

supervision

Games Played in the Supervisory Relationship: The Modern Version

Frank Delano and Jill C. Shah

Abstract: Nearly forty years ago Alfred Kadushin and Lillian Hawthorne identified a number of "games" that can develop in the supervisory relationship when one of the parties feels disempowered or threatened. Using that as a backdrop this article identifies a series of more "modernized games" played in supervision. The paper suggests a number of strategies for supervisors to identify the core health in these games and then confront them constructively to enhance the supervisory process.

It is often said that "classics are called classic for a reason". In 1968 Alfred Kadushin wrote "Games People Play in Supervision" and seven years later Lillian Hawthorne (1975) added "Games Supervisor Play". The basic premise was that when there is an imbalance in the supervisory relationship with one party feeling disempowered they will play manipulative "games" to seize power in an unhealthy way. The goal of what most games seek to achieve has a core health to it that gets lost when the manipulation begins. While being specific to social work supervision these authors provide a backdrop to our exploration of how changing times and changing dynamics in the field of child and youth

care have contributed insights to a number of "modern games" played in supervisory relationships. Our list of games and insights on how to best process these in the supervisory relationship are drawn from our own supervisory experiences over the years, as well as from feedback and insights shared by participants in a large

number of trainings we have facilitated across the United States, Canada, Israel, Scotland and India. Issues and "games" referred to in supervisory relationships were both similar and relevant across many different settings. In this article we will identify a number of games that exist in supervisory relationships in child and youth care settings and suggest strategies to constructively confront the games in a way that opens a forum to discuss the relationship dynamics fueling the games. By focusing on the core health involved in games the supervisor can increase understanding and growth for child and youth care workers, improve the supervisory relationship and enhance child and youth care practice.

Games and Relationships in Child and Youth Care

May (2005) stated "we play the same mind games with our supervisor and our lover". It is certainly an intriguing thought, but given the structurally cloudy boundaries in child and youth care, and our focus on supervi-



sion as a "professional relationship", we will gracefully avoid pursuing that issue here! Still, it is amusing to think of it and how the qualities of various types of relationships have such distinct similarities. Alwon (2000) does a superb job of articulating the many factors that influence the supervisory relationship. He points to factors such as age, educational credentials, gender, ethnicity, size, experience levels, intelligence, historical antecedents, and personality. It is easy to get one's head spinning when thinking of the geometric progression of games that could develop around all those topic areas. Garfat (1992) suggests "Supervision is an opportunity and a right; not an obligation or demand. It is the responsibility of the supervisor to provide the opportunity for quality supervision, and it is the responsibility of the supervisee to take advantage of that opportunity. Both responsibilities are of equal importance". Garfat's framework provides a strong grounding for high quality professional supervision, but if either party in the relationship fails to capitalize on the opportunity then the seeds of destructive games get planted. In analyzing games in supervision one must strongly consider that all the games have a certain core component of health in them. For instance in Kadushin's (1968) "one good question deserves another" game the supervisor could be exhibiting an excellent technique in getting the supervisee to first reflect on their own question before giving an opinion or answer

themselves. But, when one of the parties in the relationship senses an imbalance of power, or a threat to their position or sense of adequacy, the health deteriorates into a game. In this case a supervisor who may be insecure about their expertise, or annoyed with a constantly questioning supervisee, would abdicate their teaching role and keep bouncing the question back to the supervisee saying "So what do you think would be best?". This exemplifies a healthy supervision technique crossing over into a game.

Games Played by Supervisors

The primary focus of this article will be on games played by supervisees and strategies for a supervisor to best process these games within the relationship. However, it is important to acknowledge that supervisors also initiate games that can negatively impact the supervisee and the supervisory relationship. A supervisor needs to avoid initiating games as it hurts them in terms of credibility, real authority and professional image. Hawthorne (1975) placed supervisors' games into the categories of games of abdication and games of power. Kadushin (1968) relates games played by a supervisor to threats to their authority, reluctance to use their authority, and a desire to be liked. Many of the themes of the games described by Kadushin and Hawthorne are still significant in today's supervisory relationships and in the following we have compiled some additional versions to consider.

"Carpet Bombing"

In this game the supervisor is faced with a breach of policy or inappropriate practice and is reluctant to process that directly with the worker. The worker may be a strong culture carrier with other CYC staff, challenging to the supervisor, or maybe one who fills a lot of extra shifts and the supervisor doesn't want to disrupt the status quo. For instance, such a worker may have recently changed plans in a recreation program without consulting the supervisor as the policy indicates. Instead of confronting the worker directly the supervisor simply "carpet bombs" the issue by placing it on the agenda of the next team meeting as "policy review for recreation programs". Most on the team will likely know who broke the policy and will resent having to sit through the discussion. The potential health in this process is that it is always good to review and clarify policies when there may be a lack of clarity. It becomes a game when it is clear the supervisor is avoiding processing the issue directly with the offender. In this game the supervisor can negatively empower the policy breaker as well as look like they are not carrying out their responsibility to confront workers when needed.

"The Safety was Just a Mirage"

Part of excellent, professionally packaged supervision is for the supervisor to create an atmosphere where workers feel they can safely share their insecurities, mistakes, and skill shortfalls in supervision. The

supervisee is as they share these they will be rewe honesty and sel The supervisor s ways to improve supervisee, but consistent discu support for the i and therefore n occurs. When a tion time comes then relates to t nesses" reveale supervisee as a improve. The he process is that c for the worker to reflect on them struggles create way to monitor c foster professio also healthy to c tion as a forum areas needing g those areas shc only after the su worked to supp supervisee to r a positive direct tive of this gam supervisee may about what they unfair evaluatio resents having : issues so open short term tens the supervisor's create a safe fo to discuss their would be a part erous game if tl level 1 in Phela stages of child : worker develop where one of th needs of the C) develop trust ir

"The Million D

A crucial tas visor building p



ing”
he supervisor
each of policy
practice and is
ss that
orker. The
strong culture
CYC staff,
supervisor,
fills a lot of
re supervisor
isrupt the
stance, such
e recently
a recreation
onsulting the
policy indi-
onfronting
y the super-
ot bombs”
ing it on the
t team
/ review for
ns”. Most on
/ know who
nd will resent
gh the
ntential health
hat it is
/iew and
an there may
. It becomes
clear the
ling
ue directly
In this game
negatively
y breaker as
ey are not
esponsibility
s when

Just a

t, profession-
er vision is for
reate an
: workers feel
are their inse-
and skill
ision. The

supervisee is assured that if they share these issues openly they will be rewarded for their honesty and self reflection. The supervisor suggests some ways to improve for the supervisee, but there is no consistent discussion or support for the improvement and therefore no change occurs. When annual evaluation time comes the supervisor then relates to the “weaknesses” revealed by the supervisee as areas needing to improve. The health in this process is that creating a forum for the worker to honestly self reflect on themselves and their struggles creates an excellent way to monitor quality and foster professional growth. It is also healthy to use the evaluation as a forum to point out areas needing growth, but those areas should be listed only after the supervisor has worked to support the supervisee to move the issue in a positive direction. The negative of this game is that the supervisee may feel angry about what they perceive as unfair evaluation grading and resents having shared the issues so openly. This creates short term tension and erodes the supervisor’s ability to create a safe forum for workers to discuss their practice. This would be a particularly treacherous game if the worker is at level 1 in Phelan’s (1990) stages of child and youth care worker development model where one of the primary needs of the CYC worker is to develop trust in the supervisor.

“The Million Dollar Idea”

A crucial task for a supervisor building positive

relationships is to get input from workers on how to help the program function in a better way. Many supervisors will profess to want suggestions from workers in a number of forums, but some don’t genuinely want the input they are asking for. They may think it will mean extra work, create a need to lobby for more resources, they are threatened by a particularly insightful supervisee, or they just prefer the status quo. These supervisors will hear the ideas and give the impression “That is a great idea. It is a million dollar idea!” Then they do not follow up on the reality of operationalizing these ideas in the program. Worse yet, they may later raise the idea with more senior management and suggest that it was theirs. The health is obvious in soliciting input directly from workers about how to improve child and youth care practice, but unless the supervisor has a process that realistically assesses the ideas for implementation and some sort of formal report back system (for example team meetings) this can easily slide into a destructive game where the CYC worker sees the supervisor as insincere and unappreciative.

“I’m On My Way to a Meeting...”

New supervisors recently promoted from direct child care work would be particularly susceptible to this game. The new supervisor likely had excellent skills and got a lot of positive feedback for their work and relationships with children. Many times new supervisors do not get a lot of early training or

support. They are aware they now have to let others do the direct work, but don’t know how to best structure their newly found discretionary time as a supervisor. They have entered a new professional world of meetings, senior managers, etc. While that does bring some extra importance to their stature in the program, they may not feel important as they are not yet confident in the impact they are making in their new role. This game develops when the supervisor is asked to do a supervisory task by one of the workers they do not have the answer, the supervisor will dodge the situation by indicating they would like to take the time process it now, but “I’m on my way a meeting”. They look to over-accentuate their importance by giving the impression they are about to make extremely important contributions to the program in this meeting (even though they are so new to the role) so the question or request will have to wait. Of course, their anxiety likely shows through and that starts to damage their credibility with the workers as they may be seen as unsupportive and not so willing to “roll their sleeves up” anymore on some of the direct child caring work.

“As the World Turns (Around Me!)”

High functioning supervisors provide needed guidance to workers while assessing how much independence they can give each worker in performing a variety of tasks. However, supervisors who are unsure of their status will often micromanage staff and issues

Many times new supervisors do not get a lot of early training or support. They are aware they now have to let others do the direct work, but don’t know how to best structure their newly found discretionary time as a supervisor.



where they do not need to as a way to be seen as being important in all aspects of the program. This may take the form of asking workers to carbon copy them on e-mails of even the most basic tasks, putting directions that could be given to staff verbally in formal memo form, delegating tasks and insisting on updates on minute issues. Some purposefully withhold information or resources so that staff will have to rely on them to complete a task. When this attempt to “have the world turn around them” includes insisting on non-essential documentation the game takes on added dimensions. Of course, in our world of increasing emphasis on compliance and documentation having written trails and monitoring structures for supervisory practice is healthy. But, if not careful it can turn into a destructive game when it reaches that level in the program culture of “if it wasn’t written it didn’t happen”. More potential negative results of this game are that workers feel they cannot be creative and aren’t trusted. On one occasion a CYC worker told us of the time they received a memo regarding a request for a basic task that had a “return receipt requested” from the supervisor to verify they received the e-mail. Their anger was seeping through as they felt they were perhaps going to become a victim of the “gotcha” game of a micromanaging supervisor.

Assessing and Addressing Games Supervisees Play

While supervisors have to be in touch with their tendency to let a healthy process slide into

a destructive game, much more of their energy in supervision will be identifying games that supervisees initiate in the relationship and developing effective strategies to constructively address them. Kadushin (1968) felt that anxiety, threats to sense of adequacy, and the realistic threat of being in a lower power position than the supervisor will be the primary reasons for the supervisee to engage in games of control. Those dynamics still hold true in supervisory relationships in child and youth care, and as our field becomes more focused on compliance and documentation (many agencies now require that a supervisee sign a sheet after a supervisory session to prove that the session actually took place!) a new set of anxieties and threats develop for the supervisee that will compound the tendency for the CYC worker to resort to these games. In the remainder of this article we will look at some of the modern style games that child and youth care supervisees play, identify the healthy threads in the game, and suggest a number of strategies for supervisors to address these games in a way that brings the supervisory process back to a standard of excellence and a positive growth vehicle.

Kadushin (1968) suggested the most direct way for the supervisor to deal with the problem of games is to simply refuse to play. He felt that it was alright to openly confront the awareness of a game being played, but thought discussion should not go to dynamics and only look at the practical disad-

vantages for the supervisee in the game. However, we feel it is extremely important for the supervisor to develop a series of strategies to address the games in a way that can collaboratively address the dynamics and reasons for the games. By addressing games as part of regular supervisory dialogue this better hones in on the CYC relational approach and will be more likely to illuminate the larger supervisory issue to process of which the game is merely a symptom. If one looks at games as a form of resistance to the supervisory process it is crucial to note Bradley and Gould's (2002) point that “the ability of the supervisor to take resistance and turn it into a supervisory advantage may be the hallmark for determining success or failure in supervision”.

Based on our concept of professionally packaged supervisory practice (Delano and Shah, 2009) we suggest three tracks as a structure for supervisors as a base for addressing games in a productive way. Much of the dynamic for games to develop rests in the power imbalance the supervisee feels in the relationship. In earlier writings we have suggested strategies for the supervisor to constructively balance power in the supervisory relationship (Delano and Shah, 2006) and this would be the first track for the supervisor to focus on. These strategies include use of shared agendas for supervision, looking for ways to match the tasks given with the positive skills of the worker, continuous contracting of the relationship, a clear set of expectations, encouraging crit-

ical thinking, ar of the immense visor has in the

The second to have a worki “desk definitio reminder of the nents of superv model would se for standards a when a game is We developed i tion of professi supervision (De 2009) which w basic model to supervisor fine matches up wit ular relationship “professionally supervision” as

Supervision sional relatio provides sup tion, monito and provide: to reflect on practice. It s encourage c and constru tation that ir improves the all parties. R inherent hie relationship accept the e sibility to use thoughtful r dynamics of sory relation create a par in all other r including the client/worke supervision: vehicle to cr growth, esta professional and enhanc

Kadushin (1968) suggested the most direct way for the supervisor to deal with the problem of games is to simply refuse to play.



supervisee in
er, we feel it is
ant for the
elop a series
dress the
at can
dress the
sons for the
sing games
supervisory
r hones in on
approach
kely to illum-
ervisory
f which the
ymptom. If
s as a form
supervisory
l to note
's (2002)
ity of the
esistance
pervisory
the hall-
ng success
sion".
ncept of
aged super-
ano and
ggest three
e for super-
addressing
ive way.
ic for games
he power
visee feels
n earlier
ggested
pervisor to
ce power in
ionship
(2006) and
st track for
us on.
lude use of
supervi-
s to match
the posi-
er,
ng of the
set of
aging crit-

ical thinking, and being mindful of the immense power a supervisor has in the worker's life.

The second track would be to have a working model or "desk definition" that is a reminder of the crucial components of supervision. This model would serve as a guide for standards and tools to apply when a game is being played. We developed a working definition of professionally packaged supervision (Delano and Shah, 2009) which we suggest as a basic model to refer to, with the supervisor fine tuning it as it matches up with their particular relationship. We define "professionally packaged supervision" as:

Supervision is a professional relationship that provides support, education, monitoring of quality, and provides a safe forum to reflect on professional practice. It should encourage critical thinking and constructive confrontation that informs and improves the practice of all parties. Respecting the inherent hierarchy in the relationship it should accept the ethical responsibility to use power in a thoughtful manner. The dynamics of the supervisory relationship can create a parallel process in all other relationships including that of the client/worker. Ultimately, supervision should be the vehicle to create dynamic growth, establish high professional standards, and enhance quality and

culturally competent services (p.50)

Kadushin (1968) felt that if confrontation is used to deal with a game there has to be regard for the worker's ability to handle the embarrassment, discomfort and threat confrontation can involve. In our process of building a model for constructive confrontation (Delano and Shah, 2007) we developed a working definition of confrontation that was specifically meant to change the harsh and negativistic view of confrontation. We define "confrontation" as:

Confrontation is a proactive intervention to intercept and redirect behavior that may require change. It should create a forum to better understand and guide the practice of both parties to ultimately improve quality and culturally competent services (p.6)

It is important that the supervisor enter the discussion genuinely wanting to hear the worker's explanation for the behavior and be open to deciding it may not be behavior that must change. We suggest all confrontations begin with the words "help me understand...", or "what was your intent?" as a way to open up a forum that puts the worker in the position of explaining their practice. This style is meant to sometimes layer confrontations so the worker can be more self reflective in understanding process in their practice. The supervisor should never confront the worker's personality, work ethic or motives, but rather frame the confrontation

in a "professional package" (Delano and Shah, 2007) that addresses the standard the supervisor feels is in question, not "the person" who may not be meeting the standard. This approach can be very useful in flushing the more substantial supervisory issues beyond just the immediate behavior and would match up very well in addressing the dynamics of "games".

Supervisee Games: Modern Style

"The Easy Button"

In this game the supervisee will minimize their skill level, or overstate their inability to understand a task, and come to the supervisor asking for help. If the supervisor is in a hurry to have the task done, or has a perfectionist attitude about the task, they may just excuse the worker from the responsibility and do it themselves. Hence, the supervisee pushed "the easy button" on the supervisor to avoid the extra work. If the worker doesn't get the supervisor to do it themselves they may have hopes the task will now be assigned to a more willing colleague. The health in this game is that the worker seeks help when not completing a task at a high level, but it quickly slides into game territory if the goal is to reduce responsibility. Supervisors can address this game by asking the worker what specific supports they would need to do the task well. If the task has no safety concerns they can ask the worker to do the task as best they can and then process afterwards as a learning experi-



ence. A supervisor who is often caught in this game should seek to improve their delegation skills. If they have a perfectionist type personality it will be necessary to come in touch with what lesser quality can they live with while workers grow into doing the tasks at a higher level.

“Shopping for Answers”

There are times when a worker is frustrated because their supervisor has a different idea about how a particular task should be done. Instead of trying to process the issue with their supervisor and convince them their approach is a good one, the worker will approach another person in the supervisory structure and “shop for the answer” they want. Then, if confronted about their approach they can say “but I was told this was ok by ____”. This might include asking a shift supervisor, or a supervisor from a different discipline, when their own supervisor is not around. The game can take on added sparks if the worker waits until their supervisor is on vacation and then brings the question to the supervisor’s supervisor, creating a potential rift in that relationship. The supervisor can best address this game by having a clear set of expectations about which issues they are comfortable with the worker bringing elsewhere. If there is a breach of that protocol the supervisor can address the worker with the question “help me understand why you chose to bring that issue to someone else?” and invite them to explain their reasoning. The supervisor will also need to do some commu-

nicating with supervisory colleagues if they suspect a particular worker of shopping for answers. They can suggest that if the worker approaches them with an issue they ask “can you help me understand why you are bringing this to me now instead of waiting for your supervisor?” If the game exists regularly the supervisor should reflect on whether they are perceived as open enough to hearing suggestions for different ways to do things.

“Supervisor Tipper”

The “supervisor tipper” wants to convince the supervisor of their point of view and only brings the supervisor just enough information to “tip them” over to their position. It may include framing information conveniently to accentuate their point or overtly leaving out information supporting another position. For example, a worker wants to convince the supervisor that a child should get a special privilege but neglects to mention the child may not have lived up to one of the obligations to earn that privilege. The health in this game is the worker is showing the skill to be persuasive, but it can create many trust, or even safety, issues. When the supervisor recognizes that this game is going on there needs to be an assertive confrontation in which the worker is asked to help the supervisor understand how they compiled the information presented. This confrontation will force the worker to explain their process which alerts them that the supervisor is aware of the potential game being played and creates more substance

for supervisory process in their relationship.

“I Heard Everyone Talking...”

In this game the worker may want to influence the supervisor about a particular issue or express displeasure with some of the supervisor’s actions. They want to avoid responsibility for their opinion so they approach the supervisor in the guise of helpfulness and say “I just want to let you know that I heard everyone talking about this”. Of course, a supervisor wants a worker to alert them if there is general displeasure about an issue among the team, but if the supervisor senses a game they can ask the worker to be more specific about the conversations they were part of themselves, or directly ask them their opinion on the issue. The supervisor can also take a professionally packaged route by bringing discussion for “everyone” as an agenda item at the next team meeting.

“Voice Mail Roulette”

A worker might have information they should share with the supervisor promptly but may want to continue to proceed in their own direction with the matter. They may also fear the supervisor would chastise them for their actions. In this game the supervisee might wait until they are sure the supervisor is not on site and then leave a voice mail with the information. This will postpone direct discussion in hopes the issue will no longer be a priority for the supervisor to discuss. The supervisor can address this game by being sure to maintain high priority on all voice mail information follow up

discussions to hoped for advance also structure & methods of communication such messages directly available one of the time supervisor tells the future information must be brought supervisor prior to a voice mail of shift log entries

“I Already Told Weakness...”

Self awareness practice are components of and youth care supervisor should create a safe for worker to share they are having should assess if worker has the into doing the task struggling with it and then provide support and help them. However, pace of many child care programs that for that on-going and consistent if worker may avoid task or continue than acceptable confronted the attempts to discuss responsibility by supervisor they them they were task and they have support to make supervisor may not providing the support and just expectation for it Additionally they the worker account being self motivated



process in their
one Talking..."
the worker may
the super-
icular issue or
re with some
s actions.
d responsi-
ion so they
ervisor in the
ss and say "I
u know that I
lking about
supervisor
alert them if
s pleasure
ong the
pervisor
ey can ask
ore specific
ations they
selves, or
heir opinion
supervisor
professionally
bringing
yone" as an
e next team

ette"
have infor-
l share with
nptly but
ue to
n direction
ey may also
ould chas-
actions. In
rviser might
sure the
1 site and
mail with the
ill postpone
hopes the
be a priority
o discuss.
address
sure to
ty on all
ion follow up

discussions to eliminate the hoped for advantage. They can also structure alternative methods of communicating such messages if they are not directly available. This may be one of the times when a supervisor tells the worker that future information like this must be brought to another supervisor promptly in addition to a voice mail message or end of shift log entry.

"I Already Told You My Weakness..."

Self awareness and reflective practice are basic components of excellent child and youth care practice. Every supervisor should work to create a safe forum for the worker to share the struggles they are having. The supervisor should assess whether the worker has the ability to grow into doing the task they are struggling with more effectively and then provide encouragement and supports to assist them. However, in the fast pace of many child and youth care programs there is not time for that on-going direct support and consistent follow up, so the worker may avoid doing the task or continue to do it in less than acceptable fashion. When confronted the worker attempts to discharge their responsibility by reminding the supervisor they already told them they were not good at this task and they haven't had the support to make it better. The supervisor may feel guilty for not providing the needed support and just lower the expectation for the worker. Additionally they may not hold the worker accountable for being self motivated to try to do

the work in a better way. To address this game the supervisor can build in better follow up when a worker identifies a weakness and be sure to include discussion about it in supervisory agendas. In supervision they can ask the worker to be more specific and take responsibility to articulate what particular supports they will need to improve to the desired level. The process needs to be delicate as the supervisor should be careful not to chastise the worker for continuing to struggle as they don't want to hinder the safe forum to reflect on their practice and identify growth areas.

"The Crying Game"

Many child and youth care worker workers need to work two jobs to make ends meet. They are precariously juggling family and work responsibilities and often work with high stress levels. Every supervisor should want to provide emotional support to workers that are struggling with personal stresses. Most supervisors are aware of that fine line in supervision where a professional, hierarchical relationship that should have some therapeutic components can start to slide into becoming "therapy". It is a gray line and one that is tempting to cross in an effort to be supportive. Yet, when that line is crossed it undermines the professional relationship and may create all sorts of other issues. The "crying game" is a higher pitched version of the game Kadushin (1968) called "treat me, don't beat me". In the crying game the worker attempts to avoid a tough issue or manipulate the

expectation level in supervision by actually crying in the privacy of the session. This is particularly difficult for supervisors as they don't want to appear insensitive as they try to continue with tough issues on the agenda. A young supervisor once shared that she was supervising a woman about her grandmother's age who worked in the milieu of a children's residential center. In every supervision session the worker would break into flowing tears if the supervisor tried to discuss concerning interactions with the children. The supervisor shared her own struggle with supervising "her grandma figure" and having to be assertive about an issue through tears. We advised the supervisor to be very supportive the next time the worker cried in supervision and then, in another meeting, set a limit by saying it was not acceptable professionally to regularly cry in a supervision meeting. The supervisor should explain that if the worker was in that fragile of an emotional state they were concerned about how else that might be playing out in their work with the children. The supervisor should indicate that if the worker was not stable enough to avoid crying in supervision they would approve time off for her to re-compose herself to be able to function in a less stressful way. The young supervisor turned pale at the suggestion of actually doing this with "grandma", but a month later reported back to us that the process was successful and the worker was exhibiting significantly better functioning with the kids.

It is a gray line and one that is tempting to cross in an effort to be supportive. Yet, when that line is crossed it undermines the professional relationship and may create all sorts of other issues.



Sometimes a game will bring us to a difficult line, but one important to cross to keep the integrity of the professional relationship. It can remind supervisors that while we want to be supportive of workers the children are our primary customers.

“You Don’t Understand These Kids”

In a recent training we suggested that if a child and youth care worker has been working in a program about six weeks and the relationships with the children look “too good” a supervisor should want to take a closer look. We explained the difficulties traumatized children have in trusting and that by six weeks the worker would be entering the “post honeymoon period” of the relationship (Siskind 1981). In this stage limit “testing” is prominent. One CYC worker took offense and respectfully asked if we, as senior managers, might be a little jealous of the closer relationship child and youth care workers have with children. We engaged in discussion about the question but held firm that while there is no surety that something is wrong, we would think a closer look at the situation was prudent. What the person was essentially saying is “you no longer understand what relationships with these kids are about”. While we processed it easily intellectually it did give a little emotional sting in recognizing our distance from regular direct contact with kids. There is a reality that as the supervisor spends less time in direct work with the children the

supervisee will have a closer view of the child’s every day needs. The health in that is the direct care CYC worker can supply a unique perspective about the child to share with all the team members. It can become a game when the worker starts to feel they “know better” about what is good for a child and starts to undermine the approved treatment plan, or the program treatment philosophy. The game can graduate to a higher pitch when the direct service worker may have cultural similarities with the child that the supervisor does not. The supervisor may not want to be perceived as culturally insensitive and simply yield to the worker’s perspective. To best process this game the supervisor should acknowledge the worker’s unique perspective and understanding, but stay focused on their own “bigger picture perceptions” about what is best for a child. Knowing something more closely doesn’t always mean knowing better.

“You Could Look It Up”

Whenever baseball manager Casey Stengel was in a discussion with challenging reporters he would end the discussion by smugly saying “you could look it up”. His purpose was to give a cornering message that he was right and the documentation you would find would prove it. As the emphasis on documentation and compliance in CYC work grows, and technology advances, the game of “you could look it up” becomes more prevalent and potentially a very destructive one. Of course, good documentation is important for

all workers but in this game the supervisee will save every memo/e-mail that supports their position, document everything just for the sake of doing it, and send carbon copies to their supervisor just to prove they are actually doing the work. In essence, they buy into the culture of “I am covering my back”, and “if it isn’t written it didn’t happen”. Child and youth care work is primarily an art and all interventions involve some judgment and risk. When the “you could look it up” game begins it saps the essence of the work and supervisory relationship. A worker who engages in this game begins to focus on the documentation as more important than the quality of the work. If the supervisor raises questions about an issue the worker produces the documentation and says “see, I fulfilled my responsibility”. This game is a natural outgrowth of the “Gotcha” game that supervisors play which we referred to earlier in this article. To best address this game the supervisor should first do a self check that they are not giving the impression of playing “Gotcha”. They should support the idea of good documentation but clarify specifics of what needs to be copied to them and what does not. They should provide training on quality documentation as opposed to just compliance documentation. If the supervisor cannot avoid the “cover your back” culture with workers then the supervisory relationship will continually be compromised with a decrease in trust, decrease in creative interventions, and potential for quantity of work to outweigh relationship based quality of work.

Sumi

The supervisor is extraordinarily crucial in the pre-dren and familie quality services youth care prog other relatiohsh party feels threa power, or wants tively gain an ac tively partner the components of become suscep up in destructiv games. Kadush Hawthorne (19 many of these g 40 years ago ar significant fact supervisory rela Given the faster present day soc many specific d and youth care have identified more modern g aware of. Supe avoid playing o games themse should also be games supervis If the superviso supervisee is e they should as of the game an identify the cor game, and the supervisee in a encourages the explain their pr sion discussio forward in a co to look at alter they can provi game back to framework with relationship.



Summary

The supervisory relationship is extraordinarily complex and crucial in the process of children and families receiving quality services in child and youth care programs. As in any other relationship when one party feels threatened, a lack of power, or wants to manipulatively gain an advantage over their partner the core healthy components of the relationship become susceptible to ending up in destructive and inefficient games. Kadushin (1968) and Hawthorne (1975) identified many of these games almost 40 years ago and they remain significant factors in many supervisory relationships today. Given the faster pace of present day society and the many specific dynamics in child and youth care supervision we have identified a number of more modern games to be aware of. Supervisors should avoid playing or initiating these games themselves. They should also be alert for the games supervisees may play. If the supervisor senses a supervisee is engaging a game they should assess the nature of the game and its' impact, identify the core health in the game, and then confront the supervisee in a way that encourages the supervisee to explain their practice. Supervision discussion should move forward in a collaborative way to look at alternative supports they can provide to steer the game back to a healthier framework within the relationship.

References

- Alwon, F., (2000) *Effective Supervisory Practice*. Washington, D.C., Child Welfare League of America Press
- Bradley, L. and Gould, (2002) L., Supervisee Resistance, *International Child and Youth Care Network—CYC On-line*, Issue (36), January
- Delano, F. and Shah, J., (2009) Defining Supervision in a Professionally Packaged Way. *Journal of Relational Child and Youth Care*, Volume 22 (1), 49-57
- Delano, F. and Shah, J., (2007) Using the Professional Package to help Supervisors Confront in a Culturally Sensitive Manner, *Journal of Relational Child and Youth Care*, Volume 20 (1), 5-11
- Delano, F. and Shah, J. (2006). Professionally Packaging Your Power in the Supervisory Relationship, *Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care*, Volume 5 (2), 34-44
- Garfat, T. (1992). Support-Education-Training (S.E.T.): A framework for supervision in child and youth care. *The Child and Youth Child Care Administrator*, 4, (1) 2-13
- Hawthorne, L., (1975) Games Supervisors Play, *Social Work* 20 (3), 197-205
- Kadushin, A. (1968). Games People Play in Supervision, *Social Work* 13 (2), 127-136
- May, J., (2005) Lovers and Supervisors: Same Things—Just Different?, *International Child and Youth Care Network—CYC On-line*, Issue 75, April
- Phelan, J. (1990) Child care supervision: the neglected skill of evaluation. In J. P. Anglin, C. J. Denholm, R. V. Ferguson & A. R. Pence (Eds.). *Perspectives in Professional Child and Youth Care*. New York: Haworth.

Siskind, A. (1981) Stages of Residential Treatment. Presented at the JBFCS Conference celebrating the 75th Anniversary of Hawthorne Cedar Knolls, New York, NY.

Frank Delano is the Director of the JBFCS Markus Institute for Child Care Professionalization and Training in Hawthorne, New York.



Jill C. Shah is the Director of Financial Stability for United Way in Austin, Texas.

