

COLLABORATION IN SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION

What ways do we create

Ilze Norman

Dissertation submitted as part of the MA in
Systemic Teaching, Training and Supervision
(Word Count: 19 482)

In Gothenburg by KCCF/GCK
Validated by University of Bedfordshire
Supervisor: Marianne Källblad, GCK

Maj 2010

ABSTRACT

This paper is written from a systemic, social constructionist position, which proposes that there is no one essential truth to be discovered, but that all knowledge is constructed through daily interactions and conversations, self-reflexivity in the process of relational-bodily learning, supervisory practice and training.

In this paper author attend to show the main issues of the reflexive repertoire and she is going to identify and reflexively describe her own professional theoretical as we as practical values. In terms of her awareness of the range of systemic theories, author attend to make the connections with her own lived stories and own attempt in order to show what ways do we have of creating collaboration in the systemic supervision.

During the writing this dissertation the author attend to construct a meaning of using this kind of approach and reflect on her own personal style as the collaborative systemic supervisor.

CONTENT

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL GROUND OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

Table1: Co-created collaborative Systemic Approach

CHAPTER 2

ETHICAL MATTER AND RESPECT

Using video in the collegial supervision

Not-knowing position

Expertise of using the “not-knowing position”

Questions about questions

Practical experience

Summary of the chapter 1

CHAPTER 3

MATTER OF THE POWER AND SOCIAL GRRAACCESS

Modern Power

Power and the relational knowledge

Positive force of the power

Cultural competences

Summary of the chapter 2

CHAPTER 4

REFLEXIVITY IN THE SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION

Reflection on-action

Reflection in-action

My reflective learning of being reflexive practitioner

Co-created collaborative On-Going Contracting

On-going negotiation

My ON-Going learning

How do I notice that learning happens?

Am I open minded?

Summary of the chapter 3

CHAPTER 5

WHAT WAYS DO WE HAVE OF CREATING COLLABORATION IN THE SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION?

ENDING CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

In one of the exercises in the course we interviewed each other in pairs about stories we carry with us about learning, connecting to social GRRAACCESS. I told about my early experience of being straggled, depressed and not taking serious as a child (human being).

I have been grown up in the foreign Soviet System, where “everybody” knew how I must think and talk and there were no space for individual thinking or doing things. I have quite a lot of hard and difficult stories with me, which have been damaging in the moment they occurred. With time passing by I have questioned my self – how come it is so important to me being respected and show the respect to others. I have come to conclusion that not only good experiences have an impact on ones life, but also I have noticed that these “bad experiences” teaches me to appreciate and value mutual respect and co-creating of respectful meetings.

Here, I would like to share my experience of my 11 years of age. I started very early with different handcrafts, it was probably my inheritance from my mother. I had a wonderful handcraft teacher at that time, which both saw my talent and helped me to develop my crafts to fine, appreciated and useful stuff. My creations often ended up on same kind of exhibitions. So, one day it would be a great exhibition of various arts and crafts pain at our school. I went to my handicraft teachers and consulted with her regarding my idea of making a large, decorative pillow. I would embroider it in a special way. My teacher liked my idea. She only became pensive when I explained what colours I want to use in my pillow. I felt her obvious effect of changing my mind about colours or combination of colours, but I was pretty certain what I wanted, a specially because I had intended to make this pillow for my mom and I thought that my chosen colours would fit so well in her room. When we had well-discussed my choice of colours, I was disappointed with my teacher for her attempts to change my views. In the end she “gave up” and said to me: "Ok then, if you really like to do it that way, do it. Only I do not think

that your pillow could ever be chosen for exhibition." I understood nothing. In that time I had no idea that my chosen colours, which were dark red-white-dark red in the three stripes, were the very symbol for National Latvia, before the soviet occupation and these colours were totally forbidden. Those who used these combinations of colours were questioned, thrown to the jail or even killed. I just knew that my teacher was always so open, flexible and encouraging, but now she felt to me sad, disappointed and weighted and she said nothing about my "dangerous choice". It made me thoughtful, but I decided that I want to make my pillow in the way that I had imagined. I did my attempt and embroidered my pillow. Then, I went, quite proud of it done, to my teacher. She looked at the pillow, her eyes lit up, but they soon darkened again.

The teacher just said that she will put my pillow to all other work for assessment, took my pillow and went. I stood still, confused, not understood and quite sad. Came the big day - Arts and Crafts Exhibition. Large gym at school was decorated as an exhibition hall. It looked beautiful to me. Many fine works were there. I was interested in around work, admired and at the same time wondering if there is my pillow somewhere. I found it at last. It was there! In one corner, it was like hidden behind a big ceramic statue. I was glad it was there, but a bit disappointed that it was so remote. I went to my teacher. I found her, she was glad to see me. She looked at me so strange, I thought, but I did not care about it, I was just happy. I saw that in her kind eyes were a little glimmer of tears, but I interpret that as a pleasure. The exhibition lasted a week, but my pillow after three days disappeared from the exhibition. I could not find anywhere my handicraft teacher, I wanted to know what has happened. Three days after the exhibition I was called to the school's headmaster. (Here I must point out that it happened in the early 70-s in the Soviet Latvia, when Soviet regime exercised their both very visible and invisible ideas). When I went to the headmasters' office, where were master and two other people who I did not know who they were. I, an 11-year-old girl came into the heavy, silent and foreign atmosphere. All those adults looked at me and for a long time said

not a word. Then headmaster said, "you might understand why we called you here?" I understood nothing. I just thought this was unpleasant situation. Then one of the men began to ask me about colours in my pillow that had "unfortunately ended up on the exhibition". He asked if the choice of these colours were my or someone else's idea, who had encouraged me to do such a thing? I started to cry, I understood nothing what has happened. The only thing I began to understand was that I had done wrong colour selection. I had flashbacks of my handicraft teacher, her attempt to distract me from my choice, her sad eyes and that the pillow actually disappeared after a few days. Everything what happened in that room was so unreal to me, I did not know if I heard anything that was said, I just remember that everyone was deadly serious, it was heavy and everyone stared at me like I have done something bad. But I just wanted to create a pillow for my mom and I thought she would be happy to see it. How could it be so wrong to make a pillow into the wrong colours? I was sorry that my mom did not even get to see this pillow, because I had done it on the sly.

The only thing I asked them: where is my handicraft teacher? I was told that handicraft teacher have left school and that she will no longer work at any another school, either. When I asked why, I was told that I should understand that if a person makes such a *serious mistake* than she cannot work with children who need guidance in their life. I felt a shame, because my best teacher was thrown out from her work she was so great on and it was because of me ... I didn't get any opportunity even talk to her before she left. What had I done?

What do I mean by this story? What has it done to me? I, as a little girl was a threat for the soviet system and its` power, but I was not even aware about it? When I later reflected on the incident with the pillow, I understood that these adults attempt to silence me and make me more cautious, did that I became more aware of social differences. I value respect and equality in the human relationships and with time passing I started to question the "expert role".

For me, by telling this story, it became a *story told*, more than a *story lived* (Pearce, 1994), which made it possible to develop a *new story lived*. I told about my memories of episodes and comments which are part of my life story and still influence me, which I could describe as Vygotski`s concept of the *zone of proximal development (ZPD)*. By this meaning that we are at every moment both *being and becoming*.

Today, when I reflect on my refusing of “going with stream” and being silent or submissive, I can see that this un-respectable way I have been treated with, have a grate influence to me in a way how I value *respect* in every meeting I have in my professional, as well as private life. I even notice that my bodily-experience (XXX) and emotions from these “bad experiences” have influenced my bodily-knowledge (XXX) and relational-learning (XXX), which I am practicing in my therapeutical, supervision or daily meetings. When I think in these terms, I can have a good support from Taguchi (Taguchi, L.T, 1997), when she describes how co-created knowledge starts in the connection between bodily relations and communication with surroundings. Taguchi says that *learning and knowledge is not just about “I am thinking”, but it is about lived sense, lived experience, findings and understanding of surrounding through body* (free translate, Taguchi, 1997:36).

My understanding is that in the all our communications and relations with each other we are always depended of each other and it is very important to respect people we meet, be curios and not judging in order to be respected, excepted and feel free. This bodily relational knowledge helps me to keep on with my open minded and systemic approach, which I believe I am using in the supervisory process with supervisees and in the therapeutic process with my clients.

When I decided to write this Dissertation, I began to sketch out a table that yielded an overall Vision for myself on my own thinking about - what does that mean for me: The Co-creation of Collaborative Systemic Supervision? It

was the good beginning for me to start reflection on issues what are most important for me when I think about myself as the systemic supervisor.

Theme of this dissertation:

Creating collaboration in systemic supervision.

Question I want to find an answer to:

What ways do we have of creating collaboration in the systemic supervision?

Aims:

- What issues could I point out as the most important professional as well as personal values in my way of searching for collaboration in the systemic supervision?
- How do my bodily, relational knowledge have influenced my way of becoming systemic supervisor?
- What is the meaning of creating the collaborative style in the systemic supervision?

Matter of the Language

I'm writing in English, which is not my native language. I am living and working in Sweden, which is not either my ethnical country. This may shine through in thin sentences and poor language here and there. I hope the intentions of what I want to say will come through anyway, and that the reader will be indulgent with the language.

How have I organised this dissertation?

Chapter 1.

As my task is to write this paper from a Systemic, social constructionist position, I will present some theoretical background for Social Construction. From my experiential learning (Kolb, D, 1984) of the M.A/Postgraduate Diploma education I put together the theoretical and practical experience, which I believe is absolutely necessary in order to feel my self as Systemic Supervisor. This Table, which you can see on the page 13, has helped me to

have a red thread for my writing and presentation of my value system. All these themes, which I attend to go through, are very important to me. Thoughtfulness of them has helped me to co-create the idea of being systemic supervisor, which I appreciate.

Chapter 2.

In this chapter I attend to show the main issues of my reflexive repertoire and I am going to identify and reflexively describe my lived respect and professional ethics in my supervisory practice. In terms of that I attend to make the connections with my own lived stories.

I will reflect on my own personal experiences of practicing and living respect and professional ethics, which I mostly connect with using of expertise of “not-knowing position”. I am going to present the thinking of the on-going negotiation and how we can make questions about questions in order to be more ethical within the systemic supervision.

Chapter 3.

Here I am going to articulate with my awareness of the theme of power within the systemic supervision and I attend to highlight a relational knowledge, as well as positive force of the power. I will show some discourses surrounding the issue of the modern power;

I am going weave my emerging reflexivity on the SOCIAL GRRAACCESS - Gender, Race, Religion, Age, Abilities, Class, Culture, Ethnicity, Sex and Spirituality, (Alvis, D. 2008) where respect and professional ethics have guided me in the developing a reflexive practice.

I am going to describe my reflexive skills and abilities across different domains of my own supervisory and training practice and across different levels of context. I will show a range of my training strategies, which are ethically sensitive to contemporary social issues, like co-creating cultural competence in terms of systemic supervision.

Chapter 4

In this chapter I am going to highlight though case scenarios drawn from supervisory and training practice as well as from my personal life stories - the important place of reflexivity and self-reflexivity, how these parts are developing my own personal style of doing supervision. I will critically analyze and self-reflect on my reflections-on-action and reflections-in-action. I attend to show my emerging abilities of self-reflexivity in terms of weaving together my theoretical experience, reflexive-learning and professional practice. In this chapter I am going to share my thoughts and episodes of practice by showing examples of my own reflexive learning processes. I will point out importance of the collaboration of On-going contracting and learning process within the systemic supervision.

Chapter 5.

Here I will show that knowledge and experience I have co-created in my lifetime being influenced by my-lived-story-education, is never objective or value free. I have my preconceptions and my prejudices about being systemic supervisor and about my own way of doing supervision practice.
?????????

I have an idea that it would be helpful to me (hopefully to my readers as well) in terms of keep-going with systemic supervision, which I have taken from the several practitioners of the systemic constructionism.

Each chapter I will sum-up with some conclusions and reflections what occurs during writing process.

Ending discussions.

In the ending reflections I will do some conclusions about my findings on my ethical-professional-values. I am going to write some self-reflections-on-writing the paper and my emerging abilities as the systemic supervisor. I attend to conclude and summarize my reflexive thinking and doing things in the terms of the professional training and supervision. I will do my final-

reflections on the importance of respect in my professional, as well as in my private life.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

The theory behind the social constructionism is that professionals (therapists and supervisors) use their ability to co-create a new conversational domain that gives rise to different meanings. Such (systemic) approach gives possibilities to create new stories and add different perspectives. Viewed from this perspective of creating of collaboration in our conversations, Maturana and Varela points out the importance of languaging (Maturana, H. and Varela, F., 1987) and how we with different contributions are inviting people in to the co-created system of conversation. By joining her/his language (Andersson, H., Goolishian H.A. 1992) we are creating this languaging process what Maturana and Varela are talking about and in such a way widening the system.

Social constructionist Shotter, influenced by Wittgensteins ideas (Pearce, W. B., 1992) develops an argument, that “in everyday life, words do not in themselves have a meaning, but *a use*, and furthermore, *a use only in a context*. Shotter says: “think of words as instruments characterized by their use”. He also claims that words and actions not only derive their meaning from the contexts in which they accure, they create those contexts.

Pearce (1992) is saying that “joining with” is the radical, interesting and consistent mode of practice for social constructionists. Systemic social constructionist approach consists of activities, which are intended to join with, for example, particular supervisor and her/his supervisees or other professionals, what meet their client in the particular time and place.

C. Oliver (C.Oliver, 1992) have quoted Cronen and Pearce (1985) in terms of showing essence of the Coordinating Management of Meaning: “CMM is a social constructionist theory of communication – an approach that provides the tools for exploring and making moral sense of the creation, maintenance and transformation of social processes”. Ideas of CMM started from the thinking that our lives are living communication, that our conversations is

one of the ways of showing that we are humans. Oliver says that our stories contain repertoires of acts and our conjoint action co-constructs our developing stories. Some of our stories have a stronger force in shaping our actions than others. CMM uses the idea of levels of context as a device to help us analyse the levels of influence stories may have on each other and the linkages between them (Oliver. C, 1992) we could say that, one single event or episode can transform interpretation of meaning at other levels. Very similar is idea of using thinking of GRRACCEESS, which I am going to explain more detailed later on in Chapter 3.

Valeria Ugazio and Marisa Ferrario (Ugazio and Ferrario, 1992) are talking about implicit aims what allows the client to generate emotional “events” that enable her/him to falsify her/his own premises and construct new meanings. In my way of thinking they are talking about co-creation of meaning or collaborative process.

Glenda Fredman in the one of our course meetings shared with us her definition of the word **Collaboration**. She said: *Collaboration invites members of the system to join the conversation and it also views people as resources to the situation.* (Fredma, G.,2009) I found it as an comprehensible description of such a complex issue.

Anderson and Goolishian (1990) are talking about three Cs – *connect*, *collaborate* and *construct*. By that they mean that both supervisees and supervisors in their process of developing of relationship, create the knowledge. By knowledge they mean all these new things we learn and become a unique to each other. This way of thinking I recognize as respectful way of being curious in one’s surrounding.

When Harlene Andersen describes Mutual-Learning process (Anderson. H, 1995), she says: “Like the therapy system, the supervision system is one in which people generate meaning with each

other through language, meaning the spoken and the unspoken, the verbal and the nonverbal. The supervisee and supervisor create narratives and stories around which they organize the supervisory task”.

**COLLABORATIVE
SYSTEMIC APPROACH**

RESPECT

ETHIK

POWER

S O C I A L G R R A A C C E E S S

R E F L E X I V I T Y

O N - G O I N G C O N T R A C T I N G

**ON-GOING
LEARNING**

**PROFESSIONAL
ARTISTRY**

Table nr. 1

CHAPTER 2

ETHICAL MATTER AND RESPECT

When I act as a supervisor, I find it useful in helping professionals to create theoretical frameworks around their daily work, so that they can apply what they already are doing well or are curious of getting knowledge of more effectively in new contexts. Kolb's model (Kolb, 1984) has helped me to develop more ethical and reflective practice I pressure, and I see it as a constant weaving between theory, therapy and supervisory practice.

Jennifer Clegg in her dissertation about *How can services become more ethical*, describes theoretical standpoint of Honderich (Clegg, chapter 5, p. 3), where she shows three major groups or schools of ethical theorising: *deontological, teleological and virtue ethics*. My attention in this point of view is stressed on the virtue ethics, what focuses on the way people are with each other, in networks of relationships that endure through time to comprise ethical communities.

As I understand, virtue ethics in Honderich's (Clegg, j. 2004) explanation is concerned with ends as well as means: *"in people working out what they need to do, and how they need to be, in order to ensure humankind flourishes"*. Within that, she is talking about three elements: *Practices, Narrative Unity and Moral Traditions*. Some of the last years I have paid more attention to the Narrative Unit of my ethical standards. Just like Clegg is describing, *one cannot be ethical occasionally, nor only in selected settings*. My believe is that it is about our ethical values of living a "good life", which comes from our narratives from our experience, life stories – lived and told.

Recently, in one of my supervision groups came up a question of ethical matter within the social work. Where four social workers, an employee whose professional mission is to do investigative work for people who have psychosocial difficulties and has an experience of being a long-term

unemployed. The supervisees explained to me that there is an ethical dilemma in the very essence of their business. On one side, these four professionals suppose to do investigations of working capacity of people who are in the very vulnerable position in the society, but from the other side, the municipal agency they representing has a revenue requirement.

Questions what I put to one of the supervisee within the conversation during the supervision process:

What kind of ethical matters or questions do you notice, when you as a professional social worker are acting in this municipal agency you are engaged in?

How does it effects your own ethical standards?

How your ethical standards relates with the idea that the municipal agency you are engaged in has income requirement?

When, under which circumstances you feel yourself being most affected, and how? How are your ideas on municipal social activities affects of the fact that there are two such separate missions?

How does this affect you in your practical sessions with your clients?

Together with reflecting team and the interviewed person we evaluate our discussion about the ethical dilemma what were presented. We came to conclusion, that by raising these ethical issues and reflecting together, we hade created awareness and curiosity of our own positions. This kind of discussions of the ethical issues I value as an important and essential within the co-creation of collaborative systemic supervision. By discussing the ethical issues in one's working life, we are involving and co-creating an on-going collaborative respect within the interpersonal relationships, thus also working on our professional quality assurance.

When I think father on ethical matter, I see also the contract and negotiation in the supervision process as an ethical matter. We are giving space to each other for talking about ethical issues.

For example, we can ask:

- What would be most ethical way of going on with this hard topic? How shall we do, how do you want to discuss your issue, from which position? Would it be ethical to change the rules when we are discussing this family?

Scaife has described that these themes could be included in a supervisory contract, like, talking about and co-creating ground rules and boundaries of supervision process. Clarifying responsibilities of supervisor and supervisees, the negotiation of how the learning will take place, rules about supervisory alliance and expectations on each other. These are very important issues where ethical dilemmas could be pointed out and spoken about. Scaife (2001: 63) is describing contracting as “ongoing supervisory relationship” and this relationship is the creation and maintenance of safety for all the parties involved in the helping experience. She have also mentioned in her book about “mini-contracting”. These small agreements are as an on-going evaluation, which supervisor and supervisees can do in a beginning of the each supervision. I have noticed that this kind of Mini-contracting is useful not only in the beginning or end of session, but could be seen as one part of the process of the collaborative systemic supervision.

Using video in the collegial supervision

Some years ago, when I listen to Eia Asen, when he had his workshop about Family therapy with depressive couples, he showed his way of working in his clinical team in the Family Scholl in the Marlboro Centre. I found it as a respectful and ethical way of doing collegial consultation. They taped all collegial consultation sessions, when they were consulting each other about their family work. Later on they brought the tapes when they meet the families in order to show the family members – how they are talking, reflecting and getting new ideas about approaching their problem. I was really impressed about this approach and I was very keen of adapting this way in my own working place. The way Eia Asen together with his colleagues

made these video-feedbacks for their families encourage me and I could see many advantages by adapting it.

By suiting this way of doing collegial consultations and showing these pieces of video to family members, I have noticed more learning-outcome that I could ever dream of. Family members have been grateful to see these small sequences and have given me a feedback, like: *-that was really interesting to see and hear how you are talking about us, when we are not there.* I have noticed that family members are waiting for these video-sequences, they are curious – *how their stories influence us as the professionals; what kind of questions these other colleagues are pointing to their therapist; what makes us to feel stacked.*

In the same time, I can see that our way of doing collegial consultation has improved and has become more respectful and more ethical. We have taught us to think and act much more respectful and professional ethics have taking place in the more developed level. Here I can make a connection between this first contracting process with the client, when we are discussing confidentiality of the substance of our meetings, and this way of doing feedback of our colleague consultations. In my point of view, by showing how I use my confidentiality (all information I have about the family), I am actually practicing my professional ethics.

Not-knowing position

The idea of "not knowing" is contrary to the therapist's understanding is based on a theoretical narrative that he or she has in advance. A not-knowing position requires that the therapist's and the supervisors understanding, explanations and interpretations are not limited by past experience or by theory, formulated truth or knowledge (Lundby, 2002:142). Such a description of the not-knowing position is influenced by hermeneutics, says Anderson and Goolishian, and those with social constructionism related ideas about language and narrative.

A main interest of Anderson and Goolishian is that meaning and understanding are social constructed and co-created by people through conversation, in conversation with each other. Human action takes place in a reality that is created through social construction and dialogue. The socially constructed realities give meaning to and organize our experience.

The main point with a not-knowing position is that the therapist or supervisor's actions must convey a genuine curiosity. That s´ seems to me a respectful way of treating people.

Lundby, in his book "Life stories and Therapies" (Lundby, 2002:145) have quoted Anderson and Goolishian:

"The joy of the therapist is to get to know the uniqueness of each individual client's narrative truth, the coherent truths in their life stories. This means that therapists are always is based on their experience, but that they must listen in such a way that their previous experience does not exclude them from the full sentence in the clients' descriptions of their experiences. This can only happen if therapists meet each clinical experience from the "not-knowing" position. To do otherwise is to search for regular units and common sense can confirm the therapist's theory but repeal the uniqueness of clients' stories and thus their very identity ".

Making use of the full respect and, in my opinion, ethical way to collaborate and co-create, place great demands on the therapist or the supervisor's ability to provide not-knowing questions and to "how to listen". Development of new sentence are based on the un-known, un-usual and fresh experience, it is not-knowing in relation to what the therapist or supervisor is about to hear. This requires that the professional has great capacity to listen to both the inner and the outer conversation (Anderson, T. 1999) interpretation and understanding must be through a dialogue between the professional and the client and not as a result of a preconceived theoretical understanding.

In one of my supervision groups, where supervisees are social workers what are working with people who have brain damage and their public trustees, which often are parents to these people. When I interviewed one of these social worker about her frustrations on one of the public trustee, I took the "not-knowing" position. I will show you a small part of our conversation. In this sequence, my supervisee begins with "not-knowing" position, but moves to the position of knowing, while I stay in "not-knowing - tell me" position.

SW: *"I do not know what happens to me, I do not understand ... I think I'm pretty good at handling different situations, I am not rushing up so easily ... but when I meet this woman, then I am hearing myself saying "No, no, no ..."*

Me: *-What is happening to you?*

SW: *"It goes without saying that I can not accept her exercise of power attitude towards her adult son, that is understandable to everyone..."*

Me: *What is happening to You, when You see that this mother, which also is his public trustee, uses the power towards her adult son?*

SW: *I become angry and I have difficulties to listen her arguments. You understand?*

Me: *Help me to understand, what happens to You, when You notice that You are not listening any more?*

SW: *It is impossible listen to her to the end, she always talks the same, but in her actions she shows something else, You know.*

Me: *Is there some actions this women are doing, what makes You more curious to listen her?*

SW: *I already know what she is going to say, I have heard it many times, but She will never listen to mine.*

Me: *-When You think about her actions, what is it You see in her actions?*

SW: *-she acts like she owns her son, she acts like she can make orders to me and that I should just carry her crazy mission ... she's not even interested in him...*

Me: *-Is there something you want to say to this woman?*

My reflections afterwards:

From my "not-knowing" position, I am not guessing, I'm not so quick to understand frustration of the social worker, I do not show my own ethical or power point of stand, in stead I ask for her experience and I am showing my curiosity about – what is happening to her. I think if I would have been quicker to understand and acknowledge the social worker's perception that this mother does not care about her son, that she just wanted to exercise her power position over her son, then I would put my self in an "expert role" which doesn't leads of curiosity. I could show this social worker my unique curiosity and not judging, which hopefully leads to awareness and respect in our conversation.

Both in the therapy and in the supervision sessions I feel my self-comfortable with H. Andersons (1995) "not-knowing" position. By not-knowing position she means, that "a general attitude or stance that the supervisor does not have access to privileged exclusive information, can never fully understand another person and always need to learn more about what has been said or not said". Collaboration by using not knowing position gives us a possibility to try to understand each other, without knowing it in advance. That sounds to me a respectful way.

Expertise of using the "non-expert" position

Boscolo and Bertrando had in their book "systemic therapy with individuals" (1996) put forward criticisms of Anderson and Goolishians "not-knowing" position. Their criticism can be summarized in three arguments:

- 1) Boscolo and Bertrando argue that it is better to work to become as aware as possible about what we have with us from the different periods in our professional development, so that we can take it into service for the clients' best in the context of the fits. They think it

seems like an illusion to believe that it is possible to erase everything you have learned in theory and practice through many years of experience as therapists and tutors.

They say: "Just as it is impossible not to communicate, it is also impossible not to make assumptions, consciously or unconsciously use the knowledge they have acquired previously. Furthermore, it is an illusion to reject the role of expert, because the role is confirmed by the context, the therapist works in, whether for strategic reasons, he can act like he is not an expert "(Boscolo & Bertrando, 1996: 38)

2) Boscolo and Bertrando turning against Anderson and Goolishians views on the relationship between knowledge and power and thus the perception of "truth" and the expert role.

Boscolo and Bertrando: "According to Goolishian, the therapist should abandon the role of expert, and therefore their power, as constructivism does not recognize the existence of absolute truths. The very fact that some people accept that some others may have the role of therapist "and get paid for it has in all very much a pragmatic effect. Denying the role of expert means for a therapist to deny themselves the opportunity to engage in therapy ... " (Lundby, 2002:151)

3) Boscolo and Bertrando doubt about the intake of "not-knowing" position when it comes to teach and train the less experienced therapists and tutors.

If I try to summarize my view of Goolishian, Anderson, White, Epston and many other theorists and practitioners' statements on the use of "not-knowing" position, I can say that in order to achieve development and co-creating space for dialogical or multi-logical process, therapists or supervisors need to exercise expertise in asking questions on a "not-

knowing" position, rather than ask questions that are method-driven and that require specific answers.

Through the years I have experience benefit from the "not-knowing" issue of appointment. I have noticed that as more experience and knowledge I have gained for my self, as better have I become in being not so quick to "know" things. It is not so often, now days, that I am sympathetic nods or hurt: "I understand..." or "I know ..." on comment as: "You know ..." as you can understand ... " or some similar.

Questions about questions

Now I would like to concentrate on John Burnham's (2005) way to ask *questions about questions*. In this way John Burnham is using the collaborative conversation with clients or supervisees about – *Preparing question to fit*. Talking about different questions and *which questions I shall begin with*, or which words I shall use when I address the questions, for example- *if* or *when*. It has been good learning for me to talk with clients or supervisees about questions I am going to address to them. This approach has given me more confidence and feeling of mutual respect. In order of practicing systemic collaborative approach I have developed a level of negotiation, which pleases me and I am having good feedback from my supervisees. I could mentioned some of these questions:

- *What kind of questions would you like to have in order to feel that you are respected?*
- *When I will ask you questions about this issue, would you like me to address same questions to your partner/colleague or you prefer me to reformulate them?*
- *When I am asking you this kind of question, do you find them easy to answer?*
- *How do you want me to address my questions to you, in order to have a feeling that I am respecting your culture?*

Having these questions in mind in my work with clients and supervision has given me a much calmer and respectful way of meeting them.

Practical experience

I would like to share one direct supervision session in terms of educational process, when I was taking place as super-supervisor. I was giving supervision to my colleague- Kent, which meanwhile gave supervision to another colleague - Susan, who was reflecting on her action, in the past. Both of our supervisor teachers – Ulla Hansson and John Burnham were in the reflecting team. In a sequence when I was talking with supervisor Kent about similarities and distinctions in his way of addressing questions to Susan and Susan’s way of questioning her manager, I suddenly turned to the reflecting team and asked them: What do you think about these questions? Are there other ways of putting them so they can be “supportive voice” for Susan? I invited John Burnham’s voice into the process.

John Burnham goes to Susan, dropped on his knee besides her and said:
Could we do a role-play? Could you, Kent take the role of being the manager and you Susan try to ask your manager the question that is important to you?

Susan asked a question to her manager, and, when the manager answered the question, John said to Susan again:

Now I want you to stand up and go around your chair, sit down again and reformulate your question to your manager like you haven’t done before.

Susan does as John was saying, goes around the chair, sits down again, reformulate the question, just this time there is a significant difference in her way of putting the question. Even the manager’s answer to this question was different. Now comes John again and says:

Now I want you to get up one more time, go around your chair, sit down again and reformulate the question like you have never done before.

Susan does again like John was saying and even now we can notice that her way of putting the question and her choice of words are different, and manager is responding differently. John did it one more time:

Now I want you to get up, go around the chair, sit down and reformulate the question in a way that surprise you, in a way that you have never imagine you would do.

Susan did it again.

When we reflect over this “*preparing question to fit*” after our session, we agreed that it has been a good learning for all of us. Susan find it helpful to investigate with her abilities in asking more important questions. Kent was noticing that his answers to these same, but different questions were influenced by how Susan was addressing the questions. I liked this way of action within the reflection or reflection in action. I tried this method in my own supervision group, which I will describe later in my writing. (look chapter: , page:)

Summary of the chapter 2.

In this chapter I am giving my view of the ethical matter in the systemic supervision. I am looking at these issues through social constructionist eyes, which means to me that we all are living the ethics in our actions, in language and in the every episode of our lives. We are negotiating and re-negotiating around respect and other ethical issues, within an on- going process. In terms of that I attend to make the connections with my own lived stories.

Here I am reflecting on my own personal experiences of practicing and living respect and professional ethics, which I mostly connect with using of expertise of “not-knowing position”. I am presenting the thinking of the on-going negotiation and how we can make questions about questions in order to be more ethical within the systemic supervision.

CHAPTER 2

MATTER OF THE POWER AND SOCIAL GRRAACCESS

The issue of power and control has been a central theme in the family therapy theory and literature right from its beginning. Perception of power has been vital to the central narrative therapy approaches to Harlene Anderson and Goolishians "not knowing" position, and Michael White and David Epston "externalised conversation" has developed. Sight of land the concept has been influenced by ideas and thoughts on ethical platform of social CONSTRUCTIONISM.

Batesons (Lundby, G. 2002) idea of power goes around the two themes:

- 1) Bateson defines the power as an linear idea which was not able to grasp the systemic nature of the world;
- 2) Bateson thinks that using idea of the power is potential unethical and can give the harmful effect.

Haley believed that power was the essence of all human relationships, while Bateson insisted that the whole idea of power was an epistemologically disgusting. (Lundby, G.2002: p.116)

Minuchin argues that professionals are showing too little interest in actual power setting in clients' lives. He thinks not only of power role in the therapist-client relationship, but also the importance of poverty, health and racism have been in families' lives.

Willsbach and McGregor (Lundby, 2002: p.118) are two among many who argue that the impact of a therapist takes a neutral stance when dealing with abuse, may be that having lived through abuse may blame them selves even more - and that the perpetrator's tendency to deny and rationalize their actions can be strengthened. In the relation to the debate about power, makes the question of the effect of not naming "power" - and especially "the

abuse of power" - is more devastating in its impact than the potential damage that could be in talking about power.

Modern Power

Modern power is a concept that Michael White uses when he describes how power is found in today's society. (Lundby, 2002)) He believes that phenomena's of power is less visible in the modern society than before. Wealth and status appeared in a completely different way. He also thinks that the society of today is the concept of shame and guilt internalized in us.

Foucault, a French philosopher and intellectual historian, is the person who has with time being less and less talked about power as an abstract category which can be isolated from the context in which they occur. He went from talking about power to the "power relationship". In this effect, he developed the idea of power based on collaboration. For Foucault, power can not be seen as something in itself, but is something what shown by the traces that may exist in everyday collaboration, in institutionalized social practices in the discourses of knowledge that arise, and in subjectivity or the way we are able to think of "the person".

Foucault argues (Foucault, C. 1970) that we must question our will to truth and reproduce discourses of their occurrence in nature - who writes the dominant narratives that govern and limit my own? How can we in the West to protest against all of society normalized assessment is about self-control, social identity, etc., knowledge and power are linked. The more knowledge we have, the more power we create our own reality.

Bateson's idea of power is more linked to the traditional way. He thinks of power as a negative force, a force that is fundamentally restrictive and subjugation. When Foucault speaks of power (Lundby, 2002:119), he explains power as inevitable, something that exists in all social relationships. The force of the power (malicious or not) manifested in everyday social

practice, in the design of personalities and in the forms of knowledge that becomes possible. Foucault seems to be more interested of power effects in everyday life than the idea of power in itself.

Foucault focuses on how complex power relations are. He goes on to examine power relations in everyday life, in relation to knowledge and to subjectivity of the. Systemic family therapy in the mid-1980s looked at human relationships and family systems without any theory to understand power (Lundby, 2002).

Foucault makes a lot of questions about how traditions look in our Western culture. Separation methods are his words on the processes operating in society. What is it that makes people into objects and get their bodies into objects, thus subjugating themselves - is that society as a self-maintaining individuality and self-subordination, which satisfies the modern power system needs of social control.

I would like to point out two of these processes.

One of the foreclosure procedures is based on the presence of the banned word. Society, our culture perpetuates a system of knowledge and experience that something makes sense or it is crazy and true or false. This maintains control over that we should not say everything, we cannot talk about anything, and not everyone can talk about anything. The science will have the role of being able to define and classify what is rational and what is truth. The fear of becoming insane acts as a threatening abyss.

Another key concept is discourse, a form of filtration of the speaking subject. Various communities, industries gives people within them an affiliation that provides space to share some opinions with each other, which means that certain words are banned. It means that we have people from our membership of different discourse. Communities start to control ourselves so as not to be excluded from the culture we live in. In our desire to belong to the "normal crowd", we are putting our attention on a "quest for the true life". Foucault sees our quest for perfection, liberation and independence of

illusions, which in itself becomes the "truths to be" that keeps us in the name of individuality submits to their own social control.

Power and the relational knowledge

I feel attracted by Foucault's view of power impact on human relationships. According to him, power is an internalised part of social relations and it cannot be removed. If effects of the power are challenged, it can, according Foucault's position, be only possible from the inside of the power relationship. It is the idea of the ever-present potential for resistance that provides a degree of optimism for change in the subjugation of power relations.

In Foucault's approach the power might be seen in everyday collaboration:

- 1) In the structure of relationships between people;
- 2) In the physical use of place and architecture;
- 3) In the actual disciplines of our bodies, and how our mindset is shaped;
- 4) In the forms of subjectivity and forms of knowledge (Lundby, 2002:122).

Therefore, I agree with Foucault believes that power is always present in the both: a restrictive and in a productive manner. Power itself has no life outside the network of relationships in which it occurs - it can only be studied as a specific, not as something general.

Michael White (White & Epston, 1990) has picked up some ideas and developed Foucault's thoughts about power relations (Lundby, 2002:123). He shares the four main routes in this regard:

- 1) Power can be positive in its effects;
- 2) There is a function of and intimate relationship between power and knowledge;

- 3) The importance of technology in everyday practice of power;
- 4) A result of the power of practice is the oppression of the "alternative" and marginalized knowledge.

White uses all these ideas in the development of methods to contemporary stories with clients, and to co-create alternative stories that would release the potential of the oppressed, knowledge that can underpin a more usable version of people's perceived experience. White uses Foucault's ideas for integrating a progressive power politics in a client-centred practice of narrative therapy.

Geir Lunby (Lundby, 2002) has looked at the Foucault's ideas about power-relationship, and he concludes that power and knowledge are inseparable. Modern Power expansion was based on the success in constructing knowledge that appears to be "truth". That way you can ensure that knowledge is power arena and vice versa.

Foucault says that knowledge only becomes problematic (Lundby, 2002:126) when used by people in positions of power in their best interest. Since we are all trapped in the power / knowledge networks, it is not possible to act independently of it. We are also victims of the effects of power and practitioners of power in relation to others. I can clearly see that neither Foucault, or White, or someone else are saying that all people are equal in the exercise of power.

Here I would like to mention a couple that I have been meeting about a year. One of the themes in our conversations has been the position of power. It has gone a few months of our collaboration without naming a word "power", it has not come up on our agenda. I talked to them, known the different forms of power that flows around in the room, which affects all of us, but I had not mentioned the word "power".

In that moment when I began to mention the "power", it became so much clearer to all of us that we have become involved in a fight about different power relations. Power was no longer just a concept, it was something we were all influenced by and all involved in. For example: the woman could not take any decision without checking their value with her husband; the man was too controlled by the woman through her constant explanations of her effort; and I ended up in a power relationship with the man from his threat to kill himself if I do not help them in their concerns.

Only when we made our arrangements about how we deal with these various power relations, then we could collaborate on more effective way.

Positive force of the power

It is fascinating how White and Epston uses Foucault's thoughts about power relations bonded to therapeutic field in order to help their clients to take back power and control over their own lives.

I remember a family who came to my agency, where I worked with family therapy. Parents felt completely powerless in order to find some way to help their eleven-year-old daughter in her battle with fear.

This girl was afraid of lots of things: she had a fear of dying, she was afraid to "expose her self to dangerous things," such as meet friends, go out on the streets, play, etc. I met the girl with her parents during couple of months. In our conversation and collaboration, I externalized "the fear". The girl drew the fear on a very large paper. I asked her to design the fear in the different shapes and forms, depending on how scared she felt. It turned out that the girl drew different fears. While she was drawing, we were talking:

ME: Is there more than one fear?

G: Yes, of course.

Me: If there are several fears, how do you manage them?

G: *They all are mixed up most of the time.*

Me: *Have you tried to distinguish all these fears apart?*

G: *No, but, probably if it would be possible.*

Me: *Would it be helpful to call them in different names?*

G: *Then this one (she pointed to one of her drawings) would be irritating-one...*

When we concentrated on these issues, than it turned out that this girl was interested to bring order to all these fears, name them, mark the difference in their appearance and find some weaknesses of these fears. It was an early finding of control over the girl's existence.

I suggested the girl to make up a contract about "domestication of the fear". We all, the girl, her parents and I, had a common mission: to take over control and power over these fears. The girl was asked to investigate how many other children of her surroundings aware of this fear she have had in her self and what others have or have had something like "this fear"?

Every next time we met, she could tell, show and draw how she has taken control or "taming" THE FEARS.

Our collaboration ended with this eight-year old girl helping to her slightly older friend to get stronger and braver for certain decisions she must take. During the time we met, we worked with the power of the positive forces in order to co-create the management of girl's existence.

This example what I showed above is from my practice as a therapist. Same thinking and approach I have been using in my supervisory practice. My believe is that when we encourage people to use their curiosity in things they are involved in. In this context it is also like co-creating our positive power.

Recently I worked with the supervision group where one of the group members Ilona claimed that "she always thinks that her thoughts are not so valuable, that things her colleagues are saying are much more fitting to the

case and more reasonable”. Then I asked Ilona, what would she like to do with this thought about her self being less important and if she would be interested to investigate the value or importance of her own thoughts. Ilona agreed to do this investigation. Her findings were that one of her colleagues often interrupted and did not let her to expose her idea and thought in complete. This colleague was quick in words and well formulated, and she also hade this difficulty to wait while Ilona formulates her idea. In stead she was “kind to help and complete Ilonas idea”. When Ilona find out how came she have this feeling of being less important, she felt empowered to do some marks and start to use her “weakness” as a positive power for her self, which seemed to be helpful to her colleague as well.

SOCIAL GRRAACCEESS

G	R	R	A	A	C	C	E	E	S	S
e	a	e	g	b	l	u	t	d	e	p
n	c	l	e	i	a	l	h	u	x	i
d	e	i		l	s	t	n	c	u	r
e		g		i	s	u	i	a	a	i
r		i		t		r	c	t	l	t
		o		y		e	i	i	i	u
		n					t	o	t	a
							y	n	y	l
										i
										t
										y

„Social Graces“ is one of the outstanding meanings of the postgraduate education of Systemic Supervision and Training. I appreciate a meaning of

this word – “graces”. It was very first time in my professional life I heard from course teacher Diana Alvis this kind of naming of such important issues of our life. Both: name “Social Graces” and containment of things it includes are so self-evident, so self-explanatory and so important, that I became overwhelmed and adapted this way of thinking in my every day work.

Here I draw some parallels with the “pillow-case”, what I wrote about in the introduction (page, 4-7) of my dissertation. How this experience of mine have influenced my thinking and acting in terms of GRRAACCEESS. Questions what I would like to ask to myself are:

Q: Which issue of social graces is important to focus on in this particular case?

A: At first, I think - Age.

Q: Is there more than one issue to point out?

A: May be Ability, Class, Culture, Ethnicity...

Q: In which way this issue of Age do involve, prepossess or colours other issues?

A: I as a little girl was disrespected, un-informed and pressed by adult people from another class, culture, ethnicity and we had different abilities.

Q: When I think of the aspect of Abilities, what new ideas do I get about the other aspects?

A: The fear and uncertainty that I experienced as a little girl in a meeting with adults from another culture, class, ethnicity - has given bodily knowledge that I can find in the situations which reminds me what I have perceived. This unrespectable, powerful way what these adult people were treating me as a child, has made me evaluate and be aware of similar situations, as well as it has given to me a feeling of understanding when ever similar issues appear.

There I can see a possibility to use systemic thinking and circularity in the terms of social graces, and that is what makes the conversation more collaborative and more co-created.

I have become more aware of the way of thinking and dealing with "Social Graces" and I have added it as good aid both in my therapeutical and supervisory practice. And most important: now I have it naturally in my mind and that's mean – in my work. I think that this kind of thinking can be used in therapeutical work with clients as well as in supervisory work.

I remember one sequence from my professional practice, when I and three family members- father, mother and 10 years old daughter were going by car to the in-patient unit to meet their family member – the son and the brother - 16 year old boy. Father in the family could not speak Swedish at all, but mother and daughter spoke a little Swedish. Just before we are entering the car, I found out that interpretator is not going to be with us in the car, but she is going to meet us directly in the in patient unit. I recognize, that I have been left alone with this family! I felt quite uncomfortable and I realize that I am un-able to come-up with some good idea of “killing the time”. I understood, that we are going to share the same care about two hours each way. Suddenly, when we for a wile were trying to do a conversation, but not really coming somewhere, one idea came to my mind.

There was one particular thing what we were sharing – no one of us has the Swedish language as the mother tongue. Mine is Latvian, theirs are Serbian. I thought – if we have the difficulties to make a conversation, we could sing instead. I decided to turn to the youngest one in the family. I asked the dotter- *“If I will sing one of my ethnical songs, could you sing one of yours? I am really curious to hear how it sounds”*.

When I said it, in side of me I became afraid – *what if she says -NO?* I really felt my *discomfort zone* (Wilson, 2001). It took same time, nobody were answering... I took my chance. I began to sing. I had thousand of thoughts in the same time, which made me both uncertain and also very secure.

When I was finished, the little girl began to sing and after some seconds her mother also sang. It took one minute and the father joined the rest of the family. From that moment I felt joy and companionship between us. It felt naturally and all of us were deepened into our new way of communication. In this singing-way we communicate all way to the meeting were we suppose to go to. Ice was broken! I felt wonderful.

In the moment I stepped in to the uncomfortable zone and used my thinking of social graces, we were able to co-create a possibility of respectful meeting. My way of approaching them allowed co-creating an atmosphere that moved all of us to comfort zone. Despite our singing-travel, afterwards we were having a serious discussion about difficult issues with three staff members of this in-patient unit and all four family members. Just this time we were doing it with help of the interpretation!

Afterwards, I thought about what kind a professional ability of mine allowed me to act spontaneously and in the same way respectfully? I became to think about my different life learning stories. For example, I believe that I know how it feels not to understand what other people are talking about. When I moved to Sweden, I did not know a word of Swedish. I have a lot of experiences of my own, being within a group of people who all speak Swedish and me not having a clue what they are talking about. Same experience I have had when I grow-up, as a child. Russian language was dominant in the times of Soviet Latvia and it was unwritten law that everybody shall speak Russian, if there were somebody who didn't know the Latvian language. I remember my-self as a girl who not always could understand all details of everyday happenings. The pressure of following the rules sometimes gave me a feeling of being undignified or unsure. This experience of feeling un-sure, has given me an ability of sensitivity, which in a way allowed me to act spontaneously and use my bodily/feeling knowledge. My ability of being sensitive has made me able to emerge because I have both "good and bad" experiences of using an understanding of surroundings.

Here I would like to reflect on two complementary ways of *relating to experience*, which Kolb describes, when he talks about how we learn from our experience: *concrete experience and abstract conceptualisation* (Burnham, 2009).

Concrete experience in the Kolb's point of view we get "through affect, feelings, intuition, and relating to people in specific situations, unstructured, artistic, open-minded". Abstract conceptualisation we are getting by "responding to experience through analysing it through, logic, theory, symbols, rigor and discipline, aesthetic quality of a neat conceptual system". I can say that, in this particular example of doing professional artistry, I used the abstract conceptualisation of my concrete experience.

Cultural competences

White (1991), among others, has put forward and developed a narrative framework, as a social constructionist approach, both, in the therapeutic, supervisory and training process. With this approach family therapists and supervisors proposes that we organise and give meaning to our experience in terms of stories or narratives, and it is through these stories that experience is further interpreted (Hearphy, 2000). "We enter into stories; are entered into stories by others; and we live our lives through these stories" (Epston et al, 1992, p 97). Here I could also mention that, according to Pearce and Pearce (1998: 173), "the quality of life depends on the richness of our stories".

In one of my supervisory practice I am having direct/live supervision sessions with one social worker from Integration Centre and her client – family who have recently moved from Congo, Africa to Sweden. Family, which consist of three people – mother, father and 15 years old sun. In the time of two years this family were moving, each separately from one land to another land, staying in each land app 6 months, in terms of coming to their "wonder land" – Sweden.

It was social worker Annika, who had worked with this family almost one and a half year and feeling stuck and an able to help the family. She turned to me with assessment – *how can she help this family in the best way.*

Annika was having her own agenda and idea about what kind of help this family needs, but the family was asking for other things. Annika had worries about this terrible trauma this family has got through, but the parents were seeking help to get back parental authority, which they thought they had lost. They were willing to learn how to show/learn necessary boundaries and importance of their values for their son.

I have met all of them in different constellations for about one year. In all our meetings the interpreter is present.

At the time when I was interviewing Annika about her worries the parents were listening. Then I was listening when Annika was talking with the family and time-by-time I came in with some reflections-in-action. Afterwards I noticed that I have taken a position of outside whiteness (White, 1991). I could use my ethnical identity not being Swedish, in terms of giving some reflections of my own experience when I came to Sweden and share what kind of difficulties I was facing in that time. I came up with genuine curiosity about being *different* (a word the parents used) and not being able to *fit in*.

In one of the sessions, when I was talking to the parents and Annika was listening, I was asking them to teach me the most important things about their culture. I was about to join their grammar, when they suddenly asked me

- *Could you tell us what is most important, in the Swedish way of thinking, about the raising-up the child?*

My curiosity about their way of thinking and doing things raised theirs curiosity about my opinion and my experience. I noticed, that we were co-

creating the cultural competence. We were sharing and co-creating the position of expert. We were consulting each other.

After my conversation with the parents, I turned to Annika and asked her

- *What values do you find as most important for parents? What have you learned about David and his parents (15 year old son), while you were listening?*

These questions opened a possibility for Annika and the family members to meet from another point of stand and spread the prejudices she had about cultural difficulties.

By self-reflecting on this work with Annika and the African family, I have noticed that I as a supervisor and trainer has at times been an obstacle to creating a climate that facilitates open discussion and learning within the supervisory practice. And most of all my self-reflection on-action is about how I can encourage my self to move beyond discomfort and fear and develop my abilities in talking about difficult issues?

Here I can see the direct connection with my thinking about being respectfully treated and the practicing of respect and curiosity. I would like to say, that each time that I use an allowing approach of respectful curiosity in the terms of therapeutical or supervisory system, I am co-creating ability within this system, which I didn't know I had.

Summary of the chapter 3.

About power, modern and positive...

In this chapter I am showing that when I think about respect in terms of social grraaces, the cultural aspects have taken crucial place and question - how we are using thinking about respect in our every day meetings were different cultures accurse - becomes very important to me.

Hear I have done an attempt to show how my thinking about and practicing Social GRRACCES in the supervision process have been important to me. I

am showing my conscious about developing of my supervisory practice and how using idea about social grraacceess have gradually enriched my professional ethics. With my practical experience I am showing how my curiosity in the cultural competences allows me to co-create the mutual respect in the meetings I am within.

CHAPTER 4

REFLEXIVITY IN THE COLLABORATIVE SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION

Recently I read a book called "Crime", what was written by a Norwegian author Karin Fossum. It is a story of one man's life- rather a year of his life. Alvar, as he is called, lives a quiet, compartmentalised and very anonymous life. By day he works in the art gallery, leisure time he enjoys listening to music, alone, at home in the house he inherited of his parents. During the following year, he becomes the victim of forces he does not even know existed, and in the end is a disaster that Alvar forces to take a vital decision. (Fossum, 2007)

What is fascinating about this book and that caught my attention was the author's genuine way to offering the story. She reflects both within her self during writing the story and also reflects together with her personage - Alvar. Alvar comes to her house and discusses the process of writing. He asks´ the questions to Karin, the author, sets wondering and curiosity about: Why she is writing in this way; why se is challenging him so much; what she is going to do next; whence comes her ideas about him?

He is asking for some advises to his writer, how he shall manage these challenges she is putting for him.

Both, the author and Alvar reflect on their lives and their actions both within the "narrative" frames and beyond. Me as a reader have this exclusive opportunity to follow the story told and in the same time opportunity of "additional material" which shows reflections before the story, within the story, besides the story and after the story.

Page and Wosket (quoted in Scaife, 2001) advise that supervisees prepare their presentations by already having asked themselves questions like: "What is my particular difficulty or problem in working with this client?", "If I could risk telling my supervisor what really concerns me in my work, what would that be?" and some others.

I think it is quite a necessary to do this preparation work, in terms of getting more outcomes from supervisory process. This kind of preparation could help in order to make or choose the focus of discussing things of reflection on. One could say that this preparation work is like **reflection before action**.

Reflection on-action, according to Burnham (Burnham, J. 2009), refers to looking back on an event through the video, case discussion or in a post-session. This kind of reflection cannot change the action being reflected upon, "but is likely to involve thinking about the action in the context of concrete experience and or abstract conceptualisation, and planning/scaffolding for active experimentation in a future episode of practice". That can be done in the very different ways.

Reflection in-action, according to Burnham, "refers to the ability to create, through immediate reflection, the potential to change an action, as it is happening. " This could be initiated of reflecting team within the terapeutical context, by the supervisor within the direct/live supervision or one colleague during co-therapy or co-supervision.

I suppose to create more reflexive practice in the process of my relational/reflexive learning/training of being systemic supervisor and practitioner. Donald Schön says -“reflective practitioner should be credential and technically competent” (Schön, 2005). For me it means, that we as the supervisors or other practitioners, in the terms of being reflexive within the things we do, time by time must ask our-selves the questions what Schön is pointing out- What, in my work, really gives me satisfaction or I am willing to develop? How can I produce more experiences of that kind?

My reflective learning of being reflexive practitioner

In order to do and get some more reflective learning, I would like to present one of my experiences of direct supervision with a group of supervisees and their client. At first I will describe the group of supervisees, some of their thoughts and concerns about their client. Then I will expose some thoughts I got from my supervisees about their client and then I will describe a process of direct supervision with all involved. As a summery, I will do an attempt to critically evaluate and reflect on my supervisory process and my own learning. I will also do some reflections about reflexivity of the supervisees.

This group of supervisees, which I have been working with a little bit more than a year, consists of 7 practitioners - two social workers, three social pedagogues, one activity pedagogue and one nursing auxiliary. These are professional helpers who are working in the in-patient service with people who have a mental ill health. They have approximately ten clients living in their service at a time. Each of them is a contact person for some particular client, but in the same time they all have quite a close relationship with all their clients.

Anna is 24 years old. Anna has lived in this service house about a year. Anna has a very difficult relationship with her eight siblings and mother.

Two of her siblings are living in other in-patient services. Her father died seven years ago. To her contact person she has been talking about her desire of sexual fantasies, about her suicidal thoughts and outbreaks, which have not been easy to handle for the staff. When her contact person presented to Anna an idea about having a supervision session together with all the staff and one supervisor, Anna agreed and found it interesting to be part.

The supervisees have been talking about Anna in several supervision sessions. Most worries they have had about Anna's way of dealing with different relationships, her way of letting other people take advantage of her and talking about different ways of killing herself. These professionals have been struggling with their concerns and preconceptions about Anna. They have had difficulties to handle Anna's outbreaks, like screaming, threatening and self-damaging. Most of them try to find different approaches in terms of find new ways for Anna in her way of talking about different ways of "taking her life". They wanted to be clearer in their attachment towards Anna

In the stage of contracting I negotiated with Anna an idea of being respectfully met, I asked her about her own expectations from this session and gave her some suggestions- how this process could be done.

Then I negotiated with Anna's contact person Lisa about her hopes for the session. She wanted help to get more clear ideas and a new approach towards Anna.

With the other supervisees I negotiated about their way of having a feeling of ability to be less concern about Anna and having a possibility to meet Anna in a respectful way. We talked about their way of being a reflecting team in the process.

When we were sitting all together in a circle in the supervision room, I heard my-self saying: "*Let me explain my idea about us working together today...*"

I did negotiate what we need to agree about in terms of feeling respected and being comfortable with the situation. As my professional reference inside me, I was thinking about Glenda Fredman, her way of negotiating in the systemic

supervision process. I was using Glendas model of co-creating the context and in the same time I was talking about and co-creating ground rules and boundaries of supervisory process, as Joyce Scaife is describing in her Cyclical model of supervision (Scaife, 2001)

In my first, 25 minutes long interview with Anna's contact person – Lisa, we were talking about Lisa's experience of being contact person to Anna. I asked loving relational questions, like:

“What positive things surprise you about Anna's way of dealing with difficulties?”

“What kind of positive thoughts about Anna's way of dealing with relationships you have had, but hasn't been able to discuss them with Anna?”

“Which ideas and beliefs would you like to shear with Anna?”

“How Anna's talk about “killing her self” influence your willingness to help her?”

“How do you think it influence your colleagues?”

“What would Anna like you to do when she is having hard thoughts?”

I noticed, that my way of putting the questions opened-up another way of thinking and talking about Anna, which allowed us to co-create feeling of “withness”, rather than “aboutness”. I joined Lisa's grammar, by using her words and expressions, when I asked her questions.

When the reflecting team were reflecting-in-action (Schön, 2005) on our conversation by giving feedback on Lisa's ideas, beliefs and concerns, I noticed that Anna has difficulties facing the feedback, which came from Lisa's colleagues. Anna was showing with her body language, she was swinging on the chair and shaking her head, that discomfort was taken place. I paused the process by leaning my hand to Anna's shoulder and asked everyone:

“Is there some new rules about the process we all are in to, which would be necessary to negotiate, in terms of feeling/being comfortable for all of us?”

And a new rule came up: every time, when the reflecting team or Lisa was talking, they should turn back from Anna. Also, when Anna was talking with the supervisor, Lisa and her colleagues should turn back from Anna and listen quietly. Anna was glad to have this rule and also all the others.

After that, I talked with Lisa some more minutes about the reflections we got from her colleagues.

Later, in this session, I did some self-reflection on my reaction-in-action, when I noticed, that Anna is showing discomfort. Could it be an issue of professional artistry (Schön, 1987:22), when I as a supervisor was using some kind of bodily knowledge competence in this uncertain situation? I did react spontaneously, without reflecting on what I was doing, which felt comfortable and created a difference and possibility to continue the conversation.

Then, I interviewed Anna about her reflections on our conversation with Lisa and about the feedback from the other colleagues. Everybody else were sitting with their back toward us. I asked Anna:

“What kind of reaction would you like to see from all involved, in terms of having feeling that you are being respectfully treated?”

“How could you help Lisa and her colleagues to notice that you are having unpleasant thoughts to be sure that they are handling the situation?”

“In what ways have you already showed them, that you need to talk with some one, and how have they noticed that?”

I was inviting Anna to take a different position and to make new connections with the professionals. I noticed that she was pleased and felt respected, when all professionals followed the new rule.

After that, we reflected-in-action together with Lisa about my conversation with Anna and the reflecting team reflect on the whole session. We negotiated some new tools to use for Anna, in terms of getting feeling of being understood, for example: Anna could give a “stop-sign” to her contact person, when she wants to be left alone, and, when she needs to talk with someone about her fears, Anna could say to her contact person: “I have a lot

to think about, it would be nice to talk...” These achievements Anna accepted and the personal were willing to bring in. We used Anna’s key words and her language in terms of connecting all our experiences and what we have learned from this situation.

At last, I turned to Anna and talked with her about her experience of the supervision process and what outcomes she/we got from this session. I was giving her my personal learning and appreciation of this time we spent together.

After this session I did my self-reflecting learning about the experience I had. I noticed that this educational process which I am going through have given me an opportunity and willingness to take considerable initiatives in co-creating and amplifying implicative action in the supervisory process as well as I have been thickening my ethical positioning. In my way of thinking, there are privileges of using systemic collaborative approach. I have noticed that, by using this approach I have been able to negotiate and discuss the ethical issues in a very open and accosting way with the clients and the supervisees. Negotiation of the ethical positions has become as an on-going co-creating process, which generates more mutual respect in my meetings with other.

Co-created collaborative On-going Contracting

Co-creation is for me, like Tom Andersen once said – be curious and ask enough an-usual questions (Andersen, 1999). It could be done by me asking following questions to my supervisees during or after our supervision session

–

“In which way is it useful to talk about this subject?”

“ When you are listening to your colleague telling us about her new experience, what is your new learning about your own way of doing things?”

“ Why is this idea important right now?”

“ What is your new learning about this subject, after we have talked about it? ...”

When I am practicing this kind of evaluating/reflecting questions, I usually get a response from the supervisees, which leads me to realize that we are co-creating mutual learning in the supervision process.

Joyce Scaife in her book “Supervision in the Mental Health Professions” (Scaife, 2001) have described Page and Woskets (1994) Cyclical model of supervision. I have been deepened in this model in order to get some more understanding about it and usefulness in my supervision and training work. As she describes, the supervision process is presented as a cycle of five stages, such as: contracting, focusing, space, bridge and reviews.

The **Contracting** process invites supervisees to think about their needs in supervision, the ideas about their needs, support and learning process. Contract I see as help for supervisees to get to know themselves in closer way, learn about their own way of learning new things and help to find out what approach of supervision would be most useful and challenge their learning. In the process of contracting there are space to share knowledge about different supervision approaches, to structure both parts involved and create an atmosphere what allows having respectful and comfortable feeling. I noticed more and more an importance of contracting and “comforting” (Burnham, J 1993) of supervisory process and I am willing to challenge this process.

Scaife has described same themes what could be included in a supervisory contract, like, talking about and co-creating ground rules and boundaries of supervision process. Clarifying responsibilities of supervisor and supervisees, the negotiation of how the learning will take place, rules about supervisory alliance and expectations on each other. These are very important issues where ethical dilemmas could be pointed out and spoken about. Scaife (2001: 63) is describing contracting as “ongoing supervisory

relationship” and this relationship is the creation and maintenance of safety for all the parties involved in the helping experience. She have also mentioned in her book about “mini-contracting”. These mini-contracts are small agreements, which supervisor and supervisees can do in a beginning of the each supervision.

As a most important issue in the on-going contracting process I see an ethical matter. We are giving space to each other for talking about ethical issues. This mini-contracting as on-going supervisory process is useful not only in the beginning or end of session. We can talk about – What would be most ethical way of going on with this hard topic? How shall we do, how do you want to discuss your issue, from which position? Would it be ethical to change the rules when we are discussing this family?

When Peter Cantwell and Sophie Holmes (Cantwell and Holmes, 1995) describe Philosophy of supervision they are talking about learning which builds on competences already acquired. They are putting a strong emphasis on the competencies that supervisees already have acquired and promoting the idea that supervision will “hopefully enable you to do better what you already do well”. Respecting supervisee’s previous history is a very important element in their professional development. If I as a supervisor manage to weave together supervisees previous achievements, value system and desired goals in the terms of doing on-going contracting and on-going evaluation of our co-created work, than I would call it this process - Systemic Supervision.

I noticed that using of the contracting and on-going mini contracting has given me an opportunity and willingness to take considerable initiatives in co-creating and amplifying implicative action in the supervisory process as well as I have been thickening my ethical positioning. In my way of thinking, there are privileges of using systemic collaborative approach. I have noticed that, by using this approach I have been able to negotiate and discuss the ethical issues in a very open and accosting way with the clients and the supervisees. Negotiation of the ethical positions has become as an on-going co-creating process, which generates more mutual respect in my meetings with other.

I am trying to stick to the questions, as Peter Lang is saying – make the Loving relational questions (Lang, 2008). “Shift from problem questions to the loving questions”, had David Epston said (Lang, 2008). I like this idea and I value it in my supervisory practice. Tentative and Loving questions, which in the same time are relational questions gives me an awesome experience. When I think about on-going contracting, I have this attitude of putting the loving and tentative questions in my mind. My awareness of talking about things what are important and interesting for people I meet, seems to me as a part of the collaborating. By using Scott Millers questions “where are you now in the conversation?” or “how is this conversation going for you?”, I can create the mutual developing of the therapeutical or supervision process.

Scaife describes an other stage in this Cyclical model of supervision- stage of the **focus**. During this stage, the aim is to identify an issue, priorities and to identify the objectives for the session. As a characterising of this stage I would like to show some questions what Scaife (2001) is pointing out: “What would you like to focus on today?” “What would you like to happen as a result of as having this conversation?” and “ How would you like to approach this – shall I ask you questions, would you like to role-play one of the characters or would you like to tell me something first?”

In my way of thinking it would be like – going on contracting, just more identify position and thoughts of supervisee.

In the terms of the supervision process we are in the social co-creation with each other and with environment. We co-create things we believe are meaningful to us, valuable and important to focus on in our lives. In this social co-creating with each other we create also frames of allowances or not allowances, we contract things we wish to focus on and work with. In other words – in some way we co-create each other.

When I act as a supervisor, I find it incredibly useful in helping professionals to create theoretical frameworks around their daily work, so that they can

apply what they already are doing well or are curious of getting knowledge of more effectively in new contexts.

I am aware about necessarily of the frames and talk about how me as a supervisor and group as the supervisees want to have this supervisory process we are going in. Usually I was writing and drawing on the white board some kea-words from our agreement. This agreement would include some of these themes what Scaife were mentioned in her description of the process of contracting. For example, I would do some “linguagrams” on white board about important issues of supervision, together with supervisees, we would “unpack” and go in these words and expressions, in terms of making sense for everyone. Like, “what are you thinking about, when you are saying – it is important to me, that my voice is heard? What is meaning of respectful approach to you? In which way it is OK for you to be stopped or disrupt?” This part of contracting I find useful and necessary for me, in order to co-create an atmosphere, were everyone feels confidence and secure.

I feel myself verified in the Systemic collaborative approach. My pure interest is in the questions, which makes the difference, as Tom Anderson was saying, and in questions, which creates mutual respect and feeling of witness. I believe in reflective learning, were co-created, relational and collaborative learning takes place. I also believe that reflective learning is a condition of being reflective practitioner.

On-Going Negotiation

At first, I would like to share **Glenda Fredman’s model of the Systemic Supervision**: Co-creating New Ways to Go On (Fredman, 2008). I find it as a very respectful way of having supervisions and it fits to me well. I would love to show Glenda Fredman’s approach in the direct supervision with me being directly supervised by her in terms of my educational process. This process I see as a co-creational de-constructual approach in the supervision.

As a first phase of the supervision process she is pointing out Co-creating a Context: Joining in Language and Understanding. In this phase she is creating *Contracting* by explaining how the supervisor and the supervisees will work, negotiating different agreements with each and every one, and in the same time she is co-creating emotional postures of respect and comfort. For example, she asked me in the very beginning of our interview:

”Let me explain my idea about us working together today”,

”So, what do we need to agree here today so we can be together in a way that you feel comfortable and respected?”

Time by time she asked me: *“Is this OK?”*, *“Does this fit for you?”*

In this way she made me feel comfortable and lean on situation. Her way of negotiating and thickening introductions of the supervision process, created a feeling of tranquillity and being respected.

The next stage of our supervision process was *Mapping the Systems* as Glenda calls it. Here she helped me to weave connections and explore my relationships, my ideas about my values, passion of my work and my intentions. She “joined my grammar”, went into my language, by using my own words and “mapping” my agenda.

She asked me:

“I can hear that you are valuing thinking – “there is no right or wrong” in your way of treating the clients... Which words would you use to express more of this idea?”

Glenda was checking with me time by time if she has “cached” me in a way I was hoping for and gave back to me her understanding of words about what I have been expressing. For example:

“What I am hearing is, that you are giving a lot of attention of being open-minded. Have I understood you correct?”

Next phase of her way of doing the supervision was Co-creating Preferred Directions. Here I would like to pay attention to her *Future focused questions*. These are questions, which remind me of Solution focused - Miracle questions by Steve de Shazer. These future focused questions in the supervision process are my new learning which creates another, better quality of my supervision sessions. I will share some of her questions to me:

“Let’s imagine you are leaving this conversation today at 3pm and you are feeling satisfied with how we have spent the time, so that you can say to yourself, “Yes that was helpful, I got something useful from that...what it would be?”

“What we have talked about, what have we being discussing?”,

“What have become more clearer to you or what do you understand more now?”, “What are you being able to do now differently?”

I love these questions. I feel that these questions are scaffolding the supervision process and are providing an ability of my own self-reflection. They are moving me forward in my own process. I have applied in my supervision process this kind of future focused questions. I see the difference of the quality of the supervision process, which allows us to co-create more successful goals. I am having a good feedback from my supervisees, were they are saying that, by experiencing this way of interviewing, they have become more reflecting on their own professional development and become more focused on their own issues. It leads me to think, that information, which supervisees share about their own goals and hopes with the supervision, helps us to co-create a more reflecting and open minded process.

Following the future focused questions; Glenda went into a *Summarizing and Clarifying* phase by using *Key Words*. By asking questions she went inside the BIG WORDS, kea-words or important words from my presentation of issue. She was looking for different meanings of these words; some other words that connect with these or have some touch. She asked me: “ *When*

you think about this word – allowance- what other words comes in your mind?”

When I think about looking “inside of the words”, I also think of Tom Andersen (Anderson T., 1999) and his way of asking the questions: *“If you go inside of this word, what do you see?”* By giving opportunity to explore different angles of the important words, Glenda is avoiding to *“understand or to know too quickly”*, what my meaning is, when I am using my grammar. That I can see as a connection of meaning with the action we are within.

Continuing our supervision process, Glenda went in to *Generating and Exploring Resources*. She was interested in my professional achievements and successes by asking questions, which allowed me to show my abilities, rather than difficulties. She was picking up “tools”, things I am already doing in terms of my concern of issue. Glenda was waking my competence, by asking me:

“What ideas do you already had about your way of dealing with your concern?”,

“What are you already doing in terms of your issue and what are the supervisee group noticing?”,

“Which of these things you have already tried, have the supervisee group appreciated or noticed?”,

“What are you planning to do?”

Glenda Fredman was gently following my story and me, in the same time holding a focus on my issue and inviting me to be aware of my own professional competences and scaffolding it.

Before Glenda invited reflecting team, she was going through next phase of the supervision process, which she called *Widening the System or Generating Multiple Perspectives*. Now she was listening for resources I have in my own supervision process and helping me to make a new connections within this. For example:

“Who else is involved in your idea?”

“Who else is concerned about your idea?”

“Who else has a view on this idea as you do?”

She was inviting me to take a different position within the supervision system and having experience of different perspectives.

“What might your supervisee say about ... ?”,

“What would your supervisee like you to do?”

That was a pleasant way of being interviewed, and I am working on adapting this kind of approach in my own supervision practice. Later on in my essay I will do attempt to show my way of using this kind of interviewing model.

ON-GOING LEARNING

In terms of investigating my new development of learning, I would like to mention Tom Anderson’s “*four types of knowledge’s*” (Abrahamsson. E and Berglund. G, 2007). *Rational, practical, relational and bodily knowledge*. I will focus on **relational knowledge**, which means –knowledge of different ways of relating to each other. That’s leading me to my own learning process and how different relationships within this process have affected my ability to learn new knowledge. In these terms I can relate to my early experience from my childhood. When I as a child heard some narrative or story from someone I did admire, I did remember this narrative many years after. I can think about some stories that I have heard as a child, which are still with me, which I still pressure. I can think about some relationships with some people, which I have created inside me, in terms of some knowledge I have got from these people. Relations in my learning process are very important; this is something I have learned about myself.

Anderson and Goolishian (1990) mean all the new things we learn and become unique to each of us. When we share our knowledge with each other, we cannot know what each one brings to the sharing. Then I think –

how do I know that some of my ideas I have, really are mine, even though I thought I created them.

Collaboration is very important in my learning process. Being collaborative in my learning process means to me, that I as a supervisor choose my attitude to be a learner, believing that I can learn as much as the supervisees in the supervision process. For example, in one of my supervision groups I had an interview with a social worker. She was very negative sighted to one idea that was presented from her colleague. I was using my systemic thinking and circular questions; I tried hard to investigate together with her, what good outcome could be possible from this new idea from her colleague. In the same time I was completely neglecting or too less interested in her own idea, which she had before her colleague presented hers. When I did my reflection-in-action and told her about my confusing that I was not following her, she taught me a lesson. She asked me:

“Why are you not asking me about my own ideas in the same subject?” I learned something about my self and my way of being curious. I did together with the social worker some collaborative reflective learning about capacity of being curious of ideas of the others and ability of talking about ideas and not evaluating them.

Bass and Vaughan have said, “learning is a relatively permanent change in behaviour that occurs as a result of practice” (Kolb, D 1984). Than I wonder, how do my behaviour changes when I learn something new? Do I want to try to practice what I have just learned? Or – do I need to tell someone what I have just learned, in terms of hearing myself telling to others my knowledge? Could I call it co-created knowledge, when I tell others my new learned knowledge in terms of learning in this process?

How do I notice that learning happens?

We do remember best - 90% of what we both say and do by simulating, practising or doing the “real thing” and 70% of what we say by making

presentations or participating in role-play or discussions (Cave, M., Hanney, S., Henkel, M. and Kogan, M. 1997). Having knowledge about that, I can reflect on my own way of adapting and amplifying new things in my own supervision practice.

I have been a teacher through many years. Thinking of my way of learning things and adapting new things into my practice I realize that I have been most successful when I have practiced together or taught others about what I have learned. “Learning by teaching” would be my style. I am not sure if it would be correct to say, but I like to “learn” and, when I do that, I process it in my activities.

I had a teacher degree, before I become a “freshly baked” social worker. In the area where I lived, there were not enough teachers of social work, who were able to teach the students in the Higher School of Social Work. I got a job as a lecture; I should teach a programme of *Social Work introduction*, *Social Work with families* and *Social Work Theories and Practice*. Teaching social work in the Higher School was the first “real”, professional social work I did. I was teaching all these good things - techniques, theories, approaches, that I had learned during my own studies or practices, without having experience of doing them by myself. When I heard myself talking about these things I was interested in, I got more and more willingness to do them by myself. When I talked and reflected on these ideas I was willing to do, but not had opportunity to do, I can now reflect that I created the possibilities of my own social work practices.

In same time I could say that my way of amplifying new knowledge into my practice goes through trying, experimenting or simulating new techniques or methods into my practice. I am curious to practice what I am interested in; in this way I learn them best. So, I could say that my style of learning is – “learning by doing”.

When I get response from others about my new learning, new knowledge, I can relate, and reflect on my own process. When I managed to co-create different knowledge together with others, I can reflect on the feedback I get in my practice, and I can realise that new learning has taken place. Co-creation is for me, like Tom Andersen once said – be curious and ask enough an-usual questions. It could be done by me asking following questions to my supervisees during or after our supervision session –

“In which way is it useful to talk about this subject?”

“ When you are listening to your colleague telling us about her new experience, what is your new learning about your own way of doing things?”

“ Why is this idea important just now?”

“ What is your new learning about this subject, after we have talked about it? ...”

When I am practicing this kind of evaluating/reflecting questions, I usually get a response from the supervisees, which leads me to realize that we are co-creating mutual learning in the supervision process.

When Peter Cantwell and Sophie Holmes (1995) describe Philosophy of supervision they are talking about learning which builds on competences already acquired. They are putting a strong emphasis on the competencies that supervisees already have acquired and promoting the idea that supervision will “hopefully enable you to do better what you already do well”. Respecting supervisee’s previous history is a very important element in their professional development.

Based on this idea, I could say that my new learning and eager to experiment with new theoretical ideas or techniques in the supervision allow me to feel more competent as a supervisor and will hopefully enable me to do better what I already do well. For example: I have been using quite often in the family therapy practice technique of externalising and internalising, which I gladly learned from Michael White. Then, I got an idea that I would like to use this approach in the supervision process. When one of my supervision groups talked about “feeling of companionship”, I did externalise

this feeling. I took a ball and put it in the middle of the circle we were sitting in. Then I interviewed the supervisees about this *feeling*, I was using this *ball* as a visual support. In this process of the supervision the supervisees while they were talking and shearing their experiences and hopes, were able to role this ball to each other; having the ball on their knee; giving it carefully to their colleagues or holding it all together. Having experience of this supervision process I felt self-confidence; I was using familiar technique in a way I had never experienced, but by trying that new experience, I got a new competence, which lead me to the better confidence in my own supervision practice.

Teaching work has tracked me through many years. My way of learning things and adapting new things in my practice have been most successive when I have past further on or teached others about things I have learned. “Learning by teaching” would be my style. I would love to quote Bass and Vaughan (1967) – “Learning is a relatively permanent change in behaviour that occurs as a result of practice”. I am not sure if it would be correct to say that, but- I like to “learn it out”, and, when I do it, I process it in my activities.

When I read Kolb’s Theory of Experiential learning (Kolb, 1984), I became more interested in my learning style. In a beginning of 2008, I did participate in one workshop arranged by Community I work in, “what is my learning style?” It was based on Kolb’s theory of experiential learning. It was interesting to pay more attention on – how I learn what I know and why I know what I know? I did a lot of thinking and reflecting, together with some of my colleagues about different learning styles. Some exercise I did showed that I have most of the “Concrete experiential learning” and “Active experimentation learning” style. I do not know if it was what I wanted to know about my self? I think that I am more curious about process of learning it self.

Being collaborative means, that I as a supervisor must be a learner, believing that I can learn as much as supervisees

I would like to use Haley's view or question about learning (quoted in Kolb, 1984) – “how to be a supervisor without knowing how to change anybody”. This is one more challenge for me to take.

When I am now reflecting on my past reflection-in-action, I am wondering – how will these reflections shape my future actions? Donald Schön (1997, p. 31) is saying that *when we are doing our present reflection on our earlier reflection-in-action begins a dialog of thinking and doing through which we become more skilful professionals*. Here I am glad to add, that I am still going-on with my inside-dialogues/multilogos (Andersen, T 1999).

Summary of the chapter 4.

In this chapter I am showing that it important to me to create more reflexive practice in the process of my relational/reflexive learning/training of being systemic supervisor and practitioner. As Donald Schön says -“reflective practitioner should be credential and technically competent” (Schön, 2005). For me it means, that we as the supervisors or other practitioners, in the terms of being reflexive within the things we do, time by time must ask ourselves the questions what Schön is pointing out:

What, in my work, really gives me satisfaction or I am willing to develop?

How can I produce more experiences of that kind?

Could it be questions for my next chapter?

One of the theories/approaches I am highlighting here is Kolb's learning model (1984), in both training and supervision. His way of exploring different learning styles is easy to apply and reflect on, while I am training or supervising. I suppose that reflecting on his model helped me maintain my

own learning style and helped me to be more reflexive about how and what I am learning, when I am getting a new knowledge.

In this chapter I am also showing that in the terms of the co-created collaborative systemic supervision there is matter of positioning of the focus. As supervisor in a process of supervision, I am positioning my focus mostly on supervisees learning and developing process, instead of going in narratives or stories of supervisees about their clients. I am “unpacking” supervisees emotions and needs, in order to involve important values and experiences supervisees have.

CHAPTER 5

WHAT WAYS DO WE HAVE OF CREATING COLLABORATION IN THE SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION?

My own cheat sheet:

- Co-create the Context: Join in Language and Understanding.
- Retain and highlight the ethical issues.
- Go-on with negotiation.
- Look for the BIG WORDS or KEY WORDS.
- Use an expertise of “not-knowing” position.

- Use stories, create the stories and play with stories. By using lived and told stories we are able to create the stories to live.

- Fictionalise the preferred future stories – by doing this you are co-creating the present stories.

- Use the metaphors. Lift what is talking about to another level.

- Use the white-board and flip chart to create the meaning for stories. It gives wider possibilities to be aware of what we are talking about.
- Reflect in- action and on-action. Every time we do it, we co-create the mutual learning and in the same time we do collaborate.

Summary of the chapter 5.

ENDING CONCLUSIONS OF MY UNDERSTANDING OF CO-CREATED COLLABORATIVE SYSTEMIC SUPERVISION

I would like to go back to the questions what I have often put to myself:

What, in my work, really gives me satisfaction or I am willing to develop?

How can I produce more experiences of that kind?

My pure interest is in the questions, which makes the difference, as Tom Anderson was saying, and in questions, which creates mutual respect and feeling of *witness*, rather than *aboutness* (Shotter, 2004). I believe in reflective learning, were co-created, relational and collaborative learning takes place. I also believe that *reflective learning* is a condition of being *reflective practitioner*. I believe that my willingness of being *collaborative learner* and practitioner emerges my ability of being *respectfully curious systemic supervisor*.

Through the writing of this paper I have noticed that I have reflexively lifted out and described my relation to the *professional ethics* and *respect* in the professional relationships I co-create with others involved. I realize that both of these things are especially important to me, when I am meeting people. I would like to say that respectful curiosity and ethical approach gives a possibility of using expertise of “non-expert” position and willingness of being collaborative learner.

I realize that I have had a red thread through all my writing of this paper the thinking and reflecting on “SOCIAL GRRAACCES”. A reflection about “SOCIAL GRRAACCES” has given me a feeling that I have co-created the

ability of using this approach. I am glad to admit that I have enormously developed my thinking/using of “social grraacces” in the terms of my Postgraduate Diploma Systemic Supervision and Training course.

I noticed that writing this paper has been the perfect way for me to self-reflect-on-action-on-paper. I have had a terrible hard time of deciding – what shall I start with. When I stopped thinking about it and just began writing, I had a difficulties to stop myself. I must admit that I have had fun and I have done a lot of findings about myself. Writing this dissertation, focusing on systemic supervision and different ways of co-creating the collaboration in the Systemic supervision has been a journey in many ways. First of all it has been an opportunity to spend time and focus to review my thoughts and how I have used this course to enhance my repertoire of performing supervision in a way that fits with my values and style.

When I have critically analyzed and self-reflect under, through and after my writing process of this paper, I have found out that collaboration is very important in my learning process. *Being collaborative* in my learning process means to me that I as a supervisor choose my attitude to *be a learner*, believing that I can learn as much as the supervisees in the supervision process.

I am proud about my professional development and I dare to experiment and challenge myself in the different working areas, I can see that there are several things that I would like to challenge and develop in the terms of feeling more confident and secure as a *systemic supervisor*. I will find enough courage to step more often step in to the zone, which is not so familiar to me and not so comfortable (Wilson, 2001).

There is again respect what takes an importance place. I feel that it is more respectful to the people I meet in terms of the therapeutical or supervisory systems, if I dare to leave my comfortable position and meet them as a non-expert, who allows to experiment, do role or real plays and use more “action” in the room.

Focusing on the writing combined with practicing has been an active reflexive journey moving between practice and theory, which have created a context of intense learning. It has moved me from a position of ‘acting as a systemic supervisor’ to reflect upon ‘myself as a systemic supervisor’ which

for me is a developmental step further in the emergence of the identity as a systemic supervisor.

This Postgraduate Diploma education in The Systemic Supervision and Training has made me able to emerge my professional abilities as the collaborative systemic supervisor. Being supervised by my supervisor and having reflexive talks with my course-mates, have enriched my possibilities to look at my practice from another angle, what I had never done before. By writing this dissertation I have highlighted the important place of reflexivity and self-reflexivity as a development of my own personal style of doing supervision. I have used my self-reflexivity through case scenarios drawn from as well from supervisory and training practice, as from my personal life stories.

REFERENCES

- Alvis, D.** (2008). Seminar at GCK about Social GRRACCES - as an influence in training and supervision; Gothenburg, 22 May 2008.
- Anderson, H. Goolishian H. A.** (1992) *Från påverkan till medverkan*. Mareld.
- Anderson, H.** (1990) Supervision as a Collaborative Learning Community, article fro her home page:
www.harleneanderson.org/Pages/supervisionbulletin.htm
- Anderson, H and Swim, S.** (1995) Supervision as collaborative conversation: connecting the voices of supervisor and supervisee. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, Vol. 14, No. 2
- Anderson, T.** (1999). *Reflecting processes. Call and call on the talks*. Mareld Books, Stockholm
- Asen, E.** (2005). Course seminar in Gothenburg.
- Bateson, G.** (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. San Francisko, CA: Chandler Publishing
- Boscolo, L., Bertrando, P.** (1996). *Systemic therapy with individuals*. London: Karnac
- Burnham, J.** (2009) *Creating reflexive relationships between Practices of Systemic Supervision & Theories of Learning and Education*; stencil, Course literature
- Burnham, J.** (1993). *Systemic supervision: The evolution of reflexivity in the context of the Supervisory relationship*. Human systems, vol 4.
- Burnham, J.** (1993) *Systemic Supervision*. Burnham J. (ed) (1993) Special Edition; *Voices from the Training Context*. *Human Systems* 4; 3-4
- Burnham, J.** (2005) *Relational Reflexivity : A Tool for Socially Constructing Therapeutic Relationships*, (ed) Carmel Flaskas, Barry Mason and Aaryll Perlesz, Karnac Books Publisher
- Burr, V.** (2003) *Social Constructionism*, second edition, New York, NY, Routledge
- Cecchin, G., Lane, G., Ray, W.A.** (1994) *The Cybernetics of Prejudices in the Practice of Psychotherapy*, Karnac Books

Clegg, J. (2004) Chapter 5: How can services become more ethical?, stencil, cors literature, Clinical Psykology Division of Rehabilitation and Ageing, Nottingham University

Cronen, V. (1994). Coordinated management of Meaning: Practical Theory for the Complexities and Contradictions of everyday Life (paper no Two for the Dispuk Institute seminar on teaching, Therapy organizational theory and development, Denmark. June15-17)

Cronen, V. Lang, P. (1994) Language and action: Wittgenstein and Dewey in the practice of therapy and consultation. *Human systems* 5, 1-2

Foucault, M. (1970) Appendix: The discourse on language. I: The archaeology of knowledge, New York: Pantheon

Foucault, M. (1977) Det moderne fengels historie. Oslo: Gyndendal.

Fredman, G. (2008). Course Seminar at GCK, Gothenburg 2008

Fredman, G. (2009). Course Seminar at KCC, London 2009

Fossum, K. (2007). Brott. Forum: J.W. Cappelens Förlag a.s.

Herphy, G. (2000) Doing the GRRAACCES : from Reflection to Reflexive Practice, Dissertation submitted as part of the M A Systemic Practice (Teaching, Training and Supervision), University of Northumbria at Newcastle

Kolb, D. (1984) The Foundations of Contemporary Approaches to Experiential Learning, Prentice Hall, Article handed out by GCK, pp. 1-19

Kolb, D. (1984) The Process of Experiential Learning. Experiential Learning. Hall, Article handed out by GCK

Lang, P., Little, M. and Cronen, V. (1990). The systemic professional, Domains of action and the question of neutrality. Human Systems, vol 1. 1990, LFTRC & KCC

Maturana, H. & Varela, F. (1987). The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding, New Science Library, Boston.

Oliver, C., (1992) A Focus on Moral Decission-making in therapy using Co-Ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). *Human Systems*, Vol 3. 1992, LFRC & KCC, pp. 217-231

Pearce, W. B., (1992). A "Camper`s Guide" to Constructionisms. *Human Systems*, Vol 3. 1992, LFRC & KCC, pp. 139-161

Scaife, J. (2001) *Supervision in the Mental Health Professions*. Contributions from Inskipp, F., Proctor, B., Scaife, J., Walsh, S.; London and New York; Taylor & Francis group

Schön, D A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. Stockholm: Mareld

Schön, D. A. (2005) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*; Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall, Ashge

Shotter, J. (2004). *On the edge of Social Constructionism: 'Witness'-Thinking versus 'Aboutness'- thinking*. London: KCC Foundation

Taguchi, H.L, (1997). *Varför pedagogisk documentation? Om barnsyn, kunskapssyn och ett förändrat förhållningssätt till förskolans arbete*, HLS förlag

Ugazio, V., Ferrario, M. (1992). *Falsifying Experiences*. Human Systems, Vol 3. 1992, LFRC & KCC, pp. 233-252

Watzlawick, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Watzlawick

Watzlawic, P., Weakland, J. and Fish, R. (1974) *Change-Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution*, New York: Norton,

White, M. (1991). *Nya vägar inom den Systemiska terapin*. Stockholm: Mareld.

White, M., Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: Norton.

White, M., Epston, D. (2000). *Narrative terapi – en introduction*. Stockholm: Mareld.

Wilson, J (2001). *Child-focused Practice: A Collaborative systemic approach*. London, Karnac Books

Wittgenstein, L. (1953) *Philosophical investigations*, Basil Blackwell Ltd., Translated to Swedish (1998) *Filosofiska undersökningar*, MånPocket, Nörhaven a/s.