

Table 2.2 Comparison of key features of four supervision approaches

Evaluation criteria	Developmental	Reflective Learning	Strengths-based	Cultural
<i>Structure</i>	Developmental stages Transition points for interventions	Action–reflection cycle	Not prescribed	Follows cultural rituals of engagement and encounter
<i>Purpose</i>	Assists supervisees to move from novice to expert Recognises key points of transition between stages	Facilitates supervisees to find solutions within themselves through reflection on their experience and actions	Facilitates supervisees to find solutions within themselves based on their existing strengths and prior positive experiences	Supports supervisees through a process that is grounded in spiritual, traditional and theoretical understandings that are congruent with their world view
<i>Attention to relationship</i>	Reflects progression through developmental stages (supervisee and supervisor)	Trust and safety Collaborative	Trust and safety Collaborative	Negotiates and affirms cultural roles and responsibilities
<i>Attention to process</i>	Uses a range of interventions suited to supervisee developmental stages and transitions between stages	Follows the steps of action–reflection cycle	Language critical to address strengths Isomorphism requires supervisor to model strengths-based interventions	Close adherence to processes which are culturally explicit, i.e. beginning with a prayer/reflection, acknowledgement of kin and community connections
<i>Attention to context</i>	Based on supervisee’s level of experience	Based on supervisee’s actual experiences and responses – past, present and future	Based on supervisee’s ‘reality’	Personal, family, community, cultural and professional domains
<i>Underlying theoretical orientation</i>	Developmental theory	Adult learning theory, reflective practice and experiential learning	Post modernist ideas about language and meaning Social constructionism Isomorphism	Holistic orientation Spiritual and traditional knowledge
<i>Technical or clinical detail</i>	Supervisor led with input from supervisee 5 interventions: prescriptive, confrontative, conceptual, catalytic and facilitative	Mainly supervisee’s agenda Cyclic process of reflection, exploration, analysis, experimentation and review	Supervisee’s agenda Construction of narratives based on exploration of strengths and reframing old ‘stories’	Reflects cultural practices and understandings of participants who share a similar world view
<i>Utility across professions</i>	Can be applied to any profession	Can be applied to any profession	Can be applied to any profession	Can be applied to any profession
<i>Attention to power</i>	Supervisor’s authority assumed Supervisee’s authority develops with expertise	Collaborative to develop supervisee’s self-awareness and learning	Collaborative: reframing to empower supervisee and raise self-efficacy	Consideration of the power of the dominant culture and the position of cultural minorities May include explicit hierarchy related to cultural roles and responsibilities
<i>Cultural aspects</i>	Assumption of homogeneity Traditional Western determination of stages of development	Exploration of context and content	Understanding of social constructionism of ideas, values and beliefs that underpin practice	Validation and support for cultural identity Explicit links to cultural and social development
<i>Issues of difference</i>	A developmental issue	Values and recognises individual perceptions and differences	Recognises and values individual differences and strengths	Homogeneity is important and deliberate Status is recognised Recognises impact of dominant culture Isomorphic
<i>Time</i>	Stages are recycled over time at deeper levels as practitioners develop in their experience and competence	Uses past and present to measure change and access experience and to bring to the fore for future action and understanding	Presupposes the actuality of success	Time is imbued with cultural meaning and often linked to traditional knowledge and ways of ‘knowing’