb.org.hk

Web-site : www.swrb.org.hk

Not for sale

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

Executive Summary

The aims of the study are to describe supervisory practice in Hong Kong, identify the needs and expectations of frontline social work supervisors and supervisees with regard to the existing supervisory practice, and examine the discrepancies in their expectations. The study analyses the effectiveness and importance of the administrative, educational and supportive functions of professional social work supervision as perceived by supervisees and supervisors, and the effects of age, work experience, educational level, clientele, and size of agency on their perceptions.

The study collected data from two sources: individual registered social workers (RSWs), who were given questionnaires and participated in focus group discussions, and agencies, who agreed to provide information on their supervisory arrangements. The 8,503 RSWs in the survey group were sent a questionnaire by post. Two questionnaires were used: one for social work supervisors and another for supervisees. Those who did not send back the mailed questionnaires were sampled and contacted by telephone. There were 1,268 replies (247 from supervisors and 1,021 from supervisees), representing a return rate of 14.9%. In addition to the questionnaires, respondents were invited to attend focus groups to share their views and make suggestions for improvement. Twenty workers participated in three focus groups. Of the 450 agencies employing RSWs who were asked to describe their existing policies regarding professional supervision, 60 responded.

The questionnaire subcategorized the three functions of professional supervision and asked the participants to respond to eight behavioural statements regarding supervision structure, administrative functions, facilitative functions, practice teaching, skills acquisition, theoretical and reflective learning, emotional support and performance recognition. The ratings of these supervisory behaviours by supervisees and supervisors indicate their perceptions and expectations of professional supervisory functions.

There is a high consensus between supervisees and supervisors regarding existing supervisory practice. Both groups rated skills acquisition and practice teaching as the most effective and most important functions, though they were not in complete accord regarding the functions that they considered less critical. As for supervisory objectives, the responses of supervisors and supervisees were nearly identical. They considered the administrative function the most effective, but rated it as second last in importance.

The most frequent format of supervisory sessions is individual sessions on a by-need basis, usually occurring about once a month and lasting an average of 30 minutes. Scheduled individual meetings were arranged every two to three months and lasted around one and a half hours. Group meetings were also held around every two to three months.

The study shows that supervisors have an overly heavy workload. More than 30% were required to supervise more than six RSWs. Twenty-two per cent were responsible for supervision of 20 or more colleagues. Participants in the focus groups noted that supervisors were increasingly given non-supervisory responsibilities, and the time available for professional supervision had been reduced as a consequence.

The most significant variables affecting the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees are work experience and the length of work in one's current post. The study showed that new supervisees require more attention during sessions, and that new supervisors are less sure about their supervisory duties. The ratings did not vary much across different service settings; however, workers in the family and children service settings gave supervisory effectiveness the lowest rating. The results of the study suggest that the more demanding the setting, the greater the need on the part of workers to receive support and guidance to help them to meet challenges and to perform satisfactorily. Supervisees in organizations with more RSWs perceived supervisory functions as effective and important, but supervisors in these organizations were less positive. Academic qualifications appear to have played no significant role in the perceptions of the participants.

The last chapter of the study provides a more in-depth analysis of the needs of both less experienced and experienced supervisees, the common ground between supervisors and supervisees, and the effect of the organization. The study concludes that the resources and energies in the field have been inappropriately placed; supervisory efforts are not geared to those less experienced workers who need them most. Less experienced supervisors also need extra help to improve their job performance. More experienced workers who rated supervision lower in effectiveness were still extensively supervised. Summarizing the data and analyses, the study proposes the following:

1. **Support for Supervisees:** The profession should contemplate the value of introducing "supervised practice", a period of practice under intensive professional supervision for new social workers who need more support. Upon successful completion of supervised practice, a social worker will achieve professional independence. The profession should have a system in place to determine which experienced workers are capable of independent practice and, as a result, it will be able to redirect its attention to help those who are less experienced.

2. **Support for Supervisors:** Supervisors should be provided with guidelines and accredited training to prepare them for their supervisory functions. The study shows there are functions that both supervisors and supervisees consider important, but not effectively performed. Guidelines and training will provide supervisors with the knowledge and skills to meet the needs of their supervisees. Supervisors will be able to explore the importance of supervisory functions tailored to supervisees, the benefits of a more systematic supervision structure, support for workers in secondary settings, and strategies for more effective supervision delivery.

3. **The Arrangement of Supervision in Organizations:** Supervisors have been overburdened with administrative work, and, as a result, their roles as educators and supporters have suffered. More balance is required: the supervisor must have the time and energy to devote to their educational and supportive roles, and to encourage experienced workers to help those less experienced with peer consultation. The burden of supervisors' administrative responsibilities should be lightened so that more time can be devoted to the pressing demands of supervisory roles.

研究報告摘要

這次研究旨在描繪香港的督導實務概況，找出前線社工督導者和被督導者在現行督導制度下的需要和期望，及探討他們在督導方面的期望的差距。研究亦分析督導者與被督導者心目中的專業社工督導，在行政、教育和支援功能上的效用和重要性，以及年齡、工作經驗、教育水平、服務對象及機構規模對其看法的影響。

研究從兩方面收集資料：透過問卷及焦點小組討論向個別註冊社工蒐集資料，與及由機構自願提供有關其督導安排的資料。研究員以郵寄方式向研究組別內的8,503名註冊社工發出問卷，當中以兩份問卷分別發給社工督導者及被督導者，研究員其後從那些沒有寄回問卷的註冊社工中抽樣及以電話訪問，結果總共得到1,268份回應（247份由督導者及1,021份由被督導者得到），回應率為14.9%。除透過問卷進行搜集資料外，註冊社工亦被邀參加焦點小組，結果共舉行了三次焦點小組討論，合共有二十名社工參加，分享他們的觀點及改善建議。在450間獲邀提供其現行專業督導政策的社會服務機構中，共有60間作出回應。

問卷把專業督導的功能分為三項，並要求回應者就八項有關督導行為的議題作出回應，該八項督導行為計有：督導架構、行政功能、支援性功能、實務指導、技巧承傳、理論與反思的學習、情緒支援及表現認許。督導者與被督導者的評分反映他們對專業督導功能的看法及期望。

就現行的督導實務，督導者與被督導者有高度共識。雙方均認為技巧承傳及實務指導是最重要且最具成效的功能，即使他們對那些較為次要的功能的評分並非完全一致。就督導目標而言，督導者與被督導者的回應幾乎完全相同。他們認為行政功能最為有效，但其重要性僅為次要。

在督導會面方面，最常見的方式是視乎需要進行個別面談，一般是約每月一次，每次平均三十分鐘。至於定期的個別面談，通常每隔兩至三個月安排一次，每次約一個半小時。小組會談則每隔兩至三個月召開一次。

研究顯示，督導者的工作量超出負荷。超過百分之三十的督導者需要督導超過六名註冊社工，而百分之二十二的督導者甚至負責督導二十名或以上的員工。焦點小組討論的參加者表示，督導者的非督導性工作持續增加，結果導致進行專業督導的時間減少。

最能影響督導者與被督導者的看法的因素是工作經驗及於現職的年資。研究顯示，新入職的被督導者在督導面談時需要更多關顧，而新晉的督導者則較不能肯定其應負的督導責任。這些評分在不同的服務類別的差別不大，不過，從事家庭及兒童服務的社工對督導成效給予最低評分。研究結果指出某一服務對社工的要求愈高，社工便更需要支援及指導，好讓他們能成功接受挑戰及達致理想的表現。機構轄下的註冊社工人數愈多，被督導者就更重視督導功能的效用和重要性，但這些機構的督導者的回應卻沒那麼正面。在回應者看來，在專業督導中，學歷並沒有擔演一個重要角色。

研究報告的最後一章對年資較淺與資深的被督導者的需要、督導者與被督導者的共通點、以及僱用機構的效應，作更深入的分析。研究總結出業界過往在資源及精力上的投放出現錯配；督導的努力未能配合那些在這方面最有需要的年資較淺的社工。而年資較淺的督導者亦需要額外的幫助，以改善他們的工作表現。那些給予督導成效較低評分的富經驗社工，則仍在接受廣泛深入的督導。總括數據及分析後，研究作出以下建議：

1. 向被督導者提供支援：業界應仔細考慮推行「督導實務」的重要性，讓那些需要更多支援的新入職社工，在密集式的專業督導下從事社工工作一段時間。待他們成功完成「督導實務」後，便可獨立執行專業實務。業界應設置一套機制，評定哪些資深社工具備獨立執業的能力。若如此，社工專業的關注便可轉而幫助那些年資較淺的社工。

2. 向督導者提供支援：督導者應得到指引及認可訓練，為其發揮督導功能作出充分準備。研究顯示，一些督導者與被督導者均認為重要的督導功能，都未能有效地發揮。指引及訓練能為督導者提供知識和技巧，以切合被督導者的需要。這樣，督導者便能探討為被督導者度身訂造的督導功能的重要性、一個更有系統的督導架構的好處、給予在其他服務機構提供服務的社工的支援，及更有效地提供督導的策略。

3. 僱用機構的督導安排：督導者的行政工作已超出負荷，因而導致其作為教育者及支援者的角色受到削弱。因此，兩者間需取得較多平衡：督導者須在指導及支援方面投入更多時間及精力，以及鼓勵資深同工以朋輩諮詢方式扶助年資較短的同工。此外，應減輕督導者在行政工作方面的負擔，好讓他們能騰出更多時間擔當更有迫切需要的督導角色。

I   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background

In 1997, when the Social Workers Registration Bill was submitted to Legislative Council for enactment, the dominant atmosphere only allowed the Social Workers Registration Board (SWRB) "to provide for the registration of social workers and disciplinary control of the professional registered social workers, and for related matters" (long title of the Social Workers Registration Ordinance, cap 505). The enhancement of professional quality was not included as an object of the Ordinance. As the years develop, there is a growing sentiment and expectation in the sector for the SWRB to develop and enhance the quality of the profession. Though under the constraints of its legal mandate, the SWRB has consulted RSWs a number of times on the plausible foci and directions that the SWRB should embark in relation to professional enhancement. These consultations and the present study are to provide the SWRB with useful reference to decide the necessity to propose inclusion of professional development as one of the Ordinance's objects.

In order to substantiate future consultation work, the SWRB finds it essential to have a fuller knowledge of the existing situation of the sector, especially in view of the fact that the sector is facing critical challenges and has to find means to adapt. In the discussion on quality service through quality staff, the SWRB has the view that professional supervision plays a pivotal role in the process.

One of the essential means to develop our workers and guarantee quality service to users is professional supervision. Essentially, social work is a practice profession. It is through the zealous effort of many that the practice is increasingly supported with theoretical base generalized from researches and empirical findings. Professional practice knowledge and skills are learned and gained in academic institutes. However, it never wins over the fact that continuous professional improvement has to be gained through direct practice and guidance from those experienced. Also, professional supervision is an effective means to enhance job satisfaction and sustaining work morale.

Because of the unique and functional role of supervision in our profession, the Working Group on Supervised Practice was formed in late 2003 by the SWRB. The Working Group is tasked to explore or recommend a system through which social workers are motivated to improve themselves professionally, and are assisted by quality supervision.

Understanding the paucity of information on the current practice among welfare agencies, the Working Group embarks on an all-population study to explore the issue. More comprehensive information will definitely facilitate the Working Group and the SWRB to recommend a quality improvement mechanism that is applicable to the actual situation of the field.

The present study, commissioned by the Working Group, is an empirical one that is not meant for theory building. Information is collected only if they are deemed essential to build up a quality improvement model and mechanism with special reference to professional supervision for the social work sector in Hong Kong.

1.2   Operational Objectives

A)   To grasp the mode, policies and actual provision of existing supervision for social workers in human service agencies

B)   To identify the needs and expectations of frontline social workers and supervisors for supervisory practice

C)   To examine the gap between the needs of social workers and the existing provision.

1.3   Literature Review on Major Concepts

Supervision has been defined in various ways in different times. The most comprehensive and often quoted definition is by Baker (1995). He defines supervision as "an administrative and education process used extensively in social agencies to help social workers further develop and refine their skills and to provide quality assurance for the clients. Administratively, supervisors often assign cases to the most appropriate

social worker, discuss the assessment and intervention plan, and review the social worker's ongoing contact with the client. Educationally, supervision is geared toward helping the social worker better understand social work philosophy and agency policy, become more self-aware, know the agency's and community resources, establish activity priorities, and refine knowledge and skills. Another function of supervision is to enhance the morale of staff while maintaining the system".

It has often been repeated that social work supervision provided by the employing agencies are to involve three functions. There are administrative, educational and supportive functions (Erera & Lazar, 1994; Kadushin & Harkness, 2002; Tsui, 1997a). As defined by Kadushin & Harkness (2002), the administrative function is to ensure effective implementation of agency policy and service delivery. The educational function is to enhance the values, knowledge and skills of supervisees. The supportive function is to raise the morale and job satisfaction of the staff.

1.3.1   *Administrative Function*

The administrative function in social work profession is well researched, yet quite controversial. The two classic studies in social work supervision conducted by Kadushin in 1973 and 1989 in USA found that supervisors and supervisees viewed the educational function as the most useful one and were dissatisfied with administrative part of supervision. While a task-analysis study by Poetner & Rapp in 1983 concluded that most supervisors and supervisees placed administrative function as a function of high priority.

Erera & Lazar's study (1994) examining the three functions (administrative, educational and supportive) of social work supervision provides two useful insights of supervisory practice in social work. The joint responsibilities of the administrative and educational functions might make the role of supervisor ambiguous. Supervisors and supervisees might have difficulty to define when educating begins and when monitoring commences, as the right balance between the functions requires cautious cultivation. It was further found that the weight and proportion placed on the administrative function would differ by different service settings (Erera & Lazar, 1994). In certain service environment, workers require strong steering from administrative directives.

Also, there is the possibility that the perception and expectation over the balance

is different among supervisors and supervisees too. A local study by Grace Ko (1987) on family setting found that supervisors perceived themselves to have fulfilled the three functions of supervision to a satisfactory level, yet supervisees viewed supervisory sessions to be concentrating on the administrative one and 17% of supervisees even commented that supervisors did not perform the educational function at all. Essentially, supervision is a professional practice of monitoring, guidance and development embedded in an organizational setting (Holloway & Brager, 1989; Miller, 1987; Munson, 2002). It is not surprising that social work supervisor, who is a professional worker and a manager or administrator at the same time, devotes large portion of time on administrative clarification, monitoring and workload management during supervisory session. According to Kadushin & Harkness (2002), supervisor's top concern is to execute agency strategies and policy accurately, effectively and appropriately.

1.3.2   *Educational and Supportive Functions*

Similar to the administrative functions, there have been some arguments on the importance of educational and supportive functions in social work supervision. Social work, as a practice discipline in a human service, requires social workers to learn and improve as they gain work experience. Social work supervisors, therefore, play an essential role in guiding and stimulating workers to continuously advance themselves. Also social work is an emotionally-charged discipline, the practitioners need both instrumental and emotional support to maintain work spirit and morale in face of frustrations and difficulties.

However, in the task analysis study of Poertner and Rapp (1983) among supervisors and supervisees, 63% of the respondents in the study rated administrative function as most important, while only 20% identified education and supportive functions as important. In an empirical study on administrative and supportive functions in supervision, Erera and Lazar (1994) suggested that the two functions were not compatible to each other and should be separated and conducted by different supervisors.

There are arguments among scholars over what are the most preferred functions of social work supervision. Kadushin (1992b) held a different view from that of Poertner & Rapp, and opined that the "nature of social work" demanded educative and supportive supervision. The emotional demands on the practitioner as a professional and as a person dealing with traumatic, problematic individual and social problems required the support

of the supervisory process to sustain continued effort in practice and to develop innovative and proactive responses. In fact, the two studies on supervision by Kadushin (1974, 1992a) found that the administrative function of supervisor has created a great deal of dissatisfaction, and supervisors should strengthen their educational and supportive roles.

In Kadushin's second survey (1992a), supervisees rated empathy and concern from supervisors to be the most preferred supervisory qualities, then followed by expertise, knowledge, skills and practice experience, and thirdly by their ability to listen. It is clear in Kadushin's study that the preferred qualities of supervisors are all related to supportive and educational abilities.

In his 1989 study, Kadushin further found that supervisors ranked educational activities to be first in importance, supportive activities second, and administrative function the third. He also found that the greatest satisfactions in supervision experienced by supervisors were related to educational supervision. The perception of the supervisees corresponded with those of supervisors. Kadushin was convinced that both supervisors and supervisees had similar expectation on supervisory functions.

Besides educational work, Himle, Jayaratne and Thyness (1989) found that the instrumental and informational support by supervisors might reduce frontline workers' psychological stress, burnout and job dissatisfaction. The studies of Newsome and Pillari (1991) and Rauktis and Koeske (1994) found that supportive supervision might have direct and positive association with job. The two studies strongly supported strengthening the supportive function of supervision to maintain high morale and job satisfaction. Tsui (1997b), summarizing researches on supervision from 1970-1995, found that frontline workers expected more educational and supportive elements to be incorporated into supervision. On the whole, scholars who stress the developmental aspects of the supervision place more importance and emphasis on the educational and supportive functions of supervision.

All in all, administrative function is to ensure effective implementation of agency policy and service delivery. The education function is to upkeep the social work values, and to improve the knowledge and skills of supervisees. The supportive function is to uphold the morale and enhance the job satisfaction of staff. Professional supervision has been performing these functions, and a right or an effective balance among these functions is not easy to strike.

1.4　　**Research Questions**

Similar to countries where social work profession is more developed, supervision in Hong Kong has become an institutionalized infrastructure in social work assuming a structural characteristic in social work practice and service delivery (Veeder, 1990; Kadushin, 1992a; Munson, 2002). Still professionally, supervision is a primary method of training and mechanism for professional regulation. Because of the multi-level expectation on social work supervision, the study sought views from practicing workers (supervisors and supervisees) through questionnaires and focus groups, and from agencies which provide the organizational structure for social workers to deliver services. The data collected is to produce a descriptive picture of the supervisory practice in Hong Kong, to identify the needs and expectation of frontline social workers and supervisors, and to examine the gap in their expectation. To facilitate analysis, the questionnaires were designed to answer the following research questions:

A) Whether there are marked differences between supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions on the frequency, effectiveness and importance of supervision.

B) Whether the age and work experiences of workers (supervisors and supervisees) have effect on their perceptions on supervisory effectiveness and importance.

C) Whether the target clients of the workers (supervisors and supervisees) have effect on workers' perceptions on supervisory effectiveness and importance of supervision.

D) Whether the education level of workers (supervisors and supervisees) has effect on their perception on supervisory effectiveness and importance.

E) Whether the size of the agency at which the workers (supervisors and supervisees) are employed has effect on their perception on supervisory effectiveness and importance.

The study will also further explore whether a number of related variables have effect on the perceptions and the expectations of the supervisor and supervisee. When the study can identify differences in workers' perceptions because of their organizational and personal variables, the study will, basing on the observation and analysis over the data, make recommendations to bridge the gap or improve situation.

II   METHODOLOGY

2.1   Population

All RSWs who indicated to SWRB to be in social work posts were in principle target of the study. The study was to explore the perception of supervisors and supervisees. Those who indicated themselves as ASWO, SSWA, SWA or without specified grade to the SWRB were assumed to be supervisees. Supervisors were those who specified themselves in SWO or SSWA grade. Because of the above assumptions, all ASWOs, SWAs and those with grade unspecified were sent the "questionnaire for supervisee" by mail, and the SWOs were sent the "questionnaire for supervisor", while SSWAs were sent both questionnaires for supervisor and supervisee. The covering letter asked the respondents to contact the secretariat of the SWRB for an alternative questionnaire if they were supervisors while receiving supervisee questionnaire, or vice versa. A total of 7,081 questionnaires for supervisee were sent to ASWOs, SWAs, and those with unspecified grade. A total of 808 questionnaires for supervisor were sent to SWOs, and 614 SSWAs were sent two questionnaires.

The study defined supervisors as those who had to supervise one or more registered social workers, and supervisees as those who did not have to supervise any registered social worker, and each respondent was to return one questionnaire only. By the end of July 2005, a total of 851 mailed questionnaires, 704 from supervisees and 147 from supervisors, were returned which represents 10.4% of the target RSWs.

To supplement the response rate of the mailed questionnaire, the study random sampled among those who did not reply the mailed questionnaires by telephone interview. During 27 July - 10 August, 417 respondents were interviewed by phone, 317 were supervisees and 100 were supervisors, so making a return rate of 14.9%. The table below summarizes the response rate.

Table 2.1   Response to the questionnaire survey

Response Format	Supervisor	Supervisee	Total
Mailed questionnaire	147	704	851
Telephone interview	100	317	417
Total	247	1021	1268

Individual respondents were invited to join focus groups to share their views on the existing supervisory arrangement, and recommendations for further development. A total 20 RSWs turned up in three separate meetings, enriching the analyses of the present study.

Agencies which employed one or more registered social workers were asked to share with the SWRB their agencies' existing policy over supervision objectives, frequency, format and the expected roles and conduct of the supervisors and supervisees, if any. A total of 450 letters to agencies had been sent out, 60 agencies replied.

2.2   Research Design

2.2.1   *Questionnaire*

A questionnaire for supervisor and supervisee was designed to meet the purposes of the study, namely, to understand the existing practice of supervisory practice in the sector and whether the workers of different background will have different perception and expectation over the supervisory arrangement and functions.

To collect data on the existing supervisory arrangement, a recall system method was adopted. The supervisee respondents were asked to recall the frequencies, duration of supervisory sessions in the past year. Supervisors and supervisees were asked to recall the frequency, effectiveness and importance of 24 supervisory activities. The study was to identify whether there were significant differences in their recall and perceptions because of the their organizational and personal background.

The comments sought from focus group members and information from agencies were meant to substantiate and qualify the statistics of the present study.

2.2.2   *Focus Group*

Respondents of mailed questionnaire were invited to participate in focus groups to share their views on the current practice of supervision and the development of professional supervision. A total of 56 persons indicated interest. They were asked to join any 1 of 6 sessions according to their role in supervision (supervisor or supervisee) and their years of experience in the post (1 to 5 years and 6 years or above). After a number of attempts in meeting rescheduling, 3 focus groups were held. A total of 20 supervisors and supervisees joined the focus groups and shared their views.

Focus group discussion was recorded. The views of the focus groups members were summarized under two topics - areas for improvement and the ways to improve the situation. Though the focus groups were formed to discuss the supervisory arrangement, and practices, a large number of discussions were on the total quality of the sector, and ways to maintain, enhance the quality of service delivery of the social work profession.

2.2.3   *Information from agencies*

All the replies of 60 agencies were input into computer. The computerized data were sorted and counted against some core concepts of the present study with the help of Nvivo 2.0.

2.3   Instrument

2.3.1   *Structuring the questionnaires*

Two questionnaires were drafted for the purpose: one for supervisor and one for supervisee (appendices). Both of them are essentially the same except supervisees were asked the frequency, duration of supervisory sessions and their views on an appropriate supervisory arrangement. The respondents were also asked to provide organizational and personal information for correlation analysis.

The main body of the questionnaire was comprised of 24 behavioral statements. The statements were repeated 3 times to understand how supervision was conducted, and the effectiveness and the importance of supervision. The 24 behavioral statements were meant to elaborate the 3 primary supervisory functions of social work: administrative, educational and emotional support functions.

Three research questionnaires on social work supervision were used as reference to structure the present questionnaires. They were "Supervision Analysis Questionnaire" by Munson (2001) in the Handbook of Clinical Social Work Supervision, the evaluation of supervisor by supervisee in Supervision in Social Work by Kadushin & Harkness (2002). The result of a qualitative study by the Hong Kong Social Workers Association conducted in 1997 was also used to include local concerns to the statements.

The draft questionnaire was presented to the Working Group on Supervised Practice of the SWRB. Members of the Working Group, who were senior social work managers and social work academics, further improved the relevance of the behavioral statements to the Hong Kong sector.

2.3.2   *Eight concepts used in the questionnaire*

The administrative, educational and emotional support functions of the social work professional supervision are elaborated into 8 operational concepts.

A)   *Supervision structure*

It is the regular and systematic arrangement under which professional supervision is to be conducted. It includes agenda setting, recording of meetings, and filing of records. Though it is a structural arrangement than a supervisory function, if effectively arranged, the structure will serve its functional value in professional supervision.

B)   *Administrative function*

Supervisors have the responsibility to explain and clarify the objectives and requirements of the agency to workers, assigning job and monitoring their work progress. The main purpose is to hold the workers accountable to their work.

C) *Facilitative function*

The supervisors are to facilitate co-operation among workers so they can work as a team within the agency, and network with external stakeholders in the community.

D) *Practice teaching*

Supervisors are to teach the workers practical skills to solve problems that workers are immediately facing in their work.

E) *Abilities enhancement*

Supervisors are to help workers to grasp and identify alternatives beyond their immediate tasks and problems. It is meant to enhance workers' problem-solving capabilities to become self-dependent workers.

F) *Theoretical & reflective learning*

Practice-theory integration is an essential learning element in social work practice. Supervisors, playing the role of an educator, help workers to reflect, resolve value conflicts, and integrate social work theory with their direct practice.

G) *Emotional support*

Social work is an emotionally intense professional practice. Supervisors have to play the role of a supporter allowing workers to express their work-related frustrations and emotions.

H) *Performance Recognition*

Supervisors have the role to acknowledge the performance of workers and to point out their strengths and weaknesses so workers can continually seek for improvement.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

The study is descriptive as well as exploratory. Some data such as the frequency and format of supervisory meetings were presented without further statistical analyses. Statistical analyses were essentially used to analyze the ratings of the supervisors and supervisees on the effectiveness and the importance of the supervisory functions. In order to explore whether the background of the workers had impact on their perceptions and expectation, Lambda, Kendall's tau c, Pearson's coefficient and Pearson's regression were employed to analyze the data. Lambda was used for responses of questions, which were in nominal scale. They included Q73, Q76, Q78, Q79 and Q81 of the supervisee questionnaire, Q57, Q61, Q62 and Q64 of the supervisor questionnaire. Kendall's tau c was used to predict responses in ordinal scale. These included Q74 and Q78 of supervisee questionnaire, and Q58, Q61 and Q68 of the supervisor questionnaire. Pearson coefficient as prediction tool for interval scale was used for Q75, Q80 and Q82 of the supervisee questionnaire, and Q59, Q63, Q65, Q66, and Q67 of the supervisor questionnaire. To further ascertain whether there were significant differences in perceptions among workers working for different target client groups and having different academic qualifications, their perceptions were further analyzed by Pearson's regression.

For easy reference and presentations, responses in interval scale were categorized and tabulated, though the correlations were calculated using the real value of the interval scale. Significant differences in correlation of less than 0.05 and 0.005 were marked as a rough estimate of confidence.

The observations obtained from focus groups and agencies were used to substantiate the generalizations derived from the statistics. Comments made by the focus groups were rated as individual views. When these comments could not be substantiated by statistics, the researcher would not use them to make recommendations.

2.5 Limitations of the Study

The core analysis of the study is based on the questionnaire responses from individual RSWs, both supervisors and supervisees. The RSWs could either send back the filled questionnaire by post or they could be sampled and contacted for telephone

interviews. The data collected showed that there were some differences in ratings between those who mailed back the questionnaires and those who were interviewed by telephone. The telephone respondents tended to give a higher ratings, yet the order of effectiveness and importance were corresponding between the two groups of respondents.

Table: 2.2   Comparison on ratings of supervisors from mailed questionnaire and telephone interview

	Mail survey			Telephone survey		
Functions	Frequency	Effectiveness	Ideal mode	Frequency	Effectiveness	Ideal mode
Sup Struct	2.33	2.33	2.18	2.47	2.52	2.27
Ad Func	2.61	2.59	2.44	2.76	2.63	2.38
Faci'tive Func	2.51	2.53	2.27	2.51	2.56	2.19
Pract Teach	3.10	3.17	2.96	3.16	3.27	3.05
Abilities Enhan	3.34	3.25	3.27	3.30	3.27	3.14
Theo & Ref Learn	2.47	2.49	2.53	2.44	2.50	2.39
Emotional Sup	2.56	2.55	2.51	2.52	2.53	2.38
Perf Recog	2.78	2.79	2.64	2.82	2.83	2.58

Table: 2.3   Comparison on ratings of supervisees from mailed questionnaire and telephone interview

	Mail survey			Telephone survey		
Functions	Frequency	Effectiveness	Ideal mode	Frequency	Effectiveness	Ideal mode
Sup Struct	2.10	2.21	2.10	2.19	2.32	2.11
Ad Func	2.20	2.30	2.31	2.27	2.38	2.29
Faci'tive Func	2.11	2.32	2.36	2.12	2.28	2.30
Pract Teach	2.53	2.98	3.02	2.66	2.94	2.98
Abilities Enhan	2.75	3.03	3.15	2.88	2.98	3.13
Theo & Ref Learn	1.84	2.23	2.56	1.91	2.09	2.47
Emotional Sup	1.96	2.29	2.51	2.04	2.20	2.39
Perf Recog	2.13	2.35	2.69	2.29	2.37	2.60

Lambda and Goodman & Kruskal tau were used to test whether there were significant differences between mail responses and telephone response from the supervisees and supervisors. The result of both tests showed that there were no significant differences in probability of smaller than 0.05 between mail responses and telephone responses. The data collected through two methods of data collection were calculated and compiled as one.

The study sought responses from supervisees and supervisors to assess their perceived frequencies, effectiveness and importance on a number of supervisory functions. The study could identify that supervisees and supervisors had differential perceptions on the existing supervisory provisions in Hong Kong. If the study could pair up the supervisees and supervisors who had actual supervisor-supervisee relationship, the study could more reliably see that the differences in perception were a consequence of their supervisory roles. There were only a few studies (Ko, 1987) which had studied supervision by asking the supervisor-supervisees dyad, and the number of pairs could only be limited in number. As one of the objectives of the study is to identify the mode, and delivery arrangement of supervision in Hong Kong, and to collect views from the whole relevant population, no attempt was made to pair up the supervisory dyad.

Also, logical error, in form of dimensional similarity halo, is another possible concern. The concept refers to a respondent's tendency to rate similar dimensions he or she perceives as conceptually similar or logically related. This is an apparent logical coherence of various dimensions irrespective of the respondents' preference. People usually organize concepts in a cluster and establish relations among them. They use the concept to rate similar statement related to the concept with the same rate. Therefore, their ratings on one dimension such as frequency could have effect on their ratings on effectiveness and importance.

The grades indicated by RSWs to SWRB are not the perfect way to identify whether they are supervisees (who are supervised but do not supervise any RSW) or supervisors (who at least supervise one RSW). It is possible that if a RSW who received a not-applicable questionnaire was not motivated enough to request for an applicable one from the SWRB, and so reducing the return rate of the study.

In order to supplement the mailed return with a telephone survey among those non-respondents, the respondents were requested to provide identifiable information, either name or registration number. This arrangement might again impede the return motivation of the respondents.

The study, though a large scale one involving the total population of social work supervisors and supervisees in Hong Kong, is only an exploratory one to identify the current state of social work supervision in Hong Kong. A generalized definition of supervision is used, causing the constructs or components of supervision a bit vague.

Such generalized definition affects the construct validity of the research result. On the other hand the research is able to provide a fuller picture of supervision in Hong Kong.

The study is largely relied on mailed self-administered questionnaires with Likert scaling items. The weakness of the scale is the problem of subjectivity. Yet, with a large sample, the study can denote and indicate the trend of thoughts among the supervisors and supervisees.

III   RESULTS

3.1   Questionnaires from Individual RSWs

3.1.1   *Profile of the supervisors and supervisees*

3.1.1.1   *Type of agency*

Table: 3.1   Respondent profile by type of agency

Type of agency	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
Multi-service agency	56.4%	63.4%
Single-service centre	43.6%	36.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	250	1014

By percentage, there were more supervisee respondents working in multi-service agencies, i.e. nearly one third of them were from multi-service agencies. The percentage of supervisor respondents who were working in multi-service agencies was lower, i.e. around 56%.

3.1.1.2   *Size of agency*

Table: 3.2   Respondent profile by size of organization (number of staff including non-RSW)

Size of organization	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
1-9 staff	6.0%	6.8%
10-49 staff	28.5%	34.6%
50-199 staff	17.3%	13.3%
200-499 staff	11.6%	14.2%
500 or above	36.5%	31.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	249	999

It is observed that a large proportion (41.4%) of supervisee respondents were from smaller agencies with less than 50 staff, and 31% of supervisees were from large agencies with 500 or above staff. The percentage was quite similar for supervisor respondents, 34.5% of supervisor respondents were from less than 50 staff agencies, while 36.5% was from large agencies with 500 or above staff.

3.1.1.3 _Number of RSW in organization_

Table: 3.3 Respondent profile by number of RSWs working in organization

Number of RSWs	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
1-9 RSW	27.1%	28.0%
10-49 RSW	32.0%	35.6%
50-199 RSW	20.4%	13.3%
200-499 RSW	12.9%	15.5%
500 or above	7.6%	7.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	225	854

If the number of RSWs is used to define the size of the agency, then medium sized agencies were with the highest percentage of respondents. Nearly half (48.9%) of the supervisee respondents were from agencies with 10-199 RSWs employees. More than half (52.4%) of supervisor respondents were from medium-sized agencies. By comparison, large-sized agencies, employing more than 200 RSWs, had a lower percentage of participation both among supervisee respondents (23.1%) and supervisor respondents (20.5%).

Since we do not have ready statistics to define the organizations by their service type and the number of employees, either RSWs or non-RSWs, the figure provided in the Chapter cannot reflect the representativeness of different kinds of organizations in the study.

3.1.1.4 _Age_

Table: 3.4 Respondent profile by Age

Age	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
20-24	0.8%	7.4%
25-29	5.2%	32.9%
30-34	19.5%	23.8%
35-39	20.3%	15.5%
40-44	23.9%	11.1%
45-49	20.3%	5.4%
50-54	9.2%	3.1%
55-59	0.8%	0.7%
60 or above	0.0%	0.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	251	1,013

It is logical that the average age of supervisor respondents was higher than those of supervisee respondents. A large percentage (40.3%) of supervisee respondents were under 30 years of age, while 64.5% of supervisor respondents were from the age bracket of 35-49 years. It is interesting to note that 7 of the supervisee respondents who were over 55 were being supervised and with no duty to supervise any RSWs. Yet, on the other hand, there were 2 supervisor respondents who were younger than 24, and they were already supervising RSWs.

3.1.1.5 _Highest qualification obtained_

Table: 3.5 Respondent profile by highest qualification obtained

Highest qualification	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
Social Work Dip/AD	20.7%	39.2%
Bachelor degree	37.8%	43.4%
Pgd/Master degree	40.2%	15.8%
Doctorate degree	0.8%	0.2%
Others	0.4%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	251	1,014

Once again, it is reasonable to observe that supervisee respondents would have lower academic qualifications than supervisor respondents. The majority (43.4%) of supervisee respondents had a bachelor degree, and the majority (40.2%) of supervisor respondents had a post-graduate diploma or a master degree. It is interesting to note that 2 (1.5%) of the supervisee respondents were with doctorate degree, while 20.7% of supervisor respondents had social work diploma or associate degree were supervising RSWs.

3.1.1.6   *Years in social work profession*

Table: 3.6   Respondent profile by years serving in the social work profession

Years of service	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
1-5	7.6%	40.0%
6-10	20.0%	33.4%
11-15	28.0%	15.7%
16-20	24.8%	6.8%
21-25	11.6%	2.6%
26 or above	8.0%	1.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	250	1,014

The majority (40%) of supervisee respondents worked in the social work profession for less than 5 years, a large percentage (33.4%) of supervisee respondents had 6-10 years of experience. On the other hand, it is a bit uncomforting to note that 10.9% of supervisee respondents had 16 years or above work experience in social work profession, and in fact 15 of them had been in the profession for more than 26 years.

3.1.1.7   *Target client groups*

Table: 3.7   Respondent profile by target client groups

Target client groups	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
Family and children	7.0%	18.2%
Youth	24.4%	35.4%
Adult	0.4%	0.9%
Elderly	23.1%	13.7%
Deprived groups	1.7%	2.4%
Rehabilitation	27.3%	18.9%
Offender & ex-offender	2.1%	2.0%
Substance abuse	1.2%	1.4%
Others	12.8%	7.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	242	1,004

35.4% of the supervisee respondents claimed they worked for youth, 18.9% worked in rehabilitation services and 18.2% in family and children services. 27.3% of the supervisor respondents claimed they worked in rehabilitation services, followed by youth services of 24.4% and elderly work of 23.1%. Only 7% of the supervisor respondents worked for family and children.

3.1.1.8   *Years in current position*

Table: 3.8   Respondent profile by years in current position

Years in current position	Supervisor (%)	Supervisee (%)
1-5	46.8%	63.6%
6-10	32.3%	26.6%
11-15	14.5%	7.6%
16-20	4.4%	1.1%
21-25	1.6%	0.5%
26 or above	0.4%	0.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Cases	248	999

90.2% of supervisee respondents worked in the present position for less than 10 years. 9.8% of supervisee respondents who had been in the same post for more than 10 years were not given any supervisory responsibility. Amazingly, 5 of the supervisee respondents indicated to have been working in the current position for more than 20 years. Nearly half (46.8%) of the supervisor respondents were in the current position for less than 5 years, they were a group of less experienced supervisors.

3.1.1.9   Number of RSW to be supervised

Table: 3.9   Supervisor profile by the number of RSW supervisees

Number of RSW	Cases	(%)
1-5	168	67.7%
6-10	58	23.4%
11-15	16	6.5%
16 or above	6	2.4%
Total	248	100.0%

Majority (67.7%) of the supervisor respondents supervised less than five RSWs, while a quarter (23.4%) of them had to supervisor 6-10 RSWs. 2.3% claimed they were supervising more 16 RSWs.

3.1.1.10 Number of staff to be supervised

Table: 3.10   Supervisor profile by the number of supervisees (including non-RSW)

Number of supervisees	Cases	(%)
1-20	186	77.5%
21-40	33	13.8%
41-60	8	3.3%
61-80	7	2.9%
81 or above	6	2.5%
Total	240	100.0%

The same group claimed they had to supervise non RSWs as well. The majority was supervising less than 20 staff, while 5.4% claimed they supervised more than 60 staff in the agency.

3.1.1.11 Proportion of supervisory duty

Table: 3.11   Supervisor profile by the proportion of supervisory responsibilities

Proportion of supervisory responsibilities	Cases	(%)
1-20	133	53.2%
21-40	71	28.4%
41-60	34	13.6%
61-80	9	3.6%
81 or above	3	1.2%
Total	250	100.0%

None of supervisor respondents thought supervisory responsibilities were their sole job duty. More than half (53.2%) indicated that supervisory responsibilities were only 20% of their job.

3.1.1.12 RSW or non-RSW as supervisor

Table: 3.12   Supervisee profile by the social work status of the supervisor

Status of the supervisor	Cases	(%)
RSW supervisor	940	93.0%
Non-RSW supervisor	71	7.0%
Total	1,011	100.0%

7% of the supervisee respondents were not supervised by RSW. If it were generalisable to the total population, there would be quite a substantial number of supervisees practicing without professional supervision.

3.1.1.13 Format and frequency of supervisory session

The supervisees were asked how often, in what ways and how long they met their supervisors last year. Also they were asked their preferred mode of meeting and the length of the meeting.

Table: 3.13   Frequency and appropriate frequency of different supervisory format indicated
by supervisees

Supervision format	Frequency	Appropriate frequency
Individual supervision with appointment	1.67	1.89
Individual supervision (no appointment / when necessary)	2.79	2.93
Group supervision	1.99	1.86

As 1) represents once every 6 months, 2) once every 2 to 3 months, the data indicate that once every 2 or 3 months were the norm for individual supervision with appointment, and that is what the supervisees preferred. 3) represents once a month, that is, supervisees met the supervisors more often in supervision without appointment or when necessary. It is seen that in general, supervisees also preferred the frequency for individual meetings without appointment to be about once a month. Group supervision sessions were on average held once every 2 or 3 months, and supervisees thought that was appropriate.

Table 3.14   Duration and appropriate duration of different supervisory format indicated by supervisees

Supervision format	Duration	Appropriate duration
Individual supervision with appointment	2.60	2.52
Individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary)	1.35	1.46
Group supervision	3.23	3.14

For the duration of various supervisory formats, 1) represents around 30 minutes, 2) around one hour 3) around 1.5 hours, and 4) around 2 hours. The statistics above show that the duration of individual sessions, either with appointment or without, was acceptable. The norm for individual supervision with appointment was around 1 hour to 1.5 hour. Sessions with appointment were around 30 minutes to one hour. Group supervision was around 1.5 hour to 2 hours.

The existing supervision arrangement is not totally formal. Supervision sessions were mostly held without appointment. The supervisees seemed to prefer this way. There were more "pop-in" supervisory sessions than arranged and regular sessions. This indicated that workers would like the supervisors be available for advice.

Group supervision is a supplement rather than a substitute for individual supervision. During the focus group discussions, majority of participants opined that peer and group supervision could help the staff to be more sensitive to the needs and difficulties of others by creating an atmosphere of mutual help and sharing, though peer and group supervision might not be a good choice for an inexperienced staff.

According to the documents and information provided by agencies, supervision sessions are supposed to be regular and scheduled in advance. Munson (2002) had recommended that effective supervision should be structured, regular, consistent, case-oriented and evaluated, however, the present study showed that supervisors met their supervisees on need basis, and the supervisees preferred such arrangement. Tsui (2004) reported the similar finding in his qualitative study on supervisors and supervisees.

3.1.2   *Overall ratings on supervisory functions by supervisors and supervisees*

A comparison between the supervisors' and supervisees' responses shows that supervisors gave higher ratings than supervisees on all functions including frequency of the functions used during supervisory sessions, the effectiveness of the functions if used, and whether the functions were important in professional supervision.

3.1.2.1   *Ratings and rankings on supervisory functions*

Table: 3.15   Ratings and rankings on supervisory functions by supervisors

Functions	Frequency	Effectiveness	Importance
Abilities enhancement	3.32 (1)	3.26 (1)	3.22 (1)
Practice teaching	3.12 (2)	3.21 (2)	3.00 (2)
Performance recognition	2.80 (3)	2.81 (3)	2.62 (3)
Administrative function	2.67 (4)	2.60 (4)	2.41 (6)
Emotional support	2.54 (5)	2.54 (5/6)	2.46 (5)
Facilitative function	2.51 (6)	2.54 (5/6)	2.24 (7)
Theoretical & reflective learning	2.46 (7)	2.50 (7)	2.47 (4)
Supervision structure	2.39 (8)	2.40 (8)	2.22 (8)

Table: 3.16   Ratings and rankings on supervisory functions by supervisees

Functions	Frequency	Effectiveness	Importance
Abilities enhancement	2.79 (1)	3.01 (1)	3.14 (1)
Practice teaching	2.57 (2)	2.97 (2)	3.01 (2)
Administrative function	2.22 (3)	2.33 (4)	2.30 (7)
Performance recognition	2.18 (4)	2.36 (3)	2.66 (3)
Supervision structure	2.13 (5)	2.25 (7)	2.11 (8)
Facilitative function	2.11 (6)	2.31 (5)	2.34 (6)
Emotional support	1.98 (7)	2.26 (6)	2.47 (5)
Theoretical & reflective learning	1.86 (8)	2.19 (8)	2.53 (4)

The supervisors had been consistent in their ratings on effectiveness and importance over the functions. They had been trying to enhance the abilities of supervisees, and helped the supervisees in their practice. They thought they had been effective in the abilities enhancement and practice teaching functions. Also they rated these two functions highest in importance. The supervisees also rated abilities enhancement having the highest frequency in supervisory sessions followed by practice teaching. Also they rated these two functions highest in effectiveness, and also gave them high ratings for importance.

Supervisors paid less attention to the supervisory arrangement of having agenda and written preparation for the supervisory sessions, and gave the second lowest rating in frequency to theoretical and reflective learning. These two functions had the lowest effectiveness ratings as well, while the supervisors rated facilitative function and supervision structure lowest in importance.

Though both the supervisors and supervisees rated abilities enhancement and practice teaching high in frequency, the supervisees rated theoretical and reflective learning and emotional support lowest in frequency. Also even if there was theoretical and reflective learning and emotional support during the supervisory sessions, these function were rated low in effectiveness. However, the functions, which were rated lowest in importance, were the supervision structure and administrative functions.

On the whole, the supervisors and supervisees seemed to have similar perception on the importance of the supervision, but did not seem to coincide in the perception of the frequency and effectiveness of some functions. Yet there were no obvious conflicts

in their views over the existing supervisory practice in welfare agencies. The data collected did not indicate that supervisors viewed the supervisory relationship from an organizational perspective, and supervisees viewed it from an emotional perspective. Tsui (2004) has observed in his qualitative study on supervision in Hong Kong that as far as the purpose of supervision was concerned, there were consensus among supervisors and supervisees. Both supervisors and supervisees agreed that supervision was meant to enhance service quality and professionalisation of workers.

3.1.2.2   *Ratings on supervisory objectives*

Table: 3.17   Supervisors' ratings on supervisory objectives

Objectives	Effectiveness	Importance
A means to systematically report work	3.77 (1)	3.31 (3)
To be more effective and efficient	3.72 (2)	3.53 (2)
Enhance professional growth and work abilities	3.68 (3)	3.54 (1)
Enhance job satisfaction of colleagues	3.42 (4)	3.18 (4)

Table: 3.18   Supervisees' ratings on supervisory objectives

Objectives	Effectiveness	Importance
A means to systematically report work	3.18 (1)	3.11 (4)
To be more effective and efficient	3.05 (2)	3.44 (2)
Enhance professional growth and work abilities	2.95 (3)	3.51 (1)
Enhance job satisfaction of colleagues	2.79 (4)	3.12 (3)

Supervisors rated professional growth and work abilities enhancement the highest in importance, followed by effectiveness and efficiency. The accountability (administrative) function was rated the lowest in importance. Supervisees have been consistent in rating the importance of supervisory objectives compared to their responses on different supervisory functions. They gave professional growth and work abilities enhancement the highest ratings, followed by work effectiveness and efficiency, and administration function was given the lowest ratings.

Both in the ratings of behavioral statements and supervisory objectives, the supervisors and supervisees were similar and consistent in the order of importance over various supervisory functions.

3.2   Feedback from Agencies

A total of 60 agencies replied. Four of them indicated that though they had RSWs in their staff team, they were not organizations for social work service provision, so they did not have professional supervisory arrangement.

Among the 56 replies and document provided, 50 agencies had recommended meeting frequency. Yet the variation in meeting frequency was quite extensive. Some agencies recommended supervision session to be held once every two weeks, some expected supervision to be held at least once a year. The norm seemed to be once in every two or three months. Seven agencies expected less experienced workers and workers who needed help to have more frequent supervisory sessions.

Nineteen respondents mentioned they had individual supervision, among them, 15 also had group supervision arrangement, and another 3 mentioned peer supervision as well. Twenty-four mentioned they kept records for supervision. For agencies that mentioned code of practice in their replies, 3 stated that supervision must be fair, 10 mentioned objectivity, and 17 expected content of supervision to be kept confidential. Two agencies had specifically defined the roles of supervisors and supervisees.

As regard to the concepts explored in the study, 9 agencies mentioned the provision of supervision structure. 29 mentioned administrative function, 25 mentioned facilitative function, 3 mentioned practice teaching, 35 mentioned ability enhancement, only 1 mentioned theoretical and reflective learning, 17 mentioned emotional support and 6 mentioned performance recognition as functions of supervision.

Though agencies were asked to share their supervisory practices, 10 agencies provided documents that elaborated evaluation arrangement besides that of supervision. In all these documents, there were detailed accounts on the evaluation system specifying the goals, roles of parties involved, the procedure to be followed, and expected outcome of evaluation, etc. In comparison, the description on supervision was much briefer and simpler. Though the study could not conclude that agencies put more importance on evaluation than on supervision, the discussion of the focus group did recommend agencies or concerned parties to provide clearer guidelines on the content, roles of the parities involved and expected result of the supervision provided in agencies.

3.3   Summary of Focus Group Discussion

The discussion was around two areas: weaknesses of supervisory arrangement that the sector was facing and suggestions to improve the situation.

A)   *Problems that the sector was facing*

a)   *Unbalanced supervision content*

i)   Supervision emphasized strong administrative accountability specifying work targets and outputs. By comparison, the learning and skills improvement functions were minimized.

ii)   There were supervisors who had different supervision styles, some emphasizing too much on self-reflection than practice teaching and learning.

b)   *Workload of supervisor*

i)   Supervisees could not have high expectation on the supervisors because of their heavy workload. The notional establishment for supervisor-supervisee no longer existed. Supervisors were given more administrative and planning work, they would intervene only in crisis. The situation became worse in settings which involved a lot of non-professional and minor workers. Supervisors did not have sufficient time to be available to provide supervision or to offer help.

ii)   Professional supervision was given lower priority by senior management in organizations

iii)   It was the general observation that supervisees would have a higher morale if the supervision quality was good, and supervision meetings were regularly held.

B) *Recommendations suggested by focus groups*

a) *Support to social work supervisor*

i) It was important to provide training on social work supervision to refresh social work supervisors. It was perceived that supervisors of SWD could have some training, while those in NGOs did not have the privilege. The training provided should include leadership skills, decision-making abilities and commitment to the profession besides social work knowledge and supervision practice skills. Knowledge from other disciplines could widen the horizon in supervision. Most supervisors learned how to supervise through their previous supervisory experience. If their former supervisors did not do the job well, the new supervisors would perpetuate the situation.

ii) Being a supervisor for a long time, one would become an administrator than a practice teacher and mentor. Either the supervisors had to continue advancing their practice skills or experienced workers should share the supervision work of organizational supervisors.

b) *More support for fresh social workers*

i) Fresh social workers tended to be weak in logical thinking, unstable in emotional state, unpolished in helping skills, inadequate in the knowledge of the service field and target. Therefore, these new social workers needed more practice teaching, guidance in reflective learning, emotional support and reassurance.

ii) Emotional support was very important for new workers. Besides scheduled sessions, frequent face-to-face or phone consultation could help the workers.

c) *SWRB as a clearing house for in-service training information*

SWRB was expected to engage in training, quality improvement, life-long learning, and quality assessment of the performance of supervisors and supervisees. Besides formal and professional supervision, continual training was important for social workers to grow professionally. SWRB could act as a clearinghouse disseminating in-service training and professional advancement activities to RSWs. Supervisors had been burdened by heavy administrative work, it would be more effective if SWRB could redirect training information in the sector to individual RSWs.

d) *SWRB to introduce voluntary social work advancement system*

Professional supervision was only one of the ways to promote quality social work practice. SWRB should try to cultivate a culture for professional enhancement. A voluntary social work professional advancement system might encourage both supervisors and supervisees to improve their qualities and performance. Workers would win recognition as more advanced in knowledge and skills after engagement in in-service training, and assessment on competence. The SWRB could consider setting up a voluntary advancement system to recognize workers' effort as a form of encouragement.

e) *Method of supervision*

i) Peer supervision was stimulating and valuable. Sharing among peers could help workers to be aware of different ways of handling problems and cases. It was necessary for those who supervised their colleagues to gain recognition in supervisory competence. It would allow supervisors more time for non-supervisory responsibilities. More experienced peers could help in the micro-skills and supervisors help to analyze more macro issues.

ii) The concept of senior practice could be established as far as supervision was concerned. The more senior workers should be deployed to help younger workers in their professional development. Workers with experience and qualifications should be given the opportunity to share and guide the younger workers.

iii) Case conference with case presentations by supervisees or supervisors was valuable for learning.

f) *To support RSWs working in non- social work settings*

It was necessary to have supervisory guidelines or manual for RSW supervisors supervising social workers working in non-social work setting. Guidelines and manual for non-RSW supervisors were very much needed. Non-RSW supervisors could be helpful in practice teaching as the work setting was not social work oriented, yet they would not be ready to provide systematic and more structured supervision sessions, and would not pay too much attention to resolve conflicts and contradictions between non-social work discipline and social work practice.

g) *No supervision for experienced supervisee*

The style of supervision should be different between fresh or more experienced supervisees. There was the observation that after a supervisee had been working in the post for more than 10 years, there was not much a supervisor could do to help him grow professionally. They should no longer be supervised.

h) *Supervision mode in new service setting*

It would be harder for supervisors to provide practice teaching when the service was very new in the sector, for example, employment service in the welfare field. In such setting, peer learning and group supervision could promote sharing to allow workers to learn from each other. The supervisors' role was more of a facilitator.

3.4   Current State of Supervision

The existing mode, policies and provision of supervision can be summarized as follows:

A)   *Perceptions of social workers and supervisors*

There are strong consensus between the supervisors and supervisees in their perception of supervisory practice. Both rated abilities enhancement and practice teaching as most effective and most important functions, though they did not agree as much in the areas of less effective and less important ones. Both supervisors and supervisees had nearly the same perceptions over the supervisory objectives. The most effective one was administrative function though they rated it as second last in importance. In the focus groups, both supervisors and supervisees recognized the inadequacy of the supervisory system, however, they showed understanding towards each other and were hopeful of a change in the system and improvement when the existing financial environment became better.

B)   *Mode, policies and provision of supervision*

Though only 60 agencies replied to the SWRB for the study, agencies, especially those who employed a large proportion of social workers, recognized the value of professional supervision as an effective means to upgrade and maintain professional quality. The most frequent means of supervisory sessions were individual ones on need-basis. Supervisors and supervisees were meeting around once a month in such setting, while scheduled individual sessions were arranged every two to three months. Group supervisions, too, were meeting every two to three months. When group supervision sessions were held, they were generally around two or more hours, scheduled individual meetings were around 1.5 hours while meetings on need-basis were held for 30 minutes to an hour. Also, not many of them had set clear agenda and made and filed records for their supervisory sessions.

C)   *Workload of supervisors*

According to data collected for the study, more than 30% of supervisors had to supervisee more than 6 RSWs and around 30% had to supervise more than 20 non-RSW colleagues, while more than 50% of them claimed supervisory responsibilities comprised around 20% of their workload only. The focus group participants had the common observations that the supervisors in agencies were increasingly given other responsibilities such as identification of resources, proposal writing, and management responsibilities, the time they could afford to work along with and guide supervisees were shrinking as consequence.

IV   STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Four measures of correlation were used to predict the associations between the variables to assess whether supervisors and supervisees of different background perceived the supervisory functions differently. As mentioned previously, Lambda was used for variables in nominal scale, Kendall's tau c for ordinal scale and Pearson's coefficient for variables measured in interval scale (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1981). Probability differences that are less than 0.05 and 0.005 will be marked and discussed.

4.1   Organizational Variables

4.1.1   *Agency type and size of agency*

There are hardly significant differences in perception of effectiveness and importance on the 8 supervisory functions by supervisor and supervisee respondents from multi-service or single service organizations, or agencies of different sizes (judged by the number of employees in the organizations).

4.1.2   *Number of RSWs in agency*

There are significant differences in perceptions by supervisees and supervisors in organizations with different number of registered social workers.

Table: 4.1   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisees by number of RSWs in organization

Functions	1-9 RSWs	10-49 RSWs	50-499 RSWs	500 or above
Sup Struct	2.25	2.25	2.28	2.25
Ad Func*+	2.31	2.35	2.34	2.36
Faci'tive Func*+	2.31	2.33	2.34	2.31
Pract Teach*+	2.88	2.96	3.04	2.93
Abilities Enhan	2.96	2.98	3.10	3.02
Theo & Ref Learn	2.06	2.23	2.21	2.26
Emotional Sup*+	2.20	2.28	2.29	2.19
Perf Recog**+	2.30	2.37	2.41	2.22

Note: * p.<0.05   **p.<0.005

    + Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with more RSWs

Table: 4.2   Mean importance ratings of supervisees by number of RSWs in organization

Functions	1-9 RSWs	10-49 RSWs	50-499 RSWs	500 or above
Sup Struct	2.11	2.12	2.14	2.05
Ad Func	2.30	2.27	2.38	2.23
Faci'tive Func*+	2.36	2.33	2.34	2.38
Pract Teach**+	3.02	2.97	3.03	2.97
Abilities Enhan*—	3.16	3.13	3.14	3.14
Theo & Ref Learn**+	2.49	2.53	2.56	2.49
Emotional Sup*+	2.41	2.49	2.55	2.43
Perf Recog*+	2.61	2.66	2.69	2.59

Note: * p.<0.05   **p.<0.005

    + Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with more RSWs

    - Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with less RSWs

Table: 4.3   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisors by number of RSWs in organization

Functions	1-9 RSWs	10-49 RSWs	50-499 RSWs	500 or above
Sup Struct**—	2.40	2.43	2.37	2.43
Ad Func	2.62	2.56	2.60	2.80
Faci'tive Func**—	2.52	2.53	2.58	2.47
Pract Teach	3.23	3.20	3.26	3.07
Abilities Enhan*—	3.28	3.21	3.35	3.13
Theo & Ref Learn*—	2.47	2.51	2.58	2.47
Emotional Sup*+	2.48	2.56	2.55	2.67
Perf Recog	2.81	2.79	2.80	2.93

Note: * p.<0.05   **p.<0.005

    + Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with more RSWs

    - Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with less RSWs

Table: 4.4   Mean importance ratings of supervisors by number of RSWs in organization

Functions	1-9 RSWs	10-49 RSWs	50-499 RSWs	500 or above
Sup Struct	2.23	2.29	2.15	2.18
Ad Func	2.38	2.44	2.42	2.47
Faci'tive Func*—	2.21	2.22	2.29	2.35
Pract Teach*+	3.08	2.97	2.97	3.06
Abilities Enhan	3.23	3.18	3.24	3.29
Theo & Ref Learn	2.46	2.39	2.53	2.65
Emotional Sup**+	2.39	2.47	2.41	2.59
Perf Recog*+	2.67	2.65	2.53	2.71
Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005				
+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with more RSWs				
- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with less RSWs				

For organizations with more registered social workers, the supervisees' perceptions were found significantly different in a number of functions with those in organizations with less registered social workers. Supervisees in organizations with more RSWs perceived a number of supervisory functions to be more effective and more important. It is possible that organizations with more RSWs are those more social work oriented, or "professional social work" organizations, so supervisees, under such a professional culture, would value the educational/professional development functions and emotional support functions as more effective than those with less RSWs in the organizations. However, the situation of the supervisors differed. Supervisors in organizations with more RSWs rated supervision to be less effective in a number of functions. It appeared that supervisors in larger organizations might not perceive themselves as effective as those working in smaller organizations. One possible explanation is that large organizations might be more bureaucratic, and mid-level supervisors might not see themselves too effective as compared to supervisors in smaller organizations where lines of accountability were less complex.

4.2   Age and Work Experience of Workers

4.2.1   *Age of workers*

Table: 4.5   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisees by age

Functions	20-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40-49 yrs	50 yrs or above
Sup Struct	2.27	2.22	2.29	2.04
Ad Func	2.34	2.28	2.39	2.27
Faci'tive Func**—	2.38	2.25	2.26	2.24
Pract Teach**—	3.07	2.89	2.92	2.69
Abilities Enhan**—	3.13	2.93	2.96	2.70
Theo & ref learn**—	2.29	2.11	2.16	1.88
Emotional Sup**—	2.32	2.24	2.18	2.14
Perf Recog**—	2.44	2.33	2.33	1.97
Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005				
- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those younger				

There has been a strong assumption that younger workers had more obvious needs. The present study found that younger supervisees valued facilitative function, practice teaching, abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning, emotional support and performance recognition functions as more effective compared to workers more advanced in age, yet there was only significant difference in the perceived importance in theoretical and reflective learning among supervisees of different age.

4.2.2 *Years of experience in social work profession*

Table: 4.6   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisees by years of experience in the social work profession

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct*—	2.28	2.21	2.24	2.24
Ad Func*—	2.33	2.30	2.34	2.41
Faci'tive Func	2.38	2.23	2.27	2.25
Pract Teach*—	3.06	2.91	2.95	2.70
Abilities Enhan*—	3.11	2.96	2.98	2.71
Theo & ref learn*—	2.25	2.16	2.18	1.88
Emotional Sup*—	2.31	2.24	2.25	2.03
Perf Recog*—	2.39	2.37	2.34	2.00

Note: * $p. < 0.05$ ** $p. < 0.005$
    - Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those less experienced

Table: 4.7   Mean importance ratings of supervisees by years of experience in the social work profession

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct*+	2.13	2.21	2.24	2.24
Ad Func*+	2.31	2.30	2.34	2.41
Faci'tive Func*—	2.34	2.23	2.27	2.25
Pract Teach*—	3.03	2.91	2.95	2.70
Abilities Enhan*—	3.16	2.96	2.98	2.71
Theo & ref learn*—	2.59	2.16	2.18	1.88
Emotional Sup*—	2.46	2.24	2.25	2.03
Perf Recog*—	2.66	2.37	2.34	2.00

Note: * $p. < 0.05$
    + Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced
    - Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those less experienced

The differences among supervisees by their years of experience in social work profession were obvious too. It is understandable that the need of those who were new to the profession had a higher expectation and need for supervision. The less experienced rated all functions to be significantly more effective except the facilitative function.

Year of experience is an essential variable that defines the supervisees' perception on the importance of supervisory functions. The less experienced rated the supervisory functions to be more important except the supervisory structure and administrative function. The more experienced supervisees rated these 2 functions significantly higher in importance. It could mean workers with more experience valued more systematically prepared supervision and saw the importance of the administrative function of supervision.

Since the years of experience had strong effect on the perceptions of the supervisees, it will be enlightening to analyze whether the years of social work experience of supervisees was related to the supervisory format they were undergoing. It can indicate whether the needs of supervisees are being catered for.

Table: 4.8   Frequency of existing and appropriate supervisory format by number of years in social work profession of the supervisees

Supervisory Format	Existing	Appropriate
Individual supervision (with appointment)	-.319*	-.213*
Individual supervision (no appointment / when necessary)	.069	+.568*
Group supervision	-.980**	.059

Note: * $p. < 0.05$ ** $p. < 0.005$
    + Positive correlation, i.e. higher frequency with those more experienced
    - Negative correlation, i.e. higher frequency with those less experienced

Study (Ko, 1987) in Hong Kong found that less experienced workers preferred individual sessions while more experienced workers preferred group supervisory sessions. The present study presents some similar and some different findings from the observations of Ko's qualitative study (1987). There are significant differences in the frequency and preference of individual supervision (with appointment) among supervisees with more and less social work experience. Less experienced workers had more individual supervision (with appointment) and preferred it more compared to more experienced workers. However, more experienced preferred individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary) more than the less experienced. The difference in preference is significant. Also less experienced preferred more group supervision than the more experienced workers. The difference is also significant. The finding shows that more experienced workers preferred less structured supervision, and to consult supervisors when needs arose.

4.2.3 *Years of experience in current position*

The differences in perception among supervisees by years of experience in the current position are similar to those by years of experience in social work profession.

Table: 4.9   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisees by years of experience in the current position

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct*—	2.24	2.24	2.29	2.00
Ad Func*+	2.32	2.32	2.38	2.44
Faci'tive Func*—	2.33	2.25	2.28	2.33
Pract Teach	3.00	2.90	2.90	3.00
Abilities Enhan*—	3.06	2.93	3.00	2.75
Theo & ref learn*—	2.22	2.13	2.18	2.00
Emotional Sup*—	2.28	2.23	2.23	2.20
Perf Recog	2.37	2.34	2.35	1.91

Note: * p.<0.05
+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced
- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those less experienced

Table: 4.10   Mean importance ratings of supervisees by years of experience in the current position

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct**—	2.11	2.10	2.05	2.27
Ad Func*—	2.31	2.29	2.23	2.45
Faci'tive Func*—	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.18
Pract Teach*—	3.00	3.03	2.97	3.09
Abilities Enhan*—	3.11	3.20	3.10	3.36
Theo & ref learn*—	2.55	2.48	2.53	2.64
Emotional Sup*+	2.47	2.49	2.47	2.82
Perf Recog*+	2.65	2.67	2.62	2.90

Note: * p.<0.05   **p.<0.005
+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced
- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those less experienced

Once again, with less experience in the current position, the supervisees tended to give higher ratings on both effectiveness and importance of the supervisory functions than those who were more experienced. Yet the emotional support and performance recognition functions were perceived by supervisees with more experience in the current position to be more important. The less experienced valued the administrative and educational functions while the more experienced valued the emotional support function even when they grew in experience. An analysis of the three variables, age, years of experience in social work profession, and years of experience in current position, showed that the years of experience both in social work profession and current position of supervisees had significant influence on their perception and expectation over the supervision process.

The ratings from supervisor showed some similarities with those of the supervisee, but not so intensive in significant. There are no significant differences in supervisors' perception because of age, however, their years of experience in the profession and their years of experience in current position present some significant differences.

Table: 4.11   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisors by years of experience in the social work profession

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct	2.73	2.42	2.35	2.41
Ad Func*+	2.72	2.58	2.57	2.67
Faci'tive Func	2.33	2.52	2.53	2.67
Pract Teach*+	3.22	3.18	3.20	3.26
Abilities Enhan	3.06	3.27	3.27	3.29
Theo & ref learn	2.39	2.39	2.55	2.52
Emotional Sup*+	2.39	2.51	2.57	2.53
Perf Recog	2.79	2.76	2.80	2.88

Note: * p.<0.05
+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced

Table: 4.12 Mean importance ratings of supervisors by years of experience in the social work profession

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct*—	2.26	2.28	2.17	2.25
Ad Func*+	2.32	2.44	2.41	2.42
Faci'tive Func**+	2.26	2.16	2.27	2.25
Pract Teach	2.95	3.08	2.98	2.94
Abilities Enhan	3.11	3.16	3.22	3.27
Theo & ref learn	2.42	2.42	2.46	2.56
Emotional Sup	2.53	2.36	2.42	2.58
Perf Recog*+	2.53	2.48	2.62	2.75

Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005

+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced

- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those less experienced

Table: 4.13 Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisors by years of experience in the current position

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct	2.41	2.45	2.29	2.50
Ad Func**+	2.61	2.60	2.57	2.80
Faci'tive Func**+	2.52	2.56	2.58	2.40
Pract Teach*+	3.20	3.20	3.25	3.25
Abilities Enhan*+	3.24	3.31	3.19	3.50
Theo & ref learn*+	2.49	2.51	2.49	2.60
Emotional Sup	2.48	2.55	2.63	2.60
Perf Recog*+	2.78	2.79	2.87	2.80

Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005

+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those more experienced

Table: 4.14 Mean importance ratings of supervisors by years of experience in the current position

Functions	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-20 yrs	21 yrs or above
Sup Struct*—	2.21	2.20	2.28	2.00
Ad Func*+	2.38	2.38	2.51	2.60
Faci'tive Func*+	2.25	2.21	2.23	2.60
Pract Teach*+	2.96	3.04	2.94	3.20
Abilities Enhan	3.19	3.20	3.19	4.00
Theo & ref learn**+	2.51	2.39	2.45	3.00
Emotional Sup	2.44	2.40	2.51	2.80
Perf Recog	2.58	2.59	2.68	3.00

Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005

+ Positive correlation, i.e. higher rating with those of more experience

- Negative correlation, i.e. higher rating with those of less experience

One point that deserves more in-depth discussion is the significant difference in perception found among supervisors by the length of experience in the current position. The perceived effectiveness was significantly lower in the dimensions of administrative function, facilitative function, practice teaching, abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning, and performance recognition among the less experienced supervisors. The supervisors, with their years of development, perceived themselves to be more effective while acknowledging that supervisory functions were important. It is comforting to observe that supervisors would not perceive supervision to be less important with more experience in the supervisory capacity, but also gained confidence in their practice. The comparatively low ratings on perceived effectiveness by the less experienced supervisor coincided with the observations made by focus group members. Less experienced supervisors were confused what were demanded of them, were not confident they were doing a good job, and had strong need for assistance. The study points out the less experienced supervisors could be particularly less confident in those functions with significant differences listed in Table 4.13.

4.3   Related Variables

4.3.1   *Workload of supervisor*

Table: 4.15   Number of RSW supervisees by the proportion of supervisory duty of supervisors

	1-20%	21-40%	41% or above
RSWs	%	%	%
1-5	76.9%	64.8%	45.6%
6-10	19.2%	22.5%	36.9%
11-15	3.8%	8.5%	10.9%
16 or above	0.0%	4.2%	6.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Cases	133	71	46

The number of RSWs that the supervisors had to supervise showed that the supervisors were heavily burdened in their job responsibilities. 77% of those who claimed to use 20% of their work time on supervision had to supervise 1-5 RSWs, and nearly 20% of these supervisors had to supervise 6-10 RSWs. On the whole, 2-4% of the supervisor respondents, regardless of their proportion of supervisory workload, had to supervise more than 16 RSWs.

The statistics showed the competitive demands on supervisory time and delegation of role responsibilities within the agency. This observation coincided with the comments from focus group members. Nearly all focus group members opined that the quality of supervision suffered because of the heavy workload of both parties, especially those of supervisors. Judging from the workload of supervisors, the resources of staff time and allocation of personnel costs associated with supervision could only be low.

4.3.2   *RSW or non-RSW as supervisor*

It is reasonable to presume that RSWs who were supervised by non-RSW supervisors were working in secondary settings, such as primary schools, special schools, etc., and would be quite different in their supervisory experience. Though the data showed supervisees with non-RSW supervisors would give lower ratings in effectiveness and importance ratings, only a few functions were found to have significant differences.

Table: 4.16   Effectiveness ratings of supervisees by the social work status of their supervisors

Functions	RSW as supervisor	non-RSW as supervisor
Sup Struct*	2.26	1.97
Ad Func*	2.34	2.13
Faci'tive Func	2.31	2.19
Pract Teach	2.99	2.73
Abilities Enhan*	3.02	2.89
Theo & ref learn*	2.20	1.93
Emotional Sup	2.28	2.08
Perf Recog	2.37	2.21
Note: * p.<0.05		

Table: 4.17   Importance ratings of supervisees by the social work status of their supervisors

Functions	RSW as supervisor	non-RSW as supervisor
Sup Struct	2.11	2.11
Ad Func	2.31	2.23
Faci'tive Func	2.34	2.38
Pract Teach	3.02	2.91
Abilities Enhan	3.15	3.04
Theo & ref learn*	2.54	2.45
Emotional Sup	2.48	2.39
Perf Recog*	2.67	2.51
Note: * p.<0.05		

Effectiveness in supervision structure, administrative function, abilities enhancement and theoretical and reflective learning, and importance in theoretical and reflective learning and performance recognition were found to be significantly different between the two groups of supervisees. That is, supervisees with RSW supervisors would give significantly higher ratings than those with non-RSW supervisors.

There were three social workers in the focus groups who worked in secondary setting. They felt that non-social work supervisors were able to teach them, especially practical handling skills and ways of handling problems, though it was hard for them to learn professional social work skills and theories from non-social workers. Also, it was a bit lonely to work in a secondary setting that did not give them the opportunity to share their social work experience with colleagues. It is understandable that workers

supervised by non-social work supervisor would give low ratings to the effectiveness and importance of theoretical and reflective learning. Anyway, on the whole supervisee respondents did not rate the theoretical and reflective learning function to be very effective too, it was the 7th in effectiveness, yet supervisees generally rated theoretical and reflective learning the 4th in importance seeing it as an important element for professional learning and development. The importance rating by supervisees with non-RSW supervisors was much lower than that of the supervisee population.

4.3.3 Target client groups

Table: 4.18   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisors by target client groups

Functions	Family & children	Youth	Elderly	Rehabilitation	Others
Sup Struct	2.29	2.39	2.53	2.32	2.42
Ad Func	2.50	2.63	2.67	2.55	2.61
Faci'tive Func	2.50	2.56*	2.52	2.53	2.57
Pract Teach	3.25	3.21	3.21	3.16	3.26
Abilities Enhan	3.19**	3.34	3.28	3.22	3.18
Theo & ref learn	2.31	2.63*	2.56	2.42*	2.43
Emotional Sup	2.56	2.59*	2.60	2.48	2.48
Perf Recog	2.75	2.86	2.84	2.80	2.73
Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005					

Table: 4.19   Mean importance ratings of supervisors by target client groups

Functions	Family & children	Youth	Elderly	Rehabilitation	Others
Sup Struct	2.12	2.22	2.32	2.15	2.23
Ad Func	2.24	2.32	2.46	2.50	2.40
Faci'tive Func	2.18	2.22	2.20	2.29	2.27
Pract Teach	2.88	2.98	2.91	3.11*	2.98
Abilities Enhan	2.88	3.20	3.29	3.18	3.29
Theo & ref learn	2.29	2.47	2.41	2.45	2.62
Emotional Sup	2.53	2.51	2.38	2.45	2.44
Perf Recog	2.53	2.58	2.54	2.67	2.69
Note: * p.<0.05					

Table: 4.20   Mean effectiveness ratings of supervisees by target client groups

Functions	Family & children	Youth	Elderly	Rehabilitation	Others
Sup Struct	2.22	2.27	2.37*	2.22	2.13
Ad Func	2.24*	2.36	2.43*	2.34	2.23
Faci'tive Func	2.25	2.34	2.36	2.31	2.23
Pract Teach	2.95	3.06*	2.95	2.99	2.78
Abilities Enhan	2.89*	3.10*	3.05	3.01	2.92
Theo & ref learn	2.10	2.26	2.20	2.17	2.12
Emotional Sup	2.24	2.29	2.38*	2.24	2.15
Perf Recog	2.26*	2.39	2.49*	2.35	2.29
Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005					

Table: 4.21   Mean importance ratings of supervisees by target client groups

Functions	Family & children	Youth	Elderly	Rehabilitation	Others
Sup Struct	2.08*	2.14*	2.14*	2.09	2.05
Ad Func	2.23	2.34*	2.35	2.28	2.27
Faci'tive Func	2.25**	2.37	2.37	2.32	2.38
Pract Teach	3.02	3.00	3.12*	3.01	2.92
Abilities Enhan	3.11	3.15	3.12	3.21	3.10
Theo & ref learn	2.52	2.58	2.50	2.51	2.50
Emotional Sup	2.46	2.49	2.49	2.47	2.45
Perf Recog	2.66	2.68	2.63	2.65	2.66
Note: * p.<0.05 **p.<0.005					

It is generally believed that there might be differences in supervisory experiences for workers of different service nature. When statistically analyzed by Lambda and Kruskal tau, the responses of supervisors and supervisees working for different service client groups did not show any significant differences. However, when comparisons were made and analyzed between responses from one specific service target group with responses from all others by Pearson regression method, there were some significant differences identified. The differences found among supervisors were limited, there were more significantly different responses among supervisees working for different target client groups.

On the whole, workers in family and children services gave lowest ratings on effectiveness. The effectiveness ratings on administrative function, abilities enhancement and performance recognition were significantly lower among supervisees working for family and children. There is the general belief that family and children service settings are more social work oriented. It is fair to guess that lower ratings were consequence of high expectation besides the possibility of less effective delivery. Both supervisors and supervisees working for family and children gave significantly lower effectiveness ratings to the abilities enhancement function. The low ratings among workers, especially supervisees, working for family and children can indicate that these supervisees have specific needs which the existing supervisory provision has fallen short.

Youth workers gave significantly higher effective ratings for abilities enhancement and practice teaching. The workers in elderly services rated a number of non-professional development areas to be significantly higher in effectiveness, they were supervision structure, administrative function, emotional support and performance recognition.

There were less significant differences observed among the importance ratings. Supervisees in family and children services rated supervision structure and facilitative functions significantly lower in importance. Youth workers rated supervision structure and administrative functions significantly higher in importance. Elderly workers rated supervision structure and practice teaching significantly higher in importance. No significant differences were observed among responses from workers in rehabilitation settings.

Though there were some differences in the three broad functions of administrative, education, and supportive functions, they were no significant differences identified among supervisees and supervisors serving different target client groups. Erera & Lazar (1994) came to similar conclusion in their study on social work supervision across organizations of various service settings. They found that though there might be differences in administrative functions among organizations of different service settings, however, there was hardly any difference in the educational and supportive functions of social work supervision across organizations.

4.3.4 *Academic qualifications*

Table: 4.22 Mean effectiveness and importance ratings of supervisors by the highest academic qualification obtained

Functions	SWDip/AD		Bachelor		Pdg/Master		Doctorate	
	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp
Sup Struct	2.30	2.19	2.49	2.24	2.36	2.21	3.00	2.50
Ad Func	2.46	2.40	2.66	2.40	2.62	2.43	3.00	2.00
Faci'tive Func	2.47	2.27	2.56	2.23	2.56	2.23	2.50	2.00
Pract Teach	3.12	3.06	3.32	3.04	3.15	2.91	3.00	2.50
Abilities Enhan	3.14	3.20	3.27	3.16	3.28	3.28	3.50	2.50
Theo & Ref Learn	2.48	2.52	2.48	2.47	2.50	2.44	3.00	2.50
Emotional Sup	2.50	2.44	2.59	2.39	2.49	2.51	2.50	2.50
Perf Recog	2.78	2.65	2.77	2.62	2.86	2.58	2.50	2.50

Table: 4.23 Mean effectiveness and importance ratings of supervisees by the highest academic qualification obtained

Functions	SWDip/AD		Bachelor		Pdg/Master		Doctorate	
	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp	Effect	Imp
Sup Struct	2.29	2.14	2.22	2.10	2.20	2.06	1.50	2.00
Ad Func	2.37	2.33	2.31	2.32	2.25	2.19	1.00	2.00
Faci'tive Func	2.32	2.35	2.30	2.35	2.26	2.28	1.00	2.50
Pract Teach	2.94	2.99	2.99	3.03	2.96	3.00	2.00	3.00
Abilities Enhan	3.02	3.16	3.02	3.13	2.97	3.14	2.00	2.50
Theo & Ref Learn	2.21	2.53	2.19	2.55	2.09	2.50	1.00	2.00
Emotional Sup	2.23	2.45	2.29	2.49	2.27	2.49	1.00	2.50
Perf Recog	2.42	2.68	2.30	2.65	2.34	2.64	1.00	2.00

There were hardly any significant differences in perception among supervisors and supervisees because of the highest academic qualifications obtained. Social work professionals, both supervisors and supervisees might have high academic qualifications, however, the study could not identify whether these qualifications were social work related. It will be presumptuous to conclude that further professional studies and academic development did not have effect on the perceived effectiveness and importance over supervisory functions.

4.4 Significant Findings by the Research Questions

4.4.1 *Whether there are marked differences between supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions on the frequency, effectiveness and importance of supervision*

Though supervisors gave higher ratings than the supervisees, there are no significant differences in rankings in the perceived effectiveness and importance of supervisory functions among supervisors and supervisees. The similarity in ranking supervisory functions may indicate that there is consensus on the current state of supervision in the sector.

4.4.2 *Whether the age and work experiences of workers (supervisors and supervisees) have effect on their perceptions on supervisory effectiveness and importance*

The account given in this chapter shows that the most significant variables, which affect the perception of supervisors and supervisees, are the work experiences of the workers. Also the length of work experience in current position stood out as the most significant variable. Age per se, though a highly related variable to the years of work experience, had a weaker effect on the workers' perception. It indicates that it might not be the maturity of the workers but their actual expertise and work familiarity that had strong effect on their perceptions on supervisory functions. The year of experience of supervisees was found to have effect on the actual frequency in supervisory meetings and the supervisory format, and on supervisees' preferred frequency and format of meetings.

4.4.3 *Whether the target clients of the workers (supervisors and supervisees) have effect on workers' perceptions on supervisory effectiveness and importance of supervision*

The workers in family and children settings gave the lowest ratings, and supervisees rated abilities enhancement, administrative function and performance recognition as significantly lower in effectiveness. Family and children setting generally requires casework intervention which demands solid professional skills, especially in crises and cases with violent nature. Workers working in such high-pressure environment would need emotional support and abilities improvement to meet challenges. There are some significant differences in perceptions among youth workers. Supervisees in elderly services gave the highest effectiveness ratings, their effectiveness ratings on supervision structure, administrative function, emotional support and performance recognition were significantly higher among supervisee respondents. Among all the significant difference by target client groups, there were hardly any significant differences in educational functions.

4.4.4 *Whether the education level of workers (supervisors and supervisees) has effect on their perception on supervisory effectiveness and importance*

There are hardly any significant correlations found between workers' perceptions on supervisory functions and their education background. The study has no means to identify whether the higher qualifications are social-work related, so it cannot be concluded that further professional studies and academic development in social work will have or will not have any effect on workers' perceptions towards supervisory functions.

4.4.5 *Whether the size of the agency at which the workers (supervisors and supervisees) are employed has effect on their perception on supervisory effectiveness and importance*

The size of organization by the number of RSWs in the organization showed some significant effect, but the trend of correlation differed among supervisors and supervisees. Supervisors' responses were negatively correlated with the size of the organization, while the supervisees' responses tended to be positively correlated. That is supervisors in organizations with more RSWs would perceive supervision structure, facilitative function, abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning less effective, and practice teaching and facilitative function less important. Supervisees in organizations with more RSWs tended to perceive supervisory functions more effective and more important.

V   DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDAITONS

5.1   Discussion

5.1.1   *The needs of less experienced workers*

Among all the variables, age, the years of experience in social work profession and years of experience in current position had the most obvious impact on the supervisees' perception on the supervisory functions (Tables 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.9 & 4.10). With less than 5 years of experience in the profession or in the current post, the supervisees would rate the supervisory functions to be more effective. The ratings became lower when the years of experience of the supervisees increased (Tables 4.6 & 4.9). Also, the more experienced gave higher importance ratings on nearly all functions except supervision structure and administrative function (Tables 4.7 & 4.10). The need of less experienced workers were recognized in former studies (Kadushin, 1992; Munson, 2002), and the present study substantiates the situation in the Hong Kong sector. In fact, 7 agencies among the 56 replied to the SWRB acknowledged the need of less experienced workers, and would provide more frequent help to less experienced supervisees. In analyzing the frequency of supervisory sessions by the years of experience in social work, the study did show that there were significant differences in meeting frequency of individual and group supervisions for those with less years of experience. Also, the less experienced preferred to have more frequent individual supervision (with appointment) compared to those more experienced (Table 4.8).

As expressed by experienced workers of the focus group, the less experienced were weak in logical thinking, unstable emotionally, unpolished in helping skills and inadequate in the knowledge of the service field and targets. From the data presented, the younger ones requested supervisory help in all aspects including facilitative function, practice teaching, abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning, emotional support and performance recognition by rating them significantly higher in importance as well. The conclusion is simple, the less experienced felt the need for more comprehensive supervisory support.

5.1.2   *The needs of experienced workers*

Many studies have discussed the needs of the less experienced; yet the needs of more experienced were hardly discussed. Data of the present study showed that very experienced workers, those who had been in the current post for more than 20 years, were still being supervised with no requirement for supervisory responsibilities (Tables 3.6 & 3.8). There were 41 supervisees (4.1% of the sample) with more than 21 years in the profession were still being supervised. Also 17.5 % of the supervisee respondents (Table 3.5) had postgraduate and above qualifications were not required to take up supervisory responsibilities. It is logical to presume that as their years of experience in the profession increased, these supervisees tended to rate supervisory functions significantly less effective in comparison to the less experienced workers. Tables 4.6 & 4.9 provide the data to support the logic. As professional workers become more mature, they come to appreciate the importance of supervisory structure and the value of administrative function. Though they did not rate these two functions to be more effective, but they were more important when compared to the younger ones.

As practice workers progress in their professional life, they appreciate the importance of administrative accountability of supervision and the value of structural provision of supervision, while they, with increase in knowledge and expertise, will find educational functions of the supervision less effective. More experienced workers would value supervision more as a function for administrative accountability, and its value as a professional development tool would be perceived as less obvious.

5.1.3   *Workload and needs of supervisors*

The findings (Tables 3.9, 3.10, 3.11 & 4.15) showed that supervisors have to supervise a large number of supervisees and take up administrative responsibilities at the same time.

For supervisors, the years of experience in the current position is having a strong impact on their perception on supervisory effectiveness (Table 4.13). As the supervisors themselves were providers of supervision, the perceived effectiveness of the supervision could be interpreted as their perception of their own effectiveness in the supervision. Supervisors with less experience in the current position (presumably in supervisory capacity) gave lower rating to perceived effectiveness when compared to

the ratings given by supervisors with more experience in current position. Except supervisory structure and emotional support, supervisors with less experience in the current post gave significantly lower ratings of effectiveness than those of more experience. Being trained and experienced workers, supervisors are more confident in their emotional support aspects, in fact, they are much needed and preferred by all supervisee respondents.

Members of the focus group who were in supervisory capacity shared how difficult it was for them to adjust and learn to be supervisors. There were hardly any guidance, training in the process. They tended to copy from their former supervisors, and most of them were quite different in style, in methodology and in expertise.

It is quite necessary for less experienced supervisors to learn to be administrative and educational supervisors before taking up the challenges of the supervisory responsibilities. The study shows that besides supervisory skills such as abilities enhancement and emotional support skills, supervisors had the need to upgrade their service delivery competence, as practice teaching was one of the highly preferred functions in supervision.

From data presented in Tables 4.13 & 4.14, more experienced supervisors were confident in their work by giving high ratings to effectiveness, while they also gave higher importance ratings on various supervisory functions than the less experienced. Compared to younger colleagues, the experienced supervisors gave significantly higher value to the importance of supervision structure, administrative, facilitative, practice teaching, and theoretical and reflective learning functions of supervision. On the whole, the more experienced supervisors gave high importance ratings to all functions. The more experienced supervisors could appreciate all supervisory functions were essential to develop full-fledged professionals, while supervisors in the earlier years of their career would concentrate on meeting the obvious needs of the supervisees. There is the need to provide comprehensive skill training and orientation on supervisory roles and functions to help fresh supervisors to deliver their responsibilities. Besides learning and upgrading, ways must be identified to lessen the administrative responsibility of supervisors so as to allow them more time and devotion to guide and develop their professional subordinates.

5.1.4 *Perceptions of supervisors and supervisees*

Tables 3.15 & 3.16 have presented the overall ratings on the supervisory functions by the supervisor and supervisee respondents. On the whole, the ratings given by supervisors were higher than the supervisees. There are more similarities than differences in their perceptions if the rankings on the supervisory functions are compared. The supervisors and supervisees gave abilities enhancement, practice teaching, performance recognition and administrative function the highest ratings in frequency. The same order was found in the effectiveness and importance ratings among supervisors and supervisee as the highest four functions. There was more disagreement among supervisors and supervisees in functions of lower ratings. Supervisors thought theoretical and reflective learning function and supervision structure were not frequently found in supervision. Supervisees rated emotional support and theoretical learning as the lowest in frequency. Supervisors gave lowest effective ratings to theoretical and reflective function and supervision structure (Table 3.15), while supervisees gave low effective ratings to supervision structure and theoretical and reflective learning. For the importance ratings, the lowest ones given by supervisors were facilitative function and supervision structure, and the lowest ones by supervisees were administrative function and supervision structure (Table 3.16).

It is clear that that there are no strong disagreements among supervisors and supervisees over the frequency, effectiveness and importance of supervisory functions. Though there has been the general impression that supervisors view the process as a rational and systematic tool for safeguarding the standard and quality of service, while supervisees expect the supervision to provide emotional support and foster teamwork (Tsui, 2004). That is, supervisors view the supervisory relationship from an organizational perspective but supervisees view it from an emotional perspective. However, the study could not indicate obvious differential preferences among supervisors and supervisees. For example, both supervisors and supervisees ranked theoretical and reflective learning to be 4th in importance though both of them gave it low ranking in effectiveness. Both ranked administrative function as 4th in effectiveness yet ranked it at the low end in importance. All in all, both supervisors and supervisees have common perceptions in the strengths and weaknesses of the present practice and similar expectation on the value of professional supervision.

5.1.5   *Organizational effect on perceptions*

The only organizational effect identified in the present study is the number of RSW in the organization (Tables 4.1-4.4) and whether the supervisee was supervised by a RSW or a non-RSW (Tables 4.16 & 4.17). With more RSWs in the organization, the supervisors would rate supervision structure, facilitative function, abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning and emotional support lower in effectiveness in comparison to their counterparts from organizations with less RSWs. For the supervisees, administrative, facilitative, practice teaching, emotional support and performance recognition functions were given higher ratings than their counterparts from organizations with less RSW. As there are no significant differences found in the perceptions of workers because of the number of workers in the organizations, the only possible explanation is the social work culture of the organizations affecting the perception.

The same may be true in the discussion of RSW or non-RSW supervisor (Tables 4.16 & 4.17). There are significant differences found in abilities enhancement, theoretical and reflective learning, administrative function and supervision structure. It is a bit hard for non-RSW supervisor to provide effective theoretical and reflective learning function, as it requires professional skills and knowledge as an experienced social worker to provide the function. It is important to devise ways, other than supervisory provision, to meet the gaps of supervisees by non-RSW supervisors.

Among the replies from the 56 organisations, most of them were brief in spelling out the goals and outcome of supervision, roles of parties involved and the frequency and format for supervision. Still nearly half of them mentioned administrative function, facilitative function, abilities enhancement and emotional support function as the goals of profession supervision in their agency. Two agencies specifically defined the role of supervisors and supervisees and seven would provide specific help to less experienced supervisees. Supervision as an institutional infrastructure, to be performed with the context of an organization, requests the assistance of the organization to nurture, develop and maintain a culture for quality professional supervision. Quality supervision and professional development must involve respective workers as well as the organizations they are in.

5.2   Recommendations

The study, with quantitative responses from and in-depth discussion with individual RSWs, and information provided by agencies, is going to recommend some possible measures to improve the present situation. The recommendations made are meant to provide support to supervisees, supervisors, and pave way for the continual improvement of the social work profession.

5.2.1   *Support for Supervisees*

5.2.1.1   *Supervised practice: more support for workers with less experience*

The discussions above have indicated that there are a number of areas where improvements are needed to enhance the overall quality of professional supervision. The responses from supervisors and supervisees show that because of the years of experience in social work profession and in current position, the needs of supervisees vary, and the professional supervisory provision for supervisees should also vary accordingly. There should be more support to less experienced supervisees; they need comprehensive support in administrative, educational and emotional support aspects. They should be provided regular and frequent supervisory meetings, both individual and group sessions.

The profession should contemplate the value of introducing supervised practice in Hong Kong. Supervised practice is an arranged period of practice under which the social worker will have intensive professional supervision provided by experienced and qualified professional supervisor. Although there are great variations occur across states in USA, there is a prevalent recognition that supervised practice is one of the conditions of application for licensure (Dawes, 1990). To operate the concept of supervised practice, the profession must define the group of workers requiring "supervised practice", the frequency and the scope of supervision, to prepare less experienced social workers become fully independent professionals. The period of intensive professional supervision should be time-bound, and will eventually be completed when the less experienced workers have reached a certain standard of performance. If supervised practice is indefinitely provided, the profession has not done its job to coach workers to be independent in their practice.

5.2.1.2   *Independent practice: appropriate support for workers with substantial experience*

The study shows that a substantial number of experienced workers are under continuous supervision. There were 60% of supervisees with more than 5 years of experience in the profession, and nearly half of this 60% were with more than 11 years of experience (Table 3.6). These experienced workers perceived supervision to be less effective than those greener in experience. It is hard and is a challenge to their supervisors to provide them with useful supervisory sessions. In fact, the experienced did not prefer regular supervision, but indicated the need for supervisory sessions on need basis. The study, therefore, infers that more experienced workers see the value of occasional professional consultations upon need rather than regular supervisory meetings as required by the organizations.

The study also shows that all supervisees highly valued the educational functions such as abilities enhancement and practice teaching, regardless of their background. Therefore, professional workers as a whole strive for professional development which prepares them to be independent in their practice. The profession should have a system in place which recognizes and assess who can be qualified for independent practice among more experienced workers and release their energy to coach and serve those who are less experienced.

5.2.2   *Support for Supervisors*

5.2.2.1   *Professional supervision guidelines for practicing supervisors*

The data provided in Tables 4.11 & 4.13 show that less experienced supervisors perceived supervision to be less effectively conducted. The sharing from focus group indicated that new supervisors were quite confused of their role, and uncertain of the expectation on them as supervisors. In the replies from agencies, only 2 among 56 agencies defined the role of supervisor and supervisee in professional supervision. Appraisal or evaluation arrangement supplied by agencies to SWRB showed that agencies provided more elaboration on the appraisal system. If agencies can list and discuss their expectation on supervision, the roles of the parties involved, code of practice for supervisors, frequency of meetings, and the objectives and outcomes of supervision discussed in form of a manual or guidelines, new supervisors can tune in their job responsibilities more efficiently and effectively. There is the need to publish more detailed supervisory guidelines to help supervisors.

There are some specific observations of the study which can be useful in the preparation of the guidelines.

A)   *Importance of different supervisory functions*

The objectives of supervision mentioned in agency replies did not exactly correspond with the preferences of supervisors and supervises identified by the present study. Under the objectives of supervision, 29 agencies mentioned administrative function, 25 mentioned facilitative function, 3 mentioned practice teaching, 35 mentioned abilities enhancement, 1 mentioned theoretical and reflective learning, 17 mentioned emotional support and 6 mentioned performance recognition as functions of supervision. If the frequency of functions mentioned could reflect the level of importance placed by agencies, the agency policy and objectives did not totally agree with the perceived importance of supervisory function. Supervisors and supervisees perceived abilities enhancement as the most important followed by practice teaching, performance recognition and theoretical and reflective learning.

In the agency descriptions, agencies seemed to place more emphasis on administrative function than the preferred educational functions by supervisors and supervisees. The professional supervisory guidelines, when developed, should meet both the organization and worker expectation so to enhance quality of service delivery and advance professional qualities of both supervisors and supervisees.

B)   *Supervision structure*

A review of Table 3.13 on supervisory format indicates that the existing supervisory provision tends to be informal. Individual supervision without appointment is the most frequent form of supervisory meeting, and supervisees prefer this arrangement. Both supervisors and supervisees rated supervision structure as lowest in effectiveness and importance. Yet with increase in years of experience, supervisees appreciate the value of supervision structure more (Table 4.7). Also, there are 9 agencies mentioning the need to provide supervisory structure for supervision. As

supervisors advance in experience, both in social work profession and in current position, they differ significantly with their less experienced colleagues in the perceived importance of supervision structure too. Tables 4.12 & 4.14 show that more experienced supervisors rated supervision structure as a more important supervisory function. The above data indicate that, though largely a neglected aspect of supervision, supervision structure can be helpful in organizing meetings for more purposeful and effective supervisory outcome.

Bunker & Wijnberg (1988) has recommended the use of contract, or establishment of consensus for supervision as a way to protect supervisee and balance supervisory relationship, making the relationship more professional. Kadushin (1974, 1992a, 1992b) recommended an ideal supervision model after his two large-scale surveys on supervision, and one of the elements of the ideal model is to structure supervision in regular schedule. The importance of supervision structure has been quite neglected in Hong Kong. As mentioned above, both supervisors and supervisees in Hong Kong rank supervision structure to be the lowest in importance (Tables 3.15 & 3.16). Though the present study cannot establish whether this neglect has negative effect on supervision, it is better for the whole profession if all parties concerned, agencies, supervisors and supervisees, take steps to maintain the quality of supervision. Having agreed-upon discussion agenda and clear records of supervision discussion can be one of the steps to guarantee quality of meetings. The professional supervision guidelines should discuss the value and importance of formal, systematic structure for supervision as well.

C)   *Need of workers working in secondary settings*

The study could not identify visible differential needs among workers of different service targets, yet the data showed that there are some significant differences in perceptions between supervisees supervised by RSWs or by non-RSWs (Table 4.16). Those supervised by non-RSWs perceived supervisions to be significantly lower in effectiveness in the dimensions of practice teaching and theoretical and reflective learning in addition to besides the supervision structure and administrative function. Participants of focus groups who are supervised by non-RSWs indicated interest and

need to be more involved in professional development activities which their respective organizations cannot provide. The proposed guidelines are to include a section for non-RSW supervisors reminding them the need to guide their social work professional supervisees to seize other opportunities, besides supervision, to maintain, upkeep and enhance social work professional theories, knowledge and skills, in order not to be deprived of continual development in professionalisation.

5.2.2.2   *Training for potential supervisors and practicing supervisors*

In addition to practice guidelines published by agencies, providers of professional supervision require more comprehensive training. Supervisors should learn to build and maintain rapport with supervisees within an organizational context, acquire adult learning teaching skills, advance social work theory and knowledge, cultivate sensitivity to work in the dual role of professional and administrative senior in a professional organization, as well as advance the practice knowledge and skills of specific services. Such accredited training is to help supervisors to be more effective in supervision provision and to enhance the learning environment of organization.

A)   *Importance of different supervisory functions*

As mentioned in the paragraphs above, the sector may have some differential conceptions and expectations over the importance of different supervisory functions. Any training on supervision should take note of the views of the supervisors and supervisees, and structure the curriculum accordingly.

B)   *Needs of the Supervisees*

Though less experienced social workers need or prefer more emotional support compared to more experienced colleagues, their ultimate preference is to enhance their abilities and to learn how to deliver quality service to the clients. As new comers to the profession, they value theoretical and reflective learning as well. The more experienced perceived the supervisors to be more effective in the role as an administrative supervisor, and they rated theoretical and reflective learning function low.

The data collected in the present study indicate that the provision of supervision should be more discriminating responding to supervisee's needs. Those younger and less experienced workers might need more frequent meetings and guidance; the more experienced ones should be given other means of advancement.

5.2.3   *Arrangement of Supervision in Human Service Organizations*

5.2.3.1   <u>*Role of supervision: balancing work accountability, quality practice and professional development*</u>

Our present model requires the supervisor to be the administrative and professional supervisor. Administratively, supervisors are those who are promoted to senior position to hold their supervisees accountable to the organization, to those who fund the service and to the service users. As professional supervisors, they are required to help workers to act in the best interest of the service users, including supporting supervisors emotionally. The present study has not observed that there is any conflict in the execution of administrative, educational and emotional support responsibilities. However, due to the workload of supervisors, and the fact that very experienced workers were still being supervised, supervisors were overly-burdened by the administrative duties to have time or energy to provide quality and needed professional supervision and emotional support to supervisees.

5.2.3.2   <u>*Peer consultation provided by experienced workers*</u>

It will be beneficial to supervisors and supervisees who need help if those who are qualified to be independent workers can provide peer consultation to their junior colleagues, and to provide systematic advice on need basis. It will immensely lessen the workload of supervisors and meet the learning need of the less experienced. In addition, this will be an opportunity to train up our potential supervisors in future. Moreover, the study shows that supervisees highly valued the practice teaching function, a function that experienced workers with expertise can conveniently perform. It is necessary for the sector and the organizations concerned to agree and endorse an arrangement which encourages and recognizes experienced workers in the provision of peer consultation. A mechanism must be in place to define and assess the standard of experienced workers who are eligible to provide regular peer consultations to their colleagues.

Peer consultation arrangement cannot and will not minimize the quality assurance role of supervisory positions within the organizations. As discussed in the above paragraphs, the supervisors, as the first line manager to guarantee quality and accountability of workers' service, have to maintain the role of an overall mentor to systematically develop the professional competence of the supervisees, to assign job responsibility and appraise the subordinates, etc. The supervisors can only strengthen their administrative and supervisory capacities, and enhance accountability and professional quality, if organizations can nurture those supervisees with more experience to help the less experienced in their professional development. It is a win-win-win situation when less experienced receive more guidance and support, more experienced are allowed to contribute their expertise and enhance morale, and supervisors can perform professional and administrative roles more efficiently and effectively.

The suggested arrangements will invite some discussion especially related to its implementation feasibility. An analysis of the data generated from the study clearly provides the arguments for the introduction and implementation of the measures recommended, as they are fundamental in addressing the existing weaknesses of the professional supervisory arrangement and the need for long-term professional enhancement of the sector. In fact, the participants of the focus groups who aspire for a vibrant and dynamic social work profession recommend a systematic change in the present professional advancement arrangement.

5.3   <u>Conclusion</u>

Social work, as a learning profession, has been striving for continual improvement in the past decades. The provision of effective supervisory practice is definitely an essential element in maintaining and enhancing the quality of our services to the community. The results of the study showed that both supervisors and supervisees in Hong Kong find supervision satisfactory and useful. The members of the profession are also eager to equip humanistic values, professional knowledge, and practice skills through supervisory practice. The development of a comprehensive mechanism which comprises supervised practice, independent practice and a more balanced supervision involving peer learning and professional guidance is the way ahead. This will not only strengthen our professional intervention, but also benefit our clients in need.

References

Bunker, D.R., & Wijnberg, M.H. (1988). *Supervision and Performance: Managing Professional Work in Human Service Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss.

Dawes, K.O. (1990). *Supervision: A requisite for licensing?* Research Monograph 2 Culpeper, VA: American Foundation for Research and Consumer Education in Social Work Regulation.

Erera, I.P., & Lazar, A. (1994). "The administrative and educational functions in supervision: Indications of incompatibility". *The Clinical Supervisor, 12*(2), 39-56.

Gitterman, A. (1972). Comparison of educational models and their influences on supervision. In F.W. Kaslow et al. (Eds.), *Issues in human services* (pp.18-38). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harkness, D. & Poertner, J. (1989). "Research and social work supervision: A conceptual review". *Social Work, 34*(2), 115-118.

Himle, D.P., Jayaratne, S., & Thyness, P.A. (1989). The buffering effects of four types of supervisory support on work stress. *Administration in Social Work, 13*(1), 19-34.

Holloway, S., & Brager, G. (1989). *Supervising in the human service: The politics of practice*. N.Y. : The Free Press.

HKCSS/HKSWA/HKSWGU (1999) *Consultation Paper on the Development of Social work Professional Structure*. Working Group on Development of Professional Structure (unpublished consultation paper 25/1/1999).

Ingold., T. (ed) (1994). *Companion encyclopedia of anthropology: Humanity, culture and social life*. London: Routledge.

Kadushin, A. (1974). Supervisor-supervisee: A survey. *Social Work, 19*(3), 288-298.

Kadushin, A. (1992a). Social Work supervision: An updated survey. *The Clinical Supervisor, 10*(2), 9-27.

Kadushin, A. (1992b). What's wrong, what's right with social work supervision? *The Clinical Supervisor, 10*(1), 3-19.

Kadushin, A. & Harkness, D. (2002). *Supervision in Social Work* (4th ed.). N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

Ko, G..P. (1987). Casework supervision in voluntary family service agencies in Hong Kong. *International Social Work, 30*, 17-184.

Lowy, L. (1983). Social work supervision: From models toward theory. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 19*(2), 55-62.

Miller, I. (1987). Supervision in social work. In *Encyclopedia of social work* (pp.748-756). Vol.2, 18th ed. Silver Spring, MD: NASW Press.

Munson, C.E. (1993). *Clinical Social Work Supervision* (2nd ed.). N.Y.: The Haworth Press.

Munson, C.E. (2002). *Handbook of Clinical Social Work Supervision* (3rd ed.). N.Y.: The Haworth Social Work Practice Press.

Nachmias D. & Nachmias, C. (1981). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (2nd ed.). N.Y.: St Martin's Press.

NASW on-line leaflet on Specialty Certification Program.

Newsome, M. Jr., & Pillari, V. (1991). Job satisfaction and the worker-supervisor relationship. *The Clinical Supervisor, 1*, 53-65.

Appendix 1

Payne, M. (1994). Personal supervision in social work. In A. Connor & S. Black (eds.), <u>Performance Review and Quality in Social Care</u> (pp.43-58). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Poertner, J., & Rapp, C.A. (1983). What is social work supervision? <u>The Clinical Supervisor. 1</u>(2), 53-67.

Rauktis, M.E., & Koeske, G..F. (1994). Maintaining social worker morales: when supportive supervision is not enough. <u>Administration in Social Work. 18</u>(1), 39-60.

Shulman, L. (1993). <u>Interactional Supervision</u>. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.

Social Workers Registration Ordinance. Cap. 505.

Tsui, M.S. (1997a). The roots of social work supervision: An historical review. <u>The Clinical Supervisor, 15</u>(2), 191-198.

Tsui, M.S. (1997b). Empirical research on social work supervision: the state of the art (1970-1995). <u>Journal of Social Service Research. 23</u>(2), 39-54.

Tsui, M.S. (in press). Hopes and Dreams: Ideal Supervision for Social Workers in Hong Kong. <u>Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development</u>.

Veeder, N.W. (1990). Autonomy, accountability, and professionalism: The case against close supervision in social work. <u>The Clinical Supervisor, 8</u>(2), 33-47.

WORKING GROUP ON SUPERVISED PRACTICE

Membership List

Convenor: Dr. TSUI Ming-sum

Members: Ms. FU Kwok-chu, Kitty
             Ms. HO Wai-man, Tabitha
             Dr. LAW Chi-kwong
             Dr. LEE Tak-yan
             Mrs. LEUNG NGAI Mou-yin, Justina
             Ms. WONG Siu-ling, Gabriella

Appendix 2a

督導者的問卷

《督導者（supervisor）是指需要督導一位或以上註冊社工的人士。》

請在適當的方格內填上✓號，即☑。

甲、乙兩部份均需作答。
如問題的答案於甲部（即長方格內的部份）是
(1) 從來沒有，則不用繼續回答該問題的乙部。

甲：督導會議是指督導者與接受督導者談論工作的正式會面。請列述以下項目在督導會議中出現的情況：

乙：從你個人體驗，當進行以下項目後，你覺得同事的工作或專業能力有否改善及提升：

	甲 從來沒有 1	甚少 2	間中 3	經常 4	非常頻密 5	乙 完全沒有 1	很少 2	一般 3	很多 4	完全達到 5
1. 先呈交討論文件／工作進度記錄才舉行督導會	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. 先口頭上訂定討論內容和目的	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. 討論內容是有記錄及存案	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. 交代機構的政策、要求及規則	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. 分配工作及解釋分配工作的原因	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. 引領同工明白、理解工作要求和方向	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. 協調同工工作上的合作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. 協助同工與外界建立工作關係	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. 協助同工交流意見及經驗	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. 對同工工作進行實際的觀察(實地/透過錄影帶/其他)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. 建議／示範同工解決工作難題的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. 提供資訊協助同工解決難題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. 引領同工訂定工作目標和策劃個案／工作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. 鼓勵同工對問題作多角度的分析	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. 討論檢討和改善個案／工作的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. 協助同工擴闊視野	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. 鼓勵同工獨立處事和敢於接受挑戰	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. 和同工探討在工作上遇到的價值矛盾／衝突問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. 討論如何把專業知識和理論運用在實務工作上	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. 協助同工處理在工作上所遇到的情緒問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. 聆聽同工面對的工作困難和感受	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. 清楚分析同工工作上的強項和弱點	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. 肯定同工服務成果和對服務對象的成效	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. 協助同工減輕工作壓力	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

從你個人體驗，督導有否達到以下目的：

	完全沒有 1	很少 2	一般 3	很多 4	完全達到 5
25. 督導使服務對象得到更有果效和更有效率的服務。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. 督導增強同工的工作滿足感。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. 督導促進同工的專業成長和增強工作能力。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. 督導使同工的工作能有系統地向機構交代。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

請列述理想的督導會議應包含的項目：

	不重要 1	少許重要 2	非常重要 3	非常重要 4	無意見 0
29. 先呈交討論文件／工作進度記錄才舉行督導會	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. 先口頭上訂定討論內容和目的	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. 討論內容是有記錄及存案	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. 交代機構的政策、要求及規則	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. 分配工作及解釋分配工作的原因	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. 引領同工明白、理解工作要求和方向	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. 協調同工工作上的合作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. 協助同工與外界建立工作關係	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. 協助同工交流意見及經驗	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. 對同工工作進行實際的觀察（實地/透過錄影帶/其他）	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. 建議／示範同工解決工作難題的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. 提供資訊協助同工解決難題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41. 引領同工訂定工作目標和策劃個案／工作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. 鼓勵同工對問題作多角度的分析	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. 討論檢討和改善個案／工作的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. 協助同工擴闊視野	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45. 鼓勵同工獨立處事和敢於接受挑戰	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. 和同工探討在工作上遇到的價值矛盾／衝突問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. 討論如何把專業知識和理論運用在實務工作上	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. 協助同工處理在工作上所遇到的情緒問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. 聆聽同工面對的工作困難和感受	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. 清楚分析同工工作上的強項和弱點	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. 肯定同工服務成果和對服務對象的成效	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. 協助同工減輕工作壓力	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

你覺得督導的重要性在於：

	不重要 1	少許重要 2	重要 3	非常重要 4	無意見 0
53. 督導使服務對象得到更有果效和更有效率的服務。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. 督導增強同工的工作滿足感。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. 督導促進同工的專業成長和增強工作能力。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. 督導使同工的工作能有系統地向機構交代。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

請分享現時督導安排局限的地方。

_____

_____

_____

請建議改善現時督導效能的方法。

_____

_____

_____

你服務機構的背景：

57. 你的機構屬那一類別？
    1. ☐ 綜合服務機構
    2. ☐ 單一服務機構
    1.1. 如果是提供單一服務的機構，請列明主要服務對象。 _____

58. 你的機構共有職員多少人（非社工及社工）？
    1. ☐ 1–9人   2. ☐ 10–49人   3. ☐ 50–199人
    4. ☐ 200–499人   5. ☐ 500人或以上

59. 你的機構共有註冊社工多少人？   約 _____ 人

個人資料：

60. 性別：   1. ☐ 男   2. ☐ 女

61. 年齡（歲）： 1. ☐ 20–24 2. ☐ 25–29 3. ☐ 30–34 4. ☐ 35–39 5. ☐ 40–44
      6. ☐ 45–49 7. ☐ 50–54 8. ☐ 55–59 9. ☐ 60或以上

62. 最高學歷： 1. ☐ 社工文憑／副學士 2. ☐ 學士學位 3. ☐ 研究院文憑／碩士學位
      4. ☐ 博士學位 9. ☐ 其他，請列明：_____

63. 在社工專業的工作年資： _____ 年

64. 現時職位的主要服務對象： _____

65. 在現時職位的工作年資： _____ 年

66. 你督導多少位註冊社工？ _____

67. 你督導多少位機構同事？ _____

68. 督導工作佔你整體工作的百分比 _____ %

請填上社工註冊號碼或姓名 _____，以便註冊局記錄閣下有否寄回問卷。

註冊局將以未有寄回的名單作抽樣電話訪問。此頁會於註冊局秘書處分開處理及記錄後然後銷毀。註冊局只分析整體意見，絕不會記錄個別同工的看法。

如閣下願意參加聚焦小組，分享你對現時機構督導的看法，和你期望督導的發展方向，請告訴我們。

☐ 願意參加聚焦小組   電話號碼／電郵地址：_____

☐ 不願意參加聚焦小組

註冊局已付郵費，請對摺後封口寄回。

－ 多謝合作 －

Appendix 2b

接受督導者的問卷

《接受督導者（supervisee）是指完全沒有督導註冊社工職責的人士。》

請在適當的方格內填上✓號，即 ☑ 。

督導會議是指督導者與接受督導者談論工作的正式會面。過往一年你機構的實質安排是：

督導會議的次數：
（(1) 半年一次、(2) 兩至三個月一次、(3) 每月一次、(4) 每兩星期一次、(5) 每星期一次或以上。）

　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5
1. 個別督導（預約）
2. 個別督導（無預約／因應需要）
3. 小組督導
4. 其他，請列明：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

每次督導會議所需時間：
（(1) 約三十分鐘、(2) 約一小時、(3) 約一小時三十分鐘、(4) 約兩小時、(5) 約兩小時三十分鐘、(6) 約三小時或以上。）

　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6
5. 個別督導（預約）
6. 個別督導（無預約／因應需要）
7. 小組督導
8. 其他，請列明：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

對你來說，適合你的督導安排是：

督導會議的次數：
（(1) 半年一次、(2) 兩至三個月一次、(3) 每月一次、(4) 每兩星期一次、(5) 每星期一次或以上。）

　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5
9. 個別督導（預約）
10. 個別督導（無預約／因應需要）
11. 小組督導
12. 其他，請列明：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

每次督導會議所需時間：
（(1) 約三十分鐘、(2) 約一小時、(3) 約一小時三十分鐘、(4) 約兩小時、(5) 約兩小時三十分鐘、(6) 約三小時或以上。）

　　　　　　　　　　　　1　2　3　4　5　6
5. 個別督導（預約）
6. 個別督導（無預約／因應需要）
7. 小組督導
8. 其他，請列明：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

甲、乙兩部份均需作答。
如問題的答案於甲部（即長方格內的部份）是
(1) 從來沒有，則不用繼續回答該問題的乙部。

甲：督導會議是指督導者與接受督導者談論工作的正式會面。請列述以下項目在督導會議中出現的情況：（從來沒有／甚少／間中／經常／非常頻密，1 2 3 4 5）

乙：從你個人體驗，當進行以下項目後，你覺得同事的工作或專業能力有否改善及提升：（完全沒有／很少／一般／很多／完全達到，1 2 3 4 5）

17. 先呈交討論文件／工作進度記錄才舉行督導會
18. 先口頭上訂定討論內容和目的
19. 討論內容是有記錄及存案
20. 交代機構的政策、要求及規則

21. 分配工作及解釋分配工作的原因
22. 引領同工明白、理解工作要求和方向
23. 協調同工工作上的合作
24. 協助同工與外界建立工作關係
25. 協助同工交流意見及經驗

26. 督導者對同工工作進行實際的觀察（實地／透過錄影帶／其他）
27. 建議／示範同工解決工作難題的方法
28. 提供資訊協助同工解決難題
29. 引領同工訂定工作目標和策劃個案／工作
30. 鼓勵同工對問題作多角度的分析

31. 討論檢討和改善個案／工作的方法
32. 協助同工擴闊視野
33. 鼓勵同工獨立處事和敢於接受挑戰
34. 和同工探討在工作上遇到的價值矛盾／衝突問題
35. 討論如何把專業知識和理論運用在實務工作上

36. 協助同工處理在工作上所遇到的情緒問題
37. 聆聽同工面對的工作困難和感受
38. 清楚分析同工工作上的強項和弱點
39. 肯定同工服務成果和對服務對象的成效
40. 協助同工減輕工作壓力

從你個人體驗，督導有否達到以下目的：

	完全沒有 1	很少 2	一般 3	很多 4	完全達到 5
41. 督導使服務對象得到更有果效和更有效率的服務。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. 督導增強你的工作滿足感。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. 督導促進你的專業成長和增強工作能力。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. 督導使你的工作能有系統地向機構交代。	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

請列述理想的督導會議應包含的項目：

	不重要 1	少許重要 2	重要 3	非常重要 4	無意見 0
45. 先呈交討論文件／工作進度記錄才舉行督導會	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. 先口頭上訂定討論內容和目的	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. 討論內容是有記錄及存案	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. 交代機構的政策、要求及規則	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. 分配工作及解釋分配工作的原因	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. 引領同工明白、理解工作要求和方向	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. 協調同工工作上的合作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. 協助同工與外界建立工作關係	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53. 協助同工交流意見及經驗	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. 督導者對同工工作進行實際的觀察（實地／透過錄影帶／其他）	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. 建議／示範同工解決工作難題的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. 提供資訊協助同工解決難題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. 引領同工訂定工作目標和策劃個案／工作	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. 鼓勵同工對問題作多角度的分析	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
59. 討論檢討和改善個案／工作的方法	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60. 協助同工擴闊視野	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61. 鼓勵同工獨立處事和敢於接受挑戰	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62. 和同工探討在工作上遇到的價值矛盾／衝突問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
63. 討論如何把專業知識和理論運用在實務工作上	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
64. 協助同工處理在工作上所遇到的情緒問題	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
65. 聆聽同工面對的工作困難和感受	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
66. 清楚分析同工工作上的強項和弱點	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
67. 肯定同工服務成果和對服務對象的成效	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
68. 協助同工減輕工作壓力	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

你覺得督導的重要性在於：

	不重要 1	少許重要 2	重要 3	非常重要 4	無意見 0
69. 督導使受助者得到更有果效和更有效率的服務	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
70. 督導增強你的工作滿足感	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
71. 督導促進你的專業成長和增強工作能力	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72. 督導使你的工作能有系統地向機構交代	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

請分享現時督導安排局限的地方。

_____

_____

請建議改善現時督導效能的方法。

_____

_____

你服務機構的背景：

73. 你的機構屬那一類別？
　　1. ☐ 綜合服務機構
　　2. ☐ 單一服務機構
　　1.1. 如果是提供單一服務的機構，請列明主要服務對象。 _____

74. 你的機構共有職員多少人（非社工及社工）？
　　1. ☐ 1-9人　　　2. ☐ 10-49人　　　3. ☐ 50-199人
　　4. ☐ 200-499人　　5. ☐ 500人或以上

75. 你的機構共有註冊社工多少人？　　　　　　　約_____人

76. 你的督導者是否註冊社工？
　　1. ☐ 是
　　2. ☐ 否

個人資料：

77. 性別： 1. ☐ 男　　 2. ☐ 女

78. 年齡（歲）：1. ☐ 19或以下　2. ☐ 20–24　3. ☐ 25–29　4. ☐ 30–34　5. ☐ 35–39

　　　　　　　6. ☐ 40–44　　7. ☐ 45–49　8. ☐ 50–54　9. ☐ 55–59　10. ☐ 60或以上

79. 最高學歷： 1. ☐ 社工文憑／副學士　　2. ☐ 學士學位　　　3. ☐ 研究院文憑／碩士學位

　　　　　　　4. ☐ 博士學位　　　9. ☐ 其他，請列明：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

80. 在社工專業的工作年資：　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿年

81. 現時職位的主要服務對象：　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

82. 在現時職位的工作年資：　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿年

請填上社工註冊號碼或姓名 ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿，以便註冊局記錄閣下有否寄回問卷。

註冊局將以未有寄回的名單作抽樣電話訪問。此頁會於註冊局秘書處分開處理及記錄後然後

銷毀。註冊局只分析整體意見，絕不會記錄個別同工的看法。

如閣下願意參加聚焦小組，分享你對現時機構督導的看法，和你期望督導的發展方向，請告訴我們。

☐ 願意參加聚焦小組　　　電話號碼／電郵地址：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

☐ 不願意參加聚焦小組

註冊局已付郵費，請對摺後封口寄回。

－　多謝合作　－

80

Questionnaire for Supervisors

《Supervisors refer to those who have to supervise more than one registered social worker》

Please put the ticks in the appropriate boxes. For example ☑ .

Please answer both sections A and B.
If the answer of the question is (1) Never in section A (section inside the rectangle), then, no need to answer section B of the same question.

Section A: Supervisory meeting refers to the formal discussion meeting between supervisor and supervisee. Please indicate the occurrence of following circumstances during your supervisory sessions.

Section B: According to your personal experience, whether there is any work improvement or professional enhancement for your supervisee after the occurrence of the circumstances.

	Section A					Section B				
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very frequently	None	Little	Average	Very much	Highly achieved
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
1. Discussion document/progress record is submitted before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Discussion content and objectives are verbally agreed before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Discussion content will be recorded and filed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Policies, requirements and rules of the organization are briefed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Job is assigned and allocated with explanations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Colleague is led to understand the requirements and directions of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Colleague is helped to work in a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Colleague is helped to build up network outside the agency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Colleague is helped to exchange views and experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The work of colleague (in person/through video recording/ others) is observed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Problem solving methods are demonstrated to solve particular issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Colleague is provided information on how to solve problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Colleague is guided to identify work objectives and plan his/her cases/work planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Colleague is encouraged to analyze problems from different perspectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Evaluation and improvement methods on case/ work management are discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Never 1	Seldom 2	Sometimes 3	Frequently 4	Very frequently 5	None 1	Little 2	Average 3	Very much 4	Highly achieved 5
16. Colleague is helped to widen his/her horizon	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Colleague is encouraged to work independently and to face challenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Value conflict in work is explored and discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Integration of professional knowledge and theories in work is discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Colleague is helped to handle work-related frustrations and emotions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Colleague is given the opportunity to express his/her difficulties and feelings on work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Strengths and weaknesses of colleague are clearly analyzed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. The service performance of colleague is acknowledged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Colleague is helped to lessen work pressure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

According to your personal experience, whether your supervision has achieved the following objectives:

	None 1	Little 2	Average 3	Very much 4	Highly achieved 5
25. Supervision helps service recipients to have more effective and efficient services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Supervision enhances the job satisfaction level of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Supervision enhances the professional growth and work abilities of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Supervision is a means to help colleague to systematically report his/her work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate what should be included in an ideal supervisory session:

	Not important 1	Quite important 2	Important 3	Very important 4	No comment 0
29. Discussion document/progress record is submitted before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. Discussion content and objectives are verbally agreed before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. Discussion content will be recorded and filed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Policies, requirements and rules of the organization are briefed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Job is assigned and allocated with explanations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. Colleague is led to understand the requirements and directions of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. Colleague is helped to work in a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Colleague is helped to build up network outside the agency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. Colleague is helped to exchange views and experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. Observes the work of colleague (in person/through video recording/ others)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. Problem solving methods are demonstrated to solve particular issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Colleague is provided information on how to solve problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41. Colleague is guided to identify work objectives and plan his / her cases / work planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. Colleague is encouraged to analyze problems from different perspectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. Evaluation and improvement methods on case/ work management are discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. Colleague is helped to widen his/her horizon	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45. Colleague is encouraged to work independently and to face challenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. Value conflict in work is explored and discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. Integration of professional knowledge and theories in work is discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. Colleague is helped to handle work-related frustrations and emotions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. Colleague is given the opportunity to express his/her difficulties and feelings on work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. Strengths and weaknesses of colleague are clearly analyzed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. The service performance of colleague is acknowledged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. Colleague is helped to lessen work pressure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

From your point of view, what is the importance of supervision?

	Not important	Quite important	Important	Very important	No comment
	1	2	3	4	0
53. Supervision helps service recipients to have more effective and efficient services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. Supervision enhances the job satisfaction level of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. Supervision enhances the professional growth and work abilities of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. Supervision is a means to help colleague to systematically report his/her work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please share your view on the limitations of the current supervisory practice.

_____

_____

Please suggest ways to improve the effectiveness of current practice.

_____

_____

Agency Background:

57. The type of agency of your organization
1. ☐ Multi-service agency
2. ☐ Single service agency
1.1. If your organization is providing single service, please specify the service target: _____

58. The number of staff working in your organization (including social workers and non social workers)?
1. ☐ 1-9 person(s) 2. ☐ 10-49 persons
3. ☐ 50-199 persons 4. ☐ 200-499 persons
5. ☐ 500 persons or above

59. The number of registered social workers working in your organization

Around _____ Person(s)

Personal Information:

60. Sex: 1. ☐ Male 2. ☐ Female

61. Age: 1. ☐ 20-24 2. ☐ 25-29 3. ☐ 30-34 4. ☐ 35-39 5. ☐ 40-44
6. ☐ 45-49 7. ☐ 50-54 8. ☐ 55-59 9. ☐ 60 or above

62. Highest Education obtained:
1. ☐ Social Work Diploma /Associate Degree 2. ☐ Bachelor Degree
3. ☐ Post-graduate Diploma / Master Degree 4. ☐ Doctorate Degree
9. ☐ Others, please specify: _____

63. Number of year(s) serving in the social work profession: _____ Year

64. Target clients of your position: _____

65. Number of year(s) serving in the current position: _____ Year

66. Number of registered social worker(s) you are supervising currently: _____

67. Number of staff you are supervising currently: _____

68. The proportion of supervisory work of your position: _____ %

Please put down your registration number or name _____ to facilitate the Registration Board to follow up with the collection of questionnaires. Registration Board will conduct random sampling telephone survey from the non-reply list. When your return of questionnaire is noted, this page will be subsequently destroyed. The Registration Board will only analyze aggregate data, individual opinion will not be on record.

If you are interested to participate in our focus group(s) to share your views on the current practice of supervision and your expectation on the development of supervision, please let us know.

☐ Yes, I would like to join the focus group(s) Telephone/ Email: _____

☐ No, I would not join the focus group

Please send the completed questionnaire including this page back to the Social Workers Registration Board:

11/F Heng Shan Centre, 145 Queens Road East, Wanchai, Hong Kong.

- Thank you -

Appendix 3b

Questionnaire for Supervisees

《Supervisees refer to those who do not have to supervise any registered social workers》

Please put the ticks in the appropriate boxes. For example ☑ .

<u>Supervisory session refers to the formal discussion meeting between supervisor and supervisee.</u>
<u>Last year, the actual arrangement of your agency was:</u>

Number of supervisory session(s):
((1) once every 6 months, (2) once every 2 to 3 months, (3) once a month,
(4) once every 2 weeks, (5) at least once a week.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Individual supervision (with appointment)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Group supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Others, please specify:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The average duration of each supervisory session?
((1) Around 30 minutes, (2) Around 1 hour, (3) Around 1 1/2 hour,
(4) Around 2 hours, (5) Around 2 1/2 hours, (6) Around 3 hours or above.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Individual supervision (with appointment)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Group supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Others, please specify:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

<u>An appropriate supervisory arrangement meeting your needs should be:</u>

Number of supervisory session(s):
((1) once every 6 months, (2) once every 2 to 3 months, (3) once a month,
(4) once every 2 weeks, (5) at least once a week.)

	1	2	3	4	5
9. Individual supervision (with appointment)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Group supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Others, please specify:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

The average duration of each supervisory session
((1) Around 30 minutes, (2) Around 1 hour, (3) Around 1 1/2 hour,
(4) Around 2 hours, (5) Around 2 1/2 hours, (6) Around 3 hours or above.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Individual supervision (with appointment)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Individual supervision (no appointment/ when necessary)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Group supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Others, please specify:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

86

Please answer both sections A and B.
If the answer of the question is <u>(1) Never</u> in section A
(section inside the rectangle), then, there is no need to
answer section B of the same question.

Section A: Supervisory meeting refers to the formal discussion meeting between supervisor and supervisee. Please indicate the occurrence of following circumstances during your supervisory sessions.

Section B: According to your personal experience, whether there is any work improvement or professional enhancement for your supervisee after the occurrence of the circumstances.

Section A columns: Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Frequently (4), Very frequently (5)
Section B columns: None (1), Little (2), Average (3), Very much (4), Highly achieved (5)

Question	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5
17. Discussion document/progress record is submitted before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Discussion content and objectives are verbally agreed before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Discussion content will be recorded and filed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. Policies, requirements and rules of the organization are briefed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Job is assigned and allocated with explanations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Colleague is led to understand the requirements and directions of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Colleague is helped to work in a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Colleague is helped to build up network outside the agency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Colleague is helped to exchange views and experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. The work of colleague (in person/through video recording/ others) is observed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Problem solving methods are demonstrated to solve particular issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Colleague is provided information on how to solve problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Colleague is guided to identify work objectives and plan his/her cases/work planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. Colleague is encouraged to analyze problems from different perspectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. Evaluation and improvement methods on case/ work management are discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Colleague is helped to widen his/her horizon	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Colleague is encouraged to work independently and to face challenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. Value conflict in work is explored and discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. Integration of professional knowledge and theories in work is discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Colleague is helped to handle work-related frustrations and emotions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. Colleague is given the opportunity to express his/her difficulties and feelings on work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. Strengths and weaknesses of colleague are clearly analyzed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. The service performance of colleague is acknowledged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Colleague is helped to lessen work pressure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

87

According to your personal experience, whether your supervision has
achieved the following objectives:

	None	Little	Average	Very much	Highly achieved
	1	2	3	4	5
41. Supervision helps service recipients to have more effective and efficient services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42. Supervision enhances the job satisfaction level of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43. Supervision enhances the professional growth and work abilities of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44. Supervision is a means to help colleague to systematically report his/her work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate what should be included in an ideal supervisory session:

	Not important	Quite important	Important	Very important	No comment
	1	2	3	4	0
45. Discussion document/progress record is submitted before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46. Discussion content and objectives are verbally agreed before the supervisory session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47. Discussion content will be recorded and filed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48. Policies, requirements and rules of the organization are briefed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49. Job is assigned and allocated with explanations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50. Colleague is led to understand the requirements and directions of work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51. Colleague is helped to work in a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. Colleague is helped to build up network outside the agency	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53. Colleague is helped to exchange views and experience	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. Supervisor observes the work of colleague (in person/through video recording/ others)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. Problem solving methods are demonstrated to solve particular issues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. Colleague is provided information on how to solve problems	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. Colleague is guided to identify work objectives and plan his/her cases/work planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. Colleague is encouraged to analyze problems from different perspectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
59. Evaluation and improvement methods on case/ work management are discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60. Colleague is helped to widen his/her horizon	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61. Colleague is encouraged to work independently and to face challenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62. Value conflict in work is explored and discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
63. Integration of professional knowledge and theories in work is discussed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
64. Colleague is helped to handle work-related frustrations and emotions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
65. Colleague is given the opportunity to express his/her difficulties and feelings on work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
66. Strengths and weaknesses of colleague are clearly analyzed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
67. The service performance of colleague is acknowledged	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
68. Colleague is helped to lessen work pressure	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

From your point of view, what is the importance of supervision?

	Not important	Quite important	Important	Very important	No comment
	1	2	3	4	0
69. Supervision helps service recipients to have more effective and efficient services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
70. Supervision enhances the job satisfaction level of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
71. Supervision enhances the professional growth and work abilities of colleague	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72. Supervision is a means to help colleague to systematically report his/her work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please share your view on the limitations of the current supervisory practice.

_____

_____

Please suggest ways to improve the effectiveness of current practice.

_____

_____

Agency Background:

73. The type of agency of your organization
   1. ☐ Multi-service agency
   2. ☐ Single service agency
   1.1. If your organization is providing single service, please specify the service target: _____

74. The number of staff working in your organization (including social workers and non social workers)?
   1. ☐ 1-9 person(s)   2. ☐ 10-49 persons
   3. ☐ 50-199 persons   4. ☐ 200-499 persons
   5. ☐ 500 persons or above

75. The number of registered social workers working in your organization
   Around _____ Person(s)

76. Are you supervised by a registered social worker?
   1. ☐ Yes
   2. ☐ No

Personal Information:

77. Sex: 1. ☐ Male　　　　2. ☐ Female

78. Age: 1. ☐ 19 or below　2. ☐ 20-24　3. ☐ 25-29　4. ☐ 30-34　5. ☐ 35-39

　　　　6. ☐ 40-44　7. ☐ 45-49　8. ☐ 50-54　9. ☐ 55-59　10.☐ 60 or above

79. Highest Education obtained:

　　1. ☐ Social Work Diploma /Associate Degree　　2. ☐ Bachelor Degree

　　3. ☐ Post-graduate Diploma / Master Degree　　4. ☐ Doctorate Degree

　　9. ☐ Others, please specify: _____

80. Number of year(s) serving in the social work profession: _____ Year

81. Target clients of your position: _____

Please put down your registration number or name _____ to facilitate the Registration Board to follow up with the collection of questionnaires. Registration Board will conduct random sampling telephone survey from the non-reply list. When your return of questionnaire is noted, this page will be subsequently destroyed. The Registration Board will only analyze aggregate data, individual opinion will not be on record.

If you are interested to participate in our focus group(s) to share your views on the current practice of supervision and your expectation on the development of supervision, please let us know.

☐　Yes, I would like to join the focus group(s)　　Telephone/ Email: _____

☐　No, I would not join the focus group

Please send the completed questionnaire including this page back to the Social Workers Registration Board:

11/F Heng Shan Centre, 145 Queens Road East, Wanchai, Hong Kong.

- Thank you -