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Summary

This thesis is divided into three parts. A description of each part is given below.

Part A: Literature review

The literature review sets the context for the research article that follows. It begins by firstly exploring the literature on wellbeing, presenting a definition of wellbeing before exploring the literature on teacher wellbeing and current interventions and their effectiveness at supporting teacher wellbeing and mental health. The literature review then leads into an overview of the definitions, functions, and models of supervision, before exploring one model in more detail. The literature review then presents a discussion of the current research base on the benefits of supervision for teachers. Finally, the review discusses the role of the EP in supporting teacher wellbeing and the rationale for the research presented in part two of the thesis.

Part B: Major empirical study

The research presented in part two is a qualitative study examining the impact of six weekly supervision sessions on the perceived wellbeing of mainstream classroom teachers. Sessions were facilitated by the researcher and conducted in two mainstream primary schools and one mainstream secondary school in the UK. The findings indicate attending group supervision reduced feelings of isolation through opportunities to and offload and share experience, it promoted self-awareness and self-reflection and positively impacted professional development and wellbeing. Wider implications were also found in relation to support continuing outside of the
supervision sessions and the impact on wider school staff. An element of stress and
guilt in relation to attending during the school day was also explored. The findings
are discussed with reference to relevant research and implications for EP practice.

**Part C: Critical appraisal**

In the final part of this thesis the researcher will present a reflexive account of the
research process focusing on the development of the research question and the
position of the researcher, as well as the strengths and limitations of the research,
including methods, participants and recruitment, the researcher as supervisor, and
ethical considerations. This section also explores the contribution to knowledge and
the dissemination of the results.
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'As teachers we are not used to taking time out for ourselves. We give our time to our staff, we give time to the children, but we don’t give time for ourselves’.

Exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of teachers in mainstream school.

**Part A: Major Literature Review**

Word count: 11,274
1.0 Structure of the literature review

1.1 Introduction

The literature review firstly explores the literature on wellbeing, offering definitions of the term. It then explores the literature on teacher wellbeing before exploring current interventions and their effectiveness in supporting teacher wellbeing and mental health. The literature review subsequently leads into an overview of the definitions, functions, and models of supervision, before exploring one model in more detail. The literature review then presents a discussion of the current research base on the benefits of supervision for teachers. Finally, the review discusses the role of the Educational Psychologist (EP) in supporting teacher wellbeing and the rationale for the research presented in Part B of the current thesis.

1.2 Search strategy

A scoping exercise was undertaken between July 2021 and November 2021, search terms and inclusion/exclusion criteria can be found in Appendix 1. The purpose of a scoping exercise is to ‘map the literature on a particular topic or research area in terms of the volume, nature, and characteristics of the primary research and provide an opportunity to identify key concepts; gaps in the research; and types and sources of evidence to inform practice, policymaking, and research’ (Daudt et al., 2013, cited in Pham et al, 2014, p.373). They are commonly undertaken to examine the scope, range, and nature of research activity in a specific topic area, to decide whether a systematic review is appropriate and what its potential scope might be (Pham...
et al, 2014). A scoping exercise of the literature can be of particular use when the topic has not yet been extensively reviewed (Mays et al., 2001, cited in Pham et al, 2014, p. 371). The literature retrieved from these searches was evaluated by the researcher for significance to the current study. The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist for qualitative research was used to appraise the most relevant articles (Appendix 1). The reference section of these most relevant articles was analysed, and other appropriate references were identified using the snowballing technique. In addition to the database searches, a search of the grey literature, such as textbooks on supervision, Educational Psychology journals and unpublished theses, was undertaken.

1.3 Structure

The literature that arose from the database searches that looked specifically at how supervision can support teacher wellbeing was limited (n = 5), therefore a narrative review was decided as the most appropriate structure for this literature review (Siddaway et al., 2019). Further information pertaining to the literature search can be found in Appendix 1. Narrative reviews are considered appropriate to provide a historical account of the development of a research topic so a broader overview of the literature surrounding teacher wellbeing and supervision could be comprehended (Siddaway et al., 2019).
2.0 Wellbeing

The literature on wellbeing has grown steadily over the last thirty years (Kim, 2019), suggesting this has been spurred by the popularity of the positive psychology movement, which examines the underpinnings of happiness and wellbeing. Although considerably debated, Kim (2019) suggests it is generally agreed that wellbeing is a concept that defines what is beneficial or good for a person. However, Kim (2019) also notes this is not necessarily an objective judgement. Kim suggests an individual’s life can appear to be morally and aesthetically rich but can still not be good from the perspective of the individual, therefore, wellbeing is arguably a concept that assumes a considerable amount of subjectivism and personal judgement.

2.1 Defining Wellbeing

Initial attempts to measure wellbeing theorised it in hedonic terms, that is, happiness is achieved through the absence of negative emotions and the presence of pleasure and enjoyment. In this view, then, wellbeing involves maximising pleasure and minimising pain. McLellan and Steward (2015) suggest approaching wellbeing from a purely hedonistic perspective may well undervalue the complexity of what it means to ‘be well’. Research from several disciplines, including psychology (Martela & Sheldon, 2019), suggests wellbeing involves dimensions such as personal fulfilment, and the realisation of one’s potential (McLellan and Steward, 2015). Psychological theories such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943) and his concept of self-actualisation being the goal in life, champion an eudaimonic perspective on
wellbeing. That is, living a life according to one’s values. Brady & Wilson (2021) argue that both kinds of happiness are necessary to maximise wellbeing and that wellbeing is ‘constructed within a context of interacting factors’ (p.2). In constructing wellbeing as being multidimensional in this way, such definition aligns with definitions offered by other disciplines, with the World Health Organization (WHO, 2006) defining health as ‘a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity’ (p.1).

Pollard and Lee (2008) consider five domains of wellbeing: social, physical, psychological, cognitive, and economic. With Kulali and Petridou (2019) suggesting the first three domains are the most common dimensions of wellbeing within the school environment. Baumeister & Leary (1995) argue social wellbeing is influenced by the need for belonging and association. The need to belong, also known as belongingness, refers to a human emotional need to affiliate with and be accepted by members of a group. A sense of belonging involves more than simply being acquainted with other people. Ryan and Deci (2001) suggest it is centred on a reciprocal relationship that provides acceptance, attention, and support. While belonging is not a new idea (Maslow, 1943), there is now a large body of research that suggests the need to belong is a central need which guides our thoughts, our emotions, and our behaviour (Cherry, 2020). The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) (2015) notes that interactions between teachers, pupils and the general school environment contribute to social wellbeing and is supported by Acton and Glasgow (2015) who suggest the
interpersonal aspect of wellbeing is collaboratively constructed within a social space.

Ryan & Deci (2001) suggest psychological wellbeing is about both feeling good and functioning well. Kulali and Petridou (2019) proposes that this is critical for positive learning. Self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2001) suggests people are motivated to grow and change by three innate and universal psychological needs, these are competence, connection, and autonomy, and Martela and Sheldon (2019) suggest that satisfying these needs could play a key role in making life feel meaningful and promoting psychological wellbeing.

The WHO (2006) describe physical wellbeing as the absence of any illness or disease and, according to Kulali and Petridou (2019) has a direct influence on emotional, social, and psychological wellbeing. One way of maintaining physical wellbeing is through physical wellbeing activities such as physical exercises, and according to Woolf (2013), individuals who engage in physical activity are likely to manage their thoughts, feelings, and emotions more effectively, and are more likely to be motivated in life. The overlapping nature of these domains suggests it is not enough to thrive in just one area, each influence, and interacts with the other, suggesting an individual needs to thrive in all areas to achieve a sense of wellbeing.

Another field of psychology that draws on the idea of self-realisation or actualisation is positive psychology (Seligman, 2011; McLellan & Steward,
2015). The guiding principle is that everyone’s experience and sense of self is paramount, and it is encouraged that they seek fulfilment of who they are so they may live up to their full potential. However, positive psychology is not without critics. Wright and Pascoe (2015) suggest that relational and contextual dimensions of wellbeing are overlooked, and that positive psychology takes an individualistic approach.

Crisp (2021) argues there are fundamentally good things for us, regardless of what importance we place on them. These things might include positive relationships with others, autonomy, and competence (Deci & Ryan, 2001). On the other hand, Gallagher et al. (2009) would argue what might be seen by one person as fundamental to wellbeing, may not be held in such high regard by another. Murphy (2001) hypothesises that wellbeing can be viewed on a continuum of subjectivism and objectivism depending on the mental response needed by the recipient. Kim (2019) proposes the concept of narrow wellbeing and wide wellbeing. Actions or experiences which requires the individual to have some emotional responses are likely to be subjective and constitute ‘narrow wellbeing’, whereas wide wellbeing, which does not require a mental response, is therefore more likely to be identified objectively.

The literature highlights that wellbeing is a complex concept with multiple domains, and it is for these reasons that measuring wellbeing can be particularly problematic. The American Psychological Association (APA) (n.d.) defines wellbeing as “a state of happiness and contentment, with low levels of distress, overall good physical and mental health and outlook, or good quality
of life”. This definition appears to incorporate many of the definitions discussed above suggesting wellbeing can be understood as how people feel and how they function, on a personal, social, and professional level and how they evaluate their own lives. The researcher’s position on wellbeing is that everyone will interpret their own wellbeing in a different way depending on the perceived demands and the resources available to them at the time, and what is deemed good wellbeing for one may not be for another.

### 3.0 Teacher wellbeing

#### 3.1 A worrying picture?

In the years prior to the coronavirus pandemic, the rate of self-reported work-related stress, depression, or anxiety had shown signs of increasing and in 2020/21 stress, depression and/or anxiety accounted for half of all work-related ill health cases, and was most prevalent in education, human health, and social work professions (ONS, 2022). Statistically higher rates of stress, depression or anxiety are consistently found in teaching and other educational professions across all industries¹ (HSE, 2021). The Teacher Wellbeing Index (TWIX, 2021) is an annual survey carried out by Education Support (n.d.) offering insight into the mental health and wellbeing of teaching and education staff working in the UK. It highlights the perspectives of over 3000 education staff, including teachers, at different points in their careers and from across

---

¹ Except for public administration and defence, compulsory social security, human health, and social work (HSE, 2021)
sectors and school types. In a five-year comparison study (2017-2021), the Teacher Wellbeing Index (TWIX, 2021) reports over 70% of educational professionals (senior leaders, schoolteachers, and school support staff) have experienced at least one symptom of ill health due to work. Symptoms included behavioural, psychological and/or physical, with the greatest reporting in relation to anxiety. And over half of all educational professionals consider leaving the profession each year due to work related pressures. Although it is not clear who is included as ‘support staff’, arguably working within an educational environment places individuals at a greater risk of higher levels of stress.

Teaching is often regarded as a profession that can be particularly stressful. The HSE (2021) defines work-related stress, depression or anxiety as a harmful reaction people have to undue pressures and demands placed on them at work. The Transactional model of stress and coping, developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), suggests an individual’s levels of stress depends on the individual’s perception of the demand and the perceived internal and external resources to deal with it. Bakker et al’s (2005) Job Demands-Resource (JD-R) model suggests that when demands outweigh perceived resources individuals are at greater risk of stress and burnout. A mismatch between the demands of teaching and a teachers’ perceived capacity to meet those demands may increase their vulnerability to stress. Bakker et al. (2005) would argue these vulnerabilities can be buffered through experiencing autonomy, receiving feedback, and experiencing high-quality relationships.
Pollard & Lee (2008) suggest teachers are challenged physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially though most of their careers. The Teacher Wellbeing Index (Education Support, 2019) presents a multifaceted role of the teacher. One that is expected to balance the diverse needs of learners, whilst promoting “inclusion and collaboration, alongside assessment and feedback” (p.3), and doing so with an energy that inspires, develops, and values all children and young people. Given this multifaceted role, it is arguably to be expected that the teaching profession is commonly reported to be one of the most stressful occupations (White, 2020).

Recent research into the mental health of UK teachers (Teach Well Alliance, 2020; White, 2020; Teacher Wellbeing Index, 2021) report high workloads, lack of non-contact time for class preparation, lack of work-home balance, a perceived lack of resources and, in some cases, a perceived lack of support, especially in managing pupil behaviour, as the main drivers of work-related stress for teachers (Barnardo’s Scotland, 2019; Teacher Wellbeing Index, 2020; Ofsted, 2019; NASUWT 2019). The National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers’ (NASUWT, 2019) Big Question Survey of 5,500 teachers reported over 70% had experienced workplace stress, believed their job had adversely affected their mental health and had impacted negatively on their wellbeing in the last 12 months.

Ischinger (2008), drawing on an international study of 23 countries, suggested that up to half of newly qualified teachers leave the profession at an early
stage of their careers due to a sense of low self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief that one can overcome challenges and influence events that affect them to achieve a valued goal (Bandura, 1992). Ischinger reported pupil behaviour and challenging classroom environments to be the main reasons for feelings of low self-efficacy. Day (2011) suggests that a teacher’s ability to maintain commitment to the profession is linked to their ability to cope with the emotional demands of the job. Chan (2004) and Robertson and Dunsmuir (2013) suggest teacher self-efficacy and perseverance with challenging behaviour, have been linked to effective emotion management. Whereas poor emotion regulation in teachers has been associated with more frequent and long-lasting negative effects such as stress, burnout and increased negative interactions with pupils (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Montgomery & Rupp, 2005; Chan, 2006).

When asked what would help their wellbeing, teachers report wanting to learn from others, have more time for planning and to have time to reflect on their own practices (Lynch et al., 2016). However, the TWIX (2021) reports the types of support reported by teachers as most available at work ranged from encouragement to speak up when struggling, counselling, unions, and wellbeing sessions. Arguably none of these meet the needs of reflecting on practice or peer support. According to Rothwell et al. (2019) and Brady and Wilson (2021) many teachers view the support that is available as ‘tick box’ exercises for the purpose of inspections. This might suggest the types of support most available to teacher to support their wellbeing are not valued by teachers. According to the TWIX (2021) the sources of support most
accessed by educational professionals who experience mental health problems at work are outside of the school, with some not seeking support at all. One suggestion is that staff are increasingly concerned they will be perceived negatively if seeking support within school for mental health or wellbeing issues (TWIX, 2021). Therefore, it is not surprising many are seeking support outside of the school environment, not feeling confident to discuss unmanageable stress or mental health problems with their employer (TWIX, 2021). When asked how education staff thought mental health stigma should be tackled at work, suggestions included promoting a culture that encourages people to talk openly, active engagement by senior leaders and having a safe space to speak. Yet, according to Trauma Informed Schools UK (TIS, 2021), few schools have safe spaces for teachers to reflect and process their experiences. A space that can be arguably offered through supervision.

### 3.2 How effective are current intervention at supporting teacher mental health and wellbeing?

There are few UK studies directly evaluating the effectiveness of interventions aimed at supporting teachers’ mental health and wellbeing. However, there are some studies that have looked at the effect of problem-solving groups (PSG) such as circle and consultation groups, and work-discussion groups. And those that have explored the effectiveness of interventions such as mindfulness and more relational support.
3.2.1 Problem-solving groups

Muchenje and Kelly (2021) undertook a systematic review exploring the literature describing problem-solving groups (PSGs) such as circle and consultations groups, reflecting teams and Staff Sharing Schemes in schools. Positive effects related with these groups were ascertained. Environment, preparation, and group composition enabled a sense of belonging and a sense of containment, together with an opportunity learn. Group involvement was also associated with broader positive influences in the classroom and school setting.

Bozic and Carter (2002) introduced a group consultation approach in four schools in the UK. A total of 27 teachers and four teaching assistants (TA) across educational phases engaged in between four - six sessions that ran for 75 - 90 minutes. Evaluation measures assessed the views of participant teachers on several dimensions, including perceived value, perceived main effects and the need for an external consultant. From the perspective of staff, the main effects of participation were an increase in time to react on and learn about approaches to teaching children with Special Educational Needs (SEN), a reduction in feelings of isolation, and reduction in self-blame regarding teaching problems. In addition to this, participants in this study felt the groups could not run without an external consultant i.e., the EP.

Jackson (2008) described the application and development of work discussion groups for teaching staff in educational settings. The Practice Supervisor Development Programme (2020) offers a framework for work discussion
groups and suggests they create ‘a space to learn from experience, to think and feel, and to slow down thinking’ (p. 2). Jackson’s (2008) work suggests when offered in a regular and sustained way over time and when properly supported by senior managers, work discussion groups can help staff to: deepen their understanding of pupils, their capacity to manage the relational aspects of their work and reduce work-related stress, whilst also promoting the development of reflective practice and peer consultation, within the wider culture of the organisation.

Muchenie and Kelly (2021) proposed PSGs can emulate some functions of supervision, however, PSGs and supervision differ in their conceptualisations of similarities and differences. Rae et al. (2017) highlights the restorative function of supervision, with problem-solving being a potential by product of this, in contrast to the formative function of PSGs, which may indirectly offer potential benefits for wellbeing.

3.2.2 Other interventions

There are few UK studies evaluating the effectiveness of interventions aimed at supporting teachers’ mental health and wellbeing. In a review of the evidence of what works in supporting teachers’ mental health and wellbeing, White (2020) identified six primary studies that had been conducted in the UK and Ireland. Two examined mindfulness interventions which the author suggested was found to have the most beneficial effects on perceived stress levels and mental wellbeing. Sharrocks (2014) and Lomas et al., (2017) suggest interventions, such as mindfulness offer an individual approach to
stress management and wellbeing, and arguably perpetuates the view found by Kidger et al. (2016), that mental health issues and wellbeing are the responsibility of the individual. The other four studies included a written emotional disclosure intervention (Ashley et al., 2013); The Incredible Years Classroom Management Programme (Hayes et al., 2019); Wellbeing in Secondary Education (WISE) pilot study (Kidger et al., 2016); and Chill and Chat intervention (Sharrocks, 2014). Three out of the four studies found no significant difference in teaching staff’s perception of their mental health and wellbeing following intervention. The Chill and Chat intervention however offered some interesting findings.

The Chill and Chat intervention ran for eight weeks over lunchtimes in one primary school in the UK. The session length was two hours and was open to all staff members. Held in a building accessed separately to the school, it was hosted by three facilitators including an EP. Sources of support included relaxation activities such as massage, the provision of a social area away from work/pupils and leaflets from the occupational health service. Between 12 and 16 staff accessed the Chill and Chat intervention each week, the majority of these being teaching staff. Focus groups with four school staff, consisting of three teachers and one teaching assistant, were held prior to, during and one week after intervention. Staff who took part in the intervention saw it as an opportunity to look after their own mental health and wellbeing. They felt that through using the intervention’s social space, they were able to learn more about their colleagues, which improved staff relationships. The importance of relationships and how these can help individuals not feel alone,
and decrease feelings of isolation, is highlighted in the literature in relation to the benefits of supervision (Callicot & Leadbetter, 2013; France & Billington, 2020; Osbourne & Burton, 2014).

In addition, all staff in the school were asked to complete questionnaires before (n=9) and after the intervention (n=12). Staff who did not attend the intervention cited feeling anxious about being seen attending a ‘wellbeing’ intervention as a barrier, and how attendance might be interpreted as a sign that they were not ‘coping’. This echoes the findings of the TWIX (2020) that more than half of education professionals do not feel they can share mental health issues or unmanageable stress in fear of being perceived negatively. Such barriers did not appear to be a concern for those who experienced the intervention in this study. One reason for this might be that those who attended the intervention developed a better understanding of the support it could offer and reduced the stigmatisation of discussing aspects that affect mental health and wellbeing.

A number of limitations of this study were identified that suggest these findings should be treated with caution. The authors note that individual responses from the two questionnaires could not be linked, acknowledging that it is difficult to ascertain any change in perceptions over time. Caution should also be given to the generalisability of the findings due to low response rates. However, given that more responses were received following the intervention that before might indicate a positive shift in motivation and suggest the intervention was valued by those that did attend. The study used
the Warwick Edinburgh Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS) (Tennant et al., 2006), which measures wellbeing using the Likert Scale (1932). Multi-dimensional measures of wellbeing, such as the WEMWBS have been criticised for being too objective (Gallagher et al., 2009) and restricting individual responses to indications of the strength of their agreement or disagreement regarding a question or statement (McLeod, 2019). If individual perceptions of wellbeing are subjective, based on individual appraisal of feelings and life satisfaction, the bias associated with it make it difficult to assess wellbeing against objective criteria. However, the use of focus groups offered triangulation and might arguably overcome some of these biases (Noble & Heale, 2019).

Concerns in relation to sharing mental health issues were raised in both the WISE and Chill and Chat interventions. These concerns have been well documented in other studies (Conyne (1996); Jackson, 2008; TWIX, 2021; Brady & Wilson, 2021). In relation to the literature on supervision, Conyne (1996) highlights supervisees are likely to be wary of offering opinions and discussing difficult issues that may make them feel vulnerable with a person who may later be called upon to provide appraisal or performance management, and Jackson (2008) suggests that in fact these dual relationships may be unethical. The Chill and Chat intervention was facilitated by an EP, a behaviour support teacher, and a higher-level teaching assistant (HLTA) attached to the Behaviour Support Team, arguably professionals deemed as outside of, or external to, the school system. It might be reasonable to argue then that the use of ‘external’ professionals to facilitate the intervention alleviate concerns of those who attended.
A further study, conducted by Brady & Wilson (2021), explored teachers’ responses to school-led initiatives and categorised wellbeing practices and policies on a continuum, suggesting a variety of reactionary, transactional and transformational measures exist in addressing wellbeing. Reactionary measures respond to problems by treating the symptoms rather than addressing the conditions that lead to them. Such measures included relaxation activities, group exercise classes and whole school community events, such as baking competitions and quiz nights. These measured were poorly received and seen by some as encroaching on the individual’s time, exasperating workloads and were a ‘tick box’ exercise for inspection purposes.

Contrary to this, Salter-Jones (2012) in a study looking at the promotion of wellbeing of teaching staff in a secondary school, found these types of initiatives were well received and genuinely supportive. However, Brown (2012) notes this sense of not being valued and supported by school leaders can be detrimental to teachers’ wellbeing, and Rothwell et al. (2019) suggest where initiatives are seen as ‘tick box’ exercises they are less likely to be effective. Transformational measures, or organisational interventions, such as school level policies, were the most positively received. These included streamlining marking, and assessment polices, resulting in a reduction of workload; limitations on working hours and access to the school building; and increased perceived trust and autonomy within the classroom and their career. Perceptions that the government is not listening to, and lacks trust in the profession, together with external factors such as curriculum reform,
inspections, and performance measures (NEU, 2021) are reportedly impacting significantly on teacher wellbeing (Brown, 2012; NEU, 2021).

Arguably interventions targeted at promoting the wellbeing of teachers should be valued by staff and used in conjunction with organisational change. Although supervision may not directly address organisational issues such as workload and curriculum reform, it can offer empathy and a space to reflect on the demands placed on teachers which, as highlighted by TIS UK (2021), are required to reduce high levels of stress.

4.0 Supervision

4.1 Definitions of supervision

Supervision has been used in many helping professions for some time, such as health professions, social workers, and educational psychologists, and Carrol (2007) notes terms such as clinical, professional, and reflective supervision are commonly used interchangeably. For the purpose of this research the term ‘supervision’ will be used to denote professional supervision. Dunsmuir and Leadbetter (2010), writing for the Division of Educational and Child Psychology (DECP) and the British Psychological Society (BPS), suggest professional supervision, in the context of the EP role, is “a psychological process that enables a focus on personal and professional development and that offers a confidential and reflective space to consider one’s work and responses to it” (p. 7). The Care Quality Commission (2013)
supports this view and suggests the focus should be on supporting staff in their personal and professional development and in reflecting on their practice. Additionally, Scaife (2001) adds that the aim of supervision is always to support the supervisee to provide the best possible service to their client. Carroll (2007) describes supervision as the supervisees bringing their ‘actual work-practice to another person (individual supervision), or to a group (small group or team supervision), and with their help review what has happened in their practice to learn from that experience’ (p. 36).

The concept of reflection is an integral part of supervision and is described by Helen & Douglas House (2014) as an “activity in which people recapture their experience, think about it, mull it over and evaluate it” (p.12). They suggest reflection requires “a combination of thinking, emotion and commitment to action” (p.12) and, via supervision, practitioners should be encouraged to work more reflectively. Hawkins and Shohet (1989) suggest supervision is an “indispensable part of the individual's ongoing self-development, self-awareness and commitment to learning” (Helen & Douglas House, 2014, p. 10). Carroll (2007) suggests supervision is ‘based on the assumption that reflecting on work provides the basis for learning…’ (p.36). Hawkins and Shohet (2012) suggest in relation to teachers that supervision can support them to extend their professional knowledge, increase their skills and learn to cope with the many challenges they face.

To condense the complexities of supervision into one sentence might minimise the far-reaching effects it can have, however the emphasis on
learning and reflection is important and one which subsequently differentiates it from line management (Reid & Soan, 2019). According to the Barnardo’s Scotland (2019) report, those working in education have limited experience of supervision, perhaps more used to the traditional line management approach. Dunsmuir & Leadbetter (2010) suggest line management involves appraisal and the monitoring of performance, quality assurance and evaluation of outcomes in relation to the supervisees work. In contrast supervision focuses on the “personal and professional development of the individual” (p.5).

It is well documented that for some the term supervision raises concerns and mistrust in their competencies (Cassedy, 2010; Callicott, 2011). Feltham (2010) notes for those who are unfamiliar with the concept, the word supervision may be viewed with reservation, with Cassedy (2010) suggesting this can in turn lead to resistance in taking part. Willis and Baines (2018) warn that implementing any new provision could initially increase stress levels, being perceived as another tool for assessment, performance management or 'policing'. Given supervision does not appear to be a term regularly used in education, it’s misunderstanding it is perhaps more likely to raise misconceptions and mistrust, and in this respect, there is a need to separate and clarify the functions and purpose of line management and professional supervision (Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, 2010). Carroll (2020) also suggests confusion can arise in relation to other professional development activities such as coaching and mentoring when implementing any type of supervision in schools and suggests Figure 1 might be helpful in doing this.
**Figure 1** Supervision and other forms of professional learning and development (Carroll et al., 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Enables the development of a specific aspect of a professional learner’s practice</td>
<td>- Supports professional learner through significant career transitions</td>
<td>- Development of knowledge, competence and confidence in everyday practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coach is usually chosen by professional learner</td>
<td>- Led by experienced colleagues with knowledge of the requirements of the role</td>
<td>- Explores the relational aspects if the professional role across the different working contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coach has knowledge and expertise relevant to the goals of the professional learner</td>
<td>- Broker access to a range of increasingly self-directed learning opportunities</td>
<td>- Explores and helps to process the emotional impact of the professional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of knowledge, competence and confidence in everyday practice</td>
<td>- Facilitates understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focus on individual ‘cases’ (pupils, practitioners, organisational structures and systems) related to SEND provision</td>
<td>- Focus on individual ‘cases’ (pupils, practitioners, organisational structures and systems) related to SEND provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process not expert/same experience led</td>
<td>- Process not expert/same experience led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agenda [participant led]</td>
<td>- Agenda [participant led]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- On-going throughout career</td>
<td>- On-going throughout career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Functions of supervision

The literature from various professional contexts suggests that supervision has more than one function or task. Writing from the context of social work, Kadushin (1976), focusing on the role of the supervisor, defines the three main functions of the supervisory process as: educational, administrative, and supportive. Holloway (1995) describes from a systems perspective, the primary tasks of supervision to be monitoring and evaluating; advisory and instructing; and modelling and consulting. Focusing on the benefits of supervision for the supervisee, Inskipp and Proctor (1993), describe supervision as having a formative (learning and growing) normative (monitoring) and restorative (supportive) function. Hawkins and Shohet (2012), reflecting on the functions suggested by Inskipp and Proctor, focussed on both the supervisee and supervisor and stressed the collaborative nature of supervision. They identified the main functions of supervision to be developmental, resourcing, and qualitative (see Table 1 below). The Educational/Formative/Developmental functions focus on learning, training, and teaching; the Administrative/Normative/Qualitative function relates to the ethical boundaries and considerations of any supervisory relationship; the Supportive/Restorative/Resourcing function supports the supervisees’ emotional responses (Basa, 2017). It is these last functions that Reid and Soan (2019) suggests are needed to redress burn out.
Due to the emphasis on the relationship between the supervisee and supervisor, and the supportive and restorative aspects of supervision, Hawkins and Shohet’s (2012) functions of supervision will be adopted by the author.

### 4.3 Models of supervision

The use of supervision within education, particularly within schools, is limited and White (2020) suggests the literature on the most effective models of supervision is scarce. However, there are numerous theoretical and practical models from fields such as, counselling, nursing, and social work. Page & Wosket (2001) suggest a supervision model can provide “both a container for holding and a process for working with the unknown and the unexpected” (p.16). Supervision models appear to fall into three categories: developmental models, integrative or process models and orientation-specific models (Smith, 2009, Hawkins, 2020).
The underlying premise on developmental models is the concept of individuals continually growing and developing. Development of the supervisee is defined by progressive stages, and it is the responsibility of the supervisor to be aware of where the supervisee is developmentally and provide the appropriate amount of support (Smith, 2009). As Fairall (2020) and Osborne and Burton (2014) point out, developmental models act as a helpful reminder that the supervisee is in their own learning process and how this may influence the supervisors’ approach to supervision. The process appears linear in its approach and arguably fails to consider that there are other interacting factors influencing the process, however, Smith (2009) argues that this is not the case and that supervisees can be at different developmental level in different areas of their work. Nevertheless, developmental models define progressive stages of supervisee development from novice to expert and hold that supervisees will possess certain skills at each of these stages.

Orientation-specific models adopt one type of approach (e.g., solution focussed, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy) (Smith, 2009; Hawkins, 2020), and propose that supervision is most effective when the model of choice is implicitly adhered to. Smith (2009) notes this approach relies on both supervisor and supervisee sharing the same theoretical orientation which can be problematic if this is not the case. Page and Wosket (2014) suggest using a therapy-related model of supervision may focus the attention on learning the skills of the approach rather than the supervisory process itself. It could also
be argued that orientation-specific models aim to find a solution to a problem rather than seeking to improve the quality of practice.

Integrative or process models highlight the supervisors’ functions, role, and responsibilities. Smith (2009) describes an integrative model as drawing on more than one theoretical approach. Haynes et al. (2003) suggests a combination of two or more theoretical approaches can provide a fuller outcome than that of a single theory. By drawing on multiple approaches it allows the supervisor to integrate and synthesise the most useful aspects of more than one theoretical approach and the flexibility to respond to the supervisee according to the context and the specific issue being discussed. Such models include the Seven-Eyed model (Shohet and Shohet, 2020), the CLEAR model (Hawkins, 2020) and the Cyclical model (Page and Wosket, 2014).

As noted above there are several useful models that can be adopted to help guide the supervisor and supervisee through the process of supervision. All offer a conceptual framework to guide the supervision process, but in sticking to a model too rigidly Smith (2009) warns that the supervisor runs the danger of overlooking factors that are not specifically embraced by the model. Hawkins (2020) points out that the supervisor may dismiss or suppress approaches that appear inconsistent with the model without enough reference to the needs of the individual, the style of the supervisor and the uniqueness of the supervisor-supervisee relationship. Helen and Douglas House (2014) share this view and emphasise the importance of supervisors using a range of
strategies to support learning and reflection e.g., exploration, imagination, role
play and creativity, and caution against supervisors responding out of
personal preference, comfort, or habit. In fact, Gillingham’s (2006) research in
Australia highlighted that whilst the use of rigid approaches such as
checklists, appeared to reduce supervisor anxiety, supervision lacked
creativity and did not lead to any improvements in practice. Given that the aim
of supervision is always to support the supervisee to provide the best possible
service to their client (Scaife, 2001), a framework that offers minimal flexibility
would seem counterproductive.

In relation to EPs supervising others, an online national survey conducted by
Dunsmuir et al., (2015), exploring current practices of giving and receiving
supervision in EP practice in the UK, identified that although many EPs
acknowledge the use of supervisory models such as Hawkins and Shohet’s
(GSF), and Page and Wosket’s (2001) Cyclical Model, they also listed a wide
range of other psychological influences that underpinned the supervision
received and provided. These included problem-solving frameworks such as
Constructionist Model of Informed and Reasoned Action (COMOIRA)
(Gameson & Rhydderch, 2008), Problem Analysis (Monsen & Frederickson,
2008), Coaching (Cameron & Monsen, 1998), and collaborative group
problem solving (Hanko, 1999). Although it is not clear how rigid they are in
their use of the models, it appears EPs offer a flexible approach to their
supervisory relationships. Researchers Bartle and Trevis (2015) found that
participants in their study exploring the impact of reflective teams valued the
different types of PSG structures for different purposes, adding the importance of flexibility within the supervision process.

Given the unknown nature of what teachers might bring to supervision and the need to respond flexibly to their needs (Helen & Douglas House, 2014), an integrative model of supervision appears the best fit. Providing a framework for the process of supervision, within which Hawkins and Shohet's (2012) functions of supervision can be achieved, an integrative model allows for a flexible theoretical approach more fitting with a person-centred philosophy (Rogers, 1951) and can arguably offer a more flexible approach to the supervisory process (Page and Wosket, 2014). One such integrative approach is Page and Wosket's Cyclical Model (2001). As well as providing a comprehensive explanation of the typical pathway through a supervision session, it is also a framework for considering the elements that may be relevant throughout a supervisory relationship.

4.3.1 Cyclical model

The use of a structured process for supervision, such as Page & Wosket's Cyclical Model (1995), creates a safe space to respond to individual needs appropriately, and assists all members, including the supervisor, to maintain appropriate boundaries (McNicoll, 2008). First published in 1994, the Cyclical Model (Figure 2) was originally developed as a model for counselling supervision. It has since been used successfully in supervising a range of practitioners, including social workers and teachers. Individually and in groups. As well as providing a comprehensive explanation of the typical
pathway through a supervision session, it is also a framework for considering the elements that may be relevant throughout a supervisory relationship. Based on humanistic, psychodynamic, and cognitive-behavioural principles (Callicott & Leadbetter, 2013), it is firmly grounded in the assumption that supervision is a holistic process, underpinned by person-centred principles, which contains and enables the supervisee in their practice, and places an emphasis of the importance of the supervisory relationship. The Practice Supervisor Development Programme (2020) describes emotional containment as the process of being emotionally sensitive to another's concerns or anxious thoughts and feelings and responding in a way that helps that person to feel more settled and to understand their own emotional state. The Cyclical Model consists of five stages: Contract, Focus, Space, Bridge and Review, which are further subdivided into five steps (see Figure 2).
When establishing any form of supervision there are some things to consider. Hawkins and Shohet (1989) highlight several areas that may impact on effective supervision such as previous experience, personal reservations, difficulties in the supervisory relationships, and organisational barriers. In a review of 135 papers, Rothwell et al., (2019, p.5), reporting in relation to National Health Service (NHS) staff and Social Workers, identified effective supervision is based on ten characteristics (Table 2).
It is worth at this point briefly exploring each stage of the Cyclical Model and how each one enables the supervisory process as highlighted by Rothwell et al, (2019).
**Stage 1: Contract**

Page and Wosket (2014) emphasise the importance of the contracting stage. They highlight the establishment of any supervisory relationship is underpinned by this process. A clear contract that specifies an agreed direction and purpose of the work helps reduce anxiety, sets the ground rules, and establishes informed participation by all those involved. Re-contracting as the relationship develops is seen as vital to ensure supervision remains purposeful.

A relationship built on trust has been found to be fundamental to the supervisory process (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; Osborne & Burton, 2014; Willis & Baines, 2018; Rothwell et al., 2019; Reid & Soan, 2019; France & Billingham, 2020). This relationship is underpinned by empathy, respect, and unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1951) and it is through the contracting stage where this relationship can begin to be established. Disagreements of how supervision should be structured can impact on the success of the supervision. It is during the contracting stage that Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, (2010) suggest the roles and responsibilities of both supervisor and supervisee can be clarified, along with procedural issues such as timing, frequency, and duration (of the supervisory relationship and each session) and open declarations of ethical and supervisory frameworks in use. Callicott (2011), investigating factors involved when EPs supervise other professionals, suggests that supervisees and supervisors can have competing views when it comes to how supervision should be conducted, and Osborne and Burton
(2014) speaking in relation to Emotional Literacy Support Assistants (ELSA) supervision suggested different features of supervision may be given different importance depending on how long a practitioner has been practising.

Organisational barriers such as ‘buy-in’ from senior staff, resource constraints and organisational culture (Hawkins & Shohet, 1989) can greatly affect the effectiveness of supervision. Brady and Wilson (2021) highlight the importance of choice in taking up supervision, and Jackson (2008) highlights the importance of ‘when’ supervision takes place, suggesting groups held in school need to be arranged at a time that is sustainable without unduly disrupting their primary responsibilities and suggests supervision that is planned before the school day starts is the ideal time. However, Kenny and Allenby (2013) suggest this does not indicate an organisation values the supervision process and its employees and that supervision should be provided within protected time during school hours. Much of the research suggests contracting in the initial stages of supervision and a structured supervision plan that ensures experiences and expectations are shared by all involved may help to alleviate some of these difficulties (Page & Wosket, 2014; Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; France & Billington, 2020; Hawkins, 2020).

In relation to frequency of sessions, Rothwell et al. (2019) in their review of the literature reported this was significantly related to positive outcomes. They suggested that as supervisory relationships develop over time, supervision should not be a one-off activity, but rather a continuous process, beginning early and sustained throughout one’s career. Studies conducted by McMahon
& Errity (2014), and Taylor (2013) have suggested weekly or fortnightly supervision to be most effective. Saxby et al. (2015) reported that spending at least 60 minutes in supervision led to a perception of more effective supervision, although it is unclear if they are referring to one-to-one or group supervision. The ELSA Network (2017) in relation to group supervision recommends two hours.

**Stage 2: Focus**

During the focus stage the supervisee brings an aspect of their ‘actual work practice’ to the group to explore with others and learn from the experience (Carroll, 2007). During this stage, Page and Wosket (2014) note the supervisee is encouraged to reflect and prepare in advance to ensure direction and purpose during the session. This is where supervisees prioritise their issues and present these to the group.

**Stage 3: Space**

According to Page and Wosket (2014) holding space is at the heart of the supervision process and is likely to take up most of the time, suggesting the ‘space’ is where the supervisee is ‘contained’ (Bion, 1984), and ‘not knowing’ is accepted and explored together (Page and Wosket, 2014). It is during this stage that the supervisor and supervisee can draw on and synthesise the most useful aspect of multiple theoretical approaches, which enables the supervisor to respond flexibly according to the context and the specific issue
being discussed, in order to support, challenge, and affirm the supervisee in their work. These might include problem-solving frameworks such as COMOIRA, Problem Analysis or Solution Circles (Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, 2010) supported through questioning techniques such as Socratic or circular questions but may also include more creative methods such as stories, pictures and sculpt activities (Earle et al. 2017).

**Stage 4: Bridge**

The five Steps in Bridge are: Consolidation, Information giving, Goal setting, Action planning and Client’s perspective. Page and Wosket (2014) suggest the purpose of a bridge is to ensure the learning and awareness from supervision is related back and integrated into the supervisee’s practice through goal setting and action planning. Reflecting Scaife (2001) in that the aim of supervision is always to support the supervisee to provide the best possible service to their client. With support, the supervisee comes away from the process with the sense that they have been able to accomplish something, or reach some form of resolution, even if it is recognising that nothing needs to change (Page & Wosket, 2014).

**Stage 5: Review**

Page and Wosket (2014) suggest the review stage may take the form of evaluation of the supervisee’s work e.g., in relation to the plan they had set in
the previous session. It is also an opportunity to reflect on the supervisory process and whether the desired outcomes are being achieved.

Consideration of the context in which supervision occurs is highlighted by Page and Wosket (2014) and this is represented by the shaded area in Figure 2. Contextual factors such as the setting or organisational culture, or personal and family demands can have a direct impact on supervision, and the Cyclical Model, in contrast to Developmental Models, takes this into consideration.

### 4.4 Group dynamics

Managing individual and group emotions is an important part of group supervision and developing a good understanding of group dynamics is an area frequently highlighted in the literature (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; Steen, 2012). Frameworks can be helpful in explaining and normalising group experiences and interactions (McMahon, 2014), and one such framework draws from Bion’s (as cited in Proctor & Inskipp, 2009) model of unconscious processes. Bion suggests groups function in two ways: work group mentality and basic assumption mentality. These terms relate to the basic ways in which people think and feel which determine a group’s ability to relate to one another and engage with its purpose. Although Bion argued that the two always co-exist in human interaction, at any one moment one will dominate and the group will behave in different ways according to the dominant function. Proctor and Inskipp (2009) argue that when a group becomes inefficient and ineffectual is likely due to the lack of task clarity, the task being too difficult, or there are underlying individual agendas that are not voiced. Steen (2012) advocates that the group supervisor needs to be aware of and
work to keep three main group needs in balance – the supervisory work, good working relationships and group climate, and individual needs, and Proctor and Inskipp (2009) suggest that the best way to do this is to help the group recognise and discuss difficulties during the process.

Hawkins and Shohet (2012) and others (Page & Wosket, 2014; France & Billington, 2020; Hawkins, 2020) reflect on how having a shared sense of purpose is essential for the effective working of any group. In supervision groups this usually includes the aim of supporting the supervisee to provide the best possible service for their client (Scaife, 2001), through offering a confidential, reflective, and supportive space to help review what has happened in their practice and learn from that experience (Carroll, 2007). McMahon (2014) suggests an important aspect of managing an effective supervision group is enabling supervisees to become clear and comfortable in their roles. Proctor and Inskipp (2009) suggest group supervisees can have four identified professional roles in the group – that of supervisee (needing skills in presenting one’s work in an accessible and economic way), practitioner (being able to identify one’s own personal and professional development needs), group member (needing to have good group manners) and co-supervisor (needing skills in offering clear, sensitive, and constructive feedback). By understanding role, priorities and preferred methods of engagement or feedback, problems can be avoided (Proctor & Inskipp, 2009). The discussion of these will occur during contracting (Page & Wosket, 2014), but occasionally revisiting this shared purpose can be helpful to consider how
well the group is meeting its needs and if they remain aligned with the group’s goals.

There is often a mixture of anxiety and anticipation surrounding the formation and function of new groups, regardless of how carefully they are organised (Proctor, 2008; Willis & Baines, 2018) and being aware of and able to manage these emotions and interactions is vital to ensure the effectiveness of the group.

5.0 Supervision for teachers

5.1 How can supervision support teacher wellbeing: a review of the evidence

Jackson (2008) suggests teachers can experience a whole range of feelings towards pupils, and when they are feeling inadequately supported, they can begin to feel resentment and react to pupils or situations rather than taking time to reflect on them. Beneath this reaction Jackson (2008) suggests are feelings of rejection, isolation and being undermined. According to TIS UK (2021) it is during these times staff need a space, away from the classroom, to reflect on their work, and gain a deeper understanding of what be happening under the surface, in turn this can protect them from the emotional impact of their work. Isolation can cause a great deal of work stress and for teachers who are dealing with stressful circumstances around the needs of children and young people (CYP), isolation can further compound this feeling.
Developing a school culture which promotes positive relationships between colleagues can contribute to staff wellbeing (Ofsted, 2019). One of the key benefits/aims of supervision is that it reduces the feeling of being alone in managing a problem. It promotes social networking, peer feedback, learning from others and camaraderie (Jackson, 2008; Osborne & Burton, 2014; Bainbridge et al., 2019; Reid & Soan, 2019).

Research evidence on supervision in schools is limited, however evidence from recent small-scale studies of supervision in schools for Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCo) (Additional Learning Needs Co-ordinators (ALNCo) in Wales), Headteachers and other professionals, report very positive results (Willis & Baines, 2018; Carroll et al, 2020; Reid & Soan, 2019). Benefits included providing a framework for discussing real-world challenges, time, and space to explore and reflect on complex problems, and opportunities to nurture a greater sense of camaraderie between colleagues (Willis & Baines, 2018). It was found by Reid & Soan (2019) to be a powerful restorative experience, personally and professionally, reflecting the findings of other studies into supervision of other professions (Taylor, 2013).

Jackson (2008) examined the use of supervision groups to support the wellbeing of teachers in school. He reported that engagement in group supervision saw 92 per cent of respondents develop a better understanding of challenging behaviours, a reason often cited as one of the causes of teacher stress and burnout (Barnardo’s Scotland, 2019; TWIX, 2020; Ofsted, 2019; NASUWT 2019; HSE, 2019), and 88 per cent reported improvements in their
ability to manage disruptive pupils. Despite the small population (25 teachers) and the time since publication, this study appears to continue to reflect the current national picture of concerns for teachers.

In a study exploring how teachers in schools for children with social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) understand and experience supervision in relation to their wellbeing, Rae et al. (2017) interviewed eight teachers from two schools in England with varying degrees of teaching experience and age ranges. Although it is not clear what framework of supervision was in place, and therefore what participants were evaluating, what is clear is that teachers wanted opportunities to reflect on their practice and the emotional impact of this, and they want to do this in a non-judgmental, collaborative, and supportive environment.

Willis and Baines (2018) explored the perceived benefits and difficulties in introducing and maintaining supervision groups in a Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) special school in England. The aim of the groups was to support staff working in difficult circumstances by providing opportunities to discuss with their colleagues the social and emotional pressures and challenges that working in a SEMH special school pose and, though the process, improve solidity amongst colleagues. Sessions were facilitated by an independent supervisor. Seventeen voluntary staff members were allocated to one of three supervision groups in order of take up. Of these, four teachers and seven teaching assistants participated in a 25-to-40-minute one-to-one interview with an independent research assistant. Interview questions were
provided to participants prior to interview; however, the researchers do not share these with the reader. Neither do they provide details of the supervision model used, nor the total duration of the intervention. All participants however reported that they found the supervision they had received as beneficial and something they would like to continue with. Reported benefits included the opportunity for shared emotional experiences in terms of validation, empathising and camaraderie; therapeutic effects such as opportunities to offload and the opportunity to show and discuss vulnerabilities; and development of professional practice which included the opportunity to reflect on practice, discuss strategies and have a positive impact on pupils. A lack of supervisee engagement, frequency, changes in group dynamics and the inability to influence decision-making were cited as difficulties to group supervision. In relation to the inability to influence decision-making, de Hann (2012) points out, supervisors working with different groups and individuals, can identify collective trends amongst colleagues, and, when doing so anonymously, can feed these back into the organisation and influence systemic change. In terms of maintaining the effectiveness of the groups the role of the supervisor was highlighted as important and that an external, independent supervisor was preferable, echoing the earlier recommendations by Conyne (1996), Hitchings (2004) and Jackson (2008).

Austin (2010) explored the benefits of introducing consultancy supervision, which was used interchangeably with clinical supervision, into a primary school for children with SEBD. The research focused on individual supervision rather than group supervision. 17 members of staff participated in
four half-termly supervision sessions and completed pre and post measure questionnaires. Of these, nine took part in one-to-one interviews (7 teachers, 8 LSAs, 2 non-teaching staff) with a separate interviewer. Austin reported a positive post-intervention shift in terms of supervision being a positive experience for participants. 94% viewed the ‘supportive’ function of supervision as a priority, which met their pre-intervention hopes for the supervision process. Post-intervention data suggested an increase in the topic’s participants felt appropriate to discuss in supervision. There was some change in priority of areas in the pre and post measure data, but the top four priorities following intervention were the discussion of ‘children’, ‘the present’, ‘self’ and ‘the future’. Participant’s experience suggests supervision is a way of expressing themselves on a broad level across various aspects of their lives. It also reiterates the function of supervision in supporting the supervisee to support the client, in this case the ‘children’.

In terms of how supervision was helpful, four themes emerged and included, increased self-awareness leading to change, increased self-esteem in general, and specifically to the workplace, and an opportunity to offload. As these were individual sessions, the supervisor and supervisee were able to use them in a way that was unique to the individual, which is not always possible in group supervision. However, the findings replicate many of those found within group supervision such as offloading, seeing things from different perspectives, confidence to try things, improved staff relationships and a positive impact on pupils (Willis & Baines, 2018). The ability to see things from a different perspective can help teachers feel more confident that their work
and their decisions are based on deeper understanding of pupils’ needs and difficulties, rather than on a mounting sense worry and pressure to do well (Reid & Soan, 2019). The Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families (n.d.) highlights how supervision can provide opportunities to think about the needs of pupils and consider areas of work that the teacher or staff member is finding especially challenging or difficult. Once again participants emphasised that the independence of the supervisor was ‘essential’, reiterating the importance of confidentiality, non-judgemental supervisor who is seen as separate from the system.

Reid and Soan (2019) explored the views of senior leaders and SENCOs who received six two-hour supervision sessions over the course of two years. The sessions were delivered either on a one-to-one basis or a group setting. Over the two years seven participants completed questionnaires at three points during the project: pre, mid-way and post intervention. Three themes emerged: professional safety in terms of the importance of a confidential and safe space; the promotion of professional resilience, helping with stress management, feeling re-energised and being able to take care of themselves (better work/life balance); and professional development including greater reflexivity, leading to finding their own solutions and greater strategic thinking, and benefits to the wider school. Supervision offered a ‘space’ for senior leaders to develop their ability to be ‘reflective, reflexive and to problem solve’ (p.70). Bainbridge et al., (2019) in their follow up study, later note that participants were from a county-wide Multi-Academy Trust in England, however it remains unclear who received individual supervision and who
received group sessions. Therefore, it is difficult to know if responses differed between the two groups and between headteachers and SENCOs, as the two roles arguably have different responsibilities (Department for Education (DfE), 2020; National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL), 2014). Responses in follow up interviews with four headteachers (Bainbridge et al, 2019) mirrored those of the questionnaire, however Bainbridge et al expand of the wider implications' participants referred to, suggesting this included gaining knowledge of supervisory principles and applying them to their own management of their school and staff, and a reduction in the perceived stigma attached to speaking up about difficulties or issues. Supervision was seen as beneficial in many ways and participants were keen to continue with the support, however one barrier to widening the offer to all staff was the financial implications. Findings from this research suggest supervision supports the development of professional resilience, which in turn leads to greater self-efficacy and confidence in practice (Ischinger, 2008), which has been found to support teachers’ commitment to the profession (Day, 2011), therefore investing in teacher wellbeing could arguably improve commitment and reduce the number of teachers seeking to leave the profession (Chan, 2004; Robertson & Dunsmuir, 2013). It might also be argued that supervision, whether individual or group, cannot directly address the systemic and organisational difficulties teachers identify, and continues to place the responsibility on the individual to be resilient in the face of adverse working conditions. However, supervision encourages individuals to feel empowered to make changes and this can lead to changes at a more systemic and organisation level (Willis & Baines, 2018; de Hann, 2012).
Many studies exploring the benefits of supervision have been conducted in SEMH/SEBD schools. However, mainstream schools are increasingly being asked to manage pupils with increasingly complex social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties (TIS UK, 2021). Therefore, the results of these studies may have direct implications for mainstream teachers who are likely to be facing some of the same challenges as teachers in SEMH/SEBD schools.

5.2 Why offer teachers group supervision?

Supervision can be undertaken individually, or within a group. Both have their advantages and disadvantages, however, there are several advantages to offering group supervision to teachers.

Lynch et al. (2016) found in their study that teachers want to learn from others, and to have time to reflect on their own practices. Group supervision can be advantageous in terms of offering opportunities to consider multiple perspectives (Lietz, 2008; Osborne & Burton, 2014), providing practical and emotional support, developing confidence and in turn a sense of competence (Maxwell, 2012; Osborne and Burton, 2014; Rothwell, 2019). Hawkins and Shohet (1989) suggest the “greater empathic range” provided by the diversity of a group, e.g., age, gender, and race, may also provide been an advantage (p.95). Fairall (2020), when researching ELSA views of supervision, suggests there is an element of supervisees building up their emotional resilience over time and experience, therefore diversifying the group may offer additional emotional support to less experienced practitioners.
In their research on the supervision received by ELSAs, Callicott & Leadbetter (2013) reported ELSAs viewed group supervision as a way of forming friendships and maintaining practical and emotional support outside of the supervisory sessions. Bakker et al, (2005) highlights that social support has the potential to safeguard against the vulnerabilities of stress and other research has highlighted the emotional support members of the group offer outside of the supervision sessions reduce feelings of isolation (Callicot & Leadbetter, 2013; France & Billington, 2020; Osbourne & Burton, 2014). As feelings of isolation can further compound difficulties already faced by teachers, group supervision could arguably help alleviate this (Bainbridge et al., 2019; Jackson, 2008; Osborne & Burton, 2014; Reid & Soan, 2019).

A commonly cited barrier to group supervision is insufficient time to discuss all cases in detail (Osborne & Burton, 2014). This is reportedly due to dominant group members, group size (Hawkins and Shohet, 2012) and the limitations of specific problem-solving approaches (Osborne & Burton, 2014; France & Billington, 2020; Hawkins & Shohet, 2012). Group supervision can provide opportunities to use creative techniques to support and enable supervisees to reflect on their practice individually and together, techniques they can take forward into their practice (Helen & Douglas House, 2014; Bainbridge et al., 2019; Hawkins, 2020). Using flexible frameworks such as Page and Wosket's (2014) Cyclical Model reduces the reliance on one specific approach within the supervisory process and enables the supervisor to respond to group needs.
An important consideration when setting up group supervision is the composition of the group. School staff are less likely to take risks in sharing anxieties and difficulties in front of their line manager, and vice versa (Jackson, 2008; TWIX, 2021). Reid and Soan’s (2019) study highlighted the beneficial factors of supervision for senior managers but arguably this should be separate from those not in management or senior leader positions (Austin, 2010; Willis & Baines, 2018).

Finally group supervision can be more cost- and time-effective, to both the organisation and the EP. Group supervision would arguably allow more teachers to access supervision. Although an important consideration, time and financial constraints should not outweigh the benefits of group supervision to practice and wellbeing.

6.0 The role of the EP

The Welsh Government (WG) (2016) document, “Educational psychologists in Wales”, identifies that EPs have an important role to play in both supporting CYP and those around them. It describes the EP as working in a range of situations and setting, using “a range of approaches with individuals, groups, schools and wider systems” (P.3), including the supervision of other professionals. One area of the EP role that highlights this is their role within the supervision of ELSAs (ELSA Network, 2017). According to the ELSA Network (2017) receiving supervision from a qualified EP enables ELSAs to
develop their knowledge, and understanding, of the psychological
development of CYP and apply these psychological principles to facilitate
change.

Rae et al. (2017) conducted an exploratory study that explored the EP role in
providing supervision for teacher in SEBD schools. They reported that the EP
role was seen as reactive rather than proactive or preventative, and that the
EP’s role in supporting teacher wellbeing through supervision was not
understood or seen as a role of the EP, further suggesting that supporting
teachers’ wellbeing is a relatively underdeveloped role for EPs. However,
Dunsmuir and Leadbetter (2010) provide evidence that EPs have been
increasingly asked to supervise other professionals, including teachers, as
long as 10 years ago. Dunsmuir and Leadbetter (2010) also note that “multi-
disciplinary and multi-agency supervision is a growing area and one which
offers many opportunities for EPs to develop and enhance their supervisory
skills” (p.11). In addition to this, the BPS (2008) offers generic professional
guidelines which outline the principles of supervision and the Division of
Educational and Child Psychology (Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, 2010), provide
guidelines more specifically to the EP suggesting this is an area of support
applicable to EPs.

In order for individuals to work in a reflective manner and enhance their
practices, facilitator skills and problem-solving skills are vital (Dunsmuir &
Leadbetter, 2010). Callicott and Leadbetter (2013) suggest EPs possess the
necessary knowledge and skills in consultation and facilitation of reflection
needed to undertake the role of supervisor, so they seem well-equipped to
manage inter-professional supervision. In Callicott and Leadbetter’s (2013) study respondents believed EPs were able to apply psychological theory, think through casework logically, were skilled in counselling and consultation and had a broad professional and contextual knowledge base. However, this is not to say EPs are the only professionals skilled to undertake this role. Many of the respondents on Callicott & Leadbetter’s study believed that these qualities or competencies might not be distinctly associated with the EP, believing that other professionals could acquire the skills and apply them effectively within supervision. In the “Framework on embedding a whole school approach to emotional and mental wellbeing” document, WG (2021) suggests school pastoral leads, Welsh Network of Healthy School Schemes\(^2\) (WNHSS) coordinators and other well-being leads could fulfil such a role, and it is not to say others cannot learn the skills needed for successful supervision.

However, WG (2021) state that teachers and staff “need to be supported to maintain their own well-being and have access to appropriate supervision, particularly when dealing with more challenging issues that have the potential to impact on their own well-being” (pp.50-51). It also notes school support staff, such as the EP, have a specific role in relation to promoting/supporting wellbeing and acting as sources of advice and support. Considering the EP’s unique training and experience, they are uniquely qualified and suited to

\(^2\) The Welsh Network of Healthy School Schemes - ‘Healthy School’ is one which takes responsibility for maintaining and promoting the health of all who ‘learn, work, play and live’ within it by enabling pupils and staff to take control over aspects of the school environment which influence their health. It actively promotes, protects, and embeds the physical, mental, and social health and wellbeing of its community through positive action. [https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/welsh-network-of-healthy-school-schemes/](https://phw.nhs.wales/services-and-teams/welsh-network-of-healthy-school-schemes/)
facilitating universal and targeted interventions to improve wellbeing across multiple levels, including individual, group and systems (WG, 2016; Rae et al., 2017) and have a vital role to play in supporting teacher wellbeing.

7.0 Rationale for the current study

Although research into group supervision has provided evidence regarding the benefits to practice and wellbeing, this has primarily focused on those in professions such as counselling and social work. There has been some research into the benefits of supervision for teachers, in particular those in working in schools for children with SEBD. This research has provided positive accounts of supervision being a powerful, restorative experience, professionally, personally, and emotionally (Reid & Soan, 2019). It has highlighted how supervision can increase self-awareness, self-esteem, and confidence in one’s decision making and practice, through opportunities to reflect and process the emotional demands placed on the teacher. However, research into how supervision can support the wellbeing of teachers in mainstream school is limited and given that mainstream schools are increasingly being asked to manage pupils with increasingly complex social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties (TIS UK, 2021), offering these teachers a safe space to reflect on their practice appears vital. Conversely, the literature suggests many teachers are not familiar with the term ‘supervision’ (Barnardo’s Scotland, 2019; Callicott, 2011; Cassedy, 2010; Feltham 2010) and it’s misunderstanding can create barriers to teachers’ engagement in the process (Cassedy, 2010; Austin, 2010). It is therefore important to understand
teachers’ perceptions of the term in order to demystify the concept (Carroll, 2020) and ensure experiences and expectations are shared.

EPs are well placed to promote and support teacher wellbeing as they have the professional skills to encourage and enable reflection in a safe and containing environment (Callicott & Leadbetter, 2013). The current study aims to explore how implementing EP-led group supervision for teachers in mainstream schools can support their wellbeing and positively impact their practice.

In response to the identified gap in previous research, the following three research questions will be explored in relation to mainstream teachers.

**Figure 3 Research questions for the current study**

- **RQ 1**
  • What do teachers understand by the term ‘supervision’?

- **RQ 2**
  • What impact does engagement in supervision have in terms of teacher wellbeing?

- **RQ 3**
  • What other aspects of the teacher’s role benefits from engaging in a process of supervision?
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'As teachers we are not used to taking time out for ourselves. We give our time to our staff, we give time to the children, but we don’t give time for ourselves’.

Exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of teachers in mainstream school.

**Part B: Major empirical study**

Word count: 10,385
1.0 Abstract

Teaching is a socially, emotionally, physically, and mentally challenging career. Unlike many professions working with children and young people, teachers are not routinely provided with a safe space in which to reflect and process their experiences. Group supervision is seen as an invaluable source of containment, and personal and professional development. There has been some research into the benefits of supervision for teachers in schools for children with social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties (SEBD) and those in senior management positions, yet there appears limited research into the benefits of supervision for classroom teachers in mainstream schools. This study examines the impact of six weekly supervision sessions on the perceived wellbeing of mainstream teachers. Sessions were facilitated by the researcher and conducted in two mainstream primary schools and one mainstream secondary school in the UK. A total of seven teachers took part. A qualitative research paradigm using an open-ended questionnaire and semi-structured one-to-one interviews was employed. Self-selection was used in relation to the participant teachers. Data were analysed thematically. Findings indicate attending group supervision reduced feelings of isolation through opportunities to offload and share experience, it promoted self-awareness and self-reflection, and positively impacted professional development and wellbeing. Wider implications were also found in relation to continued support and impact on the wider school staff. An element of stress and guilt in relation to attending during the school day was also expressed. These findings are discussed in terms of implications for EP practice.
2.0 Introduction

The research set out to explore the perceived benefits of group supervision for the wellbeing of teachers working in mainstream schools. Research has highlighted the role of interventions such as mindfulness, psychoeducation, and professional development in supporting teachers’ wellbeing (White, 2020), however, it is relational aspects, such as empathy and reflection, that are required to reduce high levels of stress (Trauma Informed Schools UK (TIS UK), 2021). Despite supervision being used in many helping professions for some time to support wellbeing and practice (Carroll, 2007), there has been little research on how it can support the wellbeing of teachers. Evidence from studies into supporting teachers in schools for children with Social Emotional Behavioural Difficulties (SEBD) suggest supervision, undertaken on an individual or group basis, is a purposeful and restorative space to develop personally and professionally (Reid & Soan, 2019).

2.1 Teacher wellbeing

Teaching is often regarded as one profession that can be particularly stressful (White, 2020). Pollard & Lee (2008) suggest teachers are challenged physically, mentally, emotionally, and socially though most of their careers. McBrearty (Education Support Partnership, 2019), presents a multifaceted role of the teacher. One that is expected to balance the diverse needs of learners, whilst promoting “inclusion and collaboration, alongside assessment and feedback” (p.3), and doing so with an energy that inspires, develops, and values all children and young people. Given this multifaceted role, it is
arguably to be expected that the teaching profession is commonly reported to be one of the most stressful occupations (Health and Safety Executive (HSE), 2021).

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (2021) defines work-related stress as a harmful reaction people have to undue pressures and demands placed on them at work. Bakker et al.’s (2005) job-demand resource model suggests when an individual’s perception of these work-related demands outweighs their perceived ability to deal with them individuals are at greater risk of stress and burnout. Bakker et al. (2005) argue however that these vulnerabilities can be buffered through experiencing autonomy, receiving feedback, and high-quality relationships, a view supported by Ryan and Deci’s (2001) self-determination theory. Martela and Sheldon (2019) agree that satisfying these needs could play a key role in making life feel meaningful and promoting psychological wellbeing.

There are several studies that have explored the effectiveness of interventions aimed at supporting teachers’ mental health and wellbeing. Such studies have looked at the effect of problem-solving groups (PSG) such as circle and consultation groups (Bozic & Carter, 2002; Muchenie & Kelly, 2021), work-discussion groups (Bartle & Trevis, 2015; Jackson 2008), relaxation interventions such as mindfulness (White, 2020), and whole school wellbeing events (Brady & Wilson, 2021). They have also explored interventions that seek to offer organisational and policy change (Brady & Wilson, 2021), and those that emphasis the relational aspect of their support.
such as supervision (Austin, 2010; Rae et al., 2017; Reid & Soan, 2019; Sharrocks, 2014; Willis & Baines, 2018).

Brady and Wilson (2021) suggested these interventions, practices and policies can be categorised on a continuum, suggesting they might fall into reactionary, transactional and/or transformational measures in addressing wellbeing and their success depends on how well they are received by those taking part. They suggest reactionary measures such as relaxation activities, group exercise classes and whole school community events such as baking competitions and quiz nights can be seen as encroaching on the individual’s time, exasperating workloads and as ‘tick box’ exercise for inspection purposes. Rothwell et al. (2019) notes where initiatives are seen as ‘tick box’ exercises they are less likely to be effective. Brown (2012) suggests this sense of not being valued and supported by school leaders can be detrimental to teachers' wellbeing, although these activities are felt genuine, they are well received and can be helpful in promoting wellbeing (Salter-Jones, 2012). Conversely, Brady and Wilson (2021) suggest transformational measures are far more positively received and are more successful at addressing concerns such as workload and assessment. However, TIS UK (2021) argue that for high levels of stress to reduce, relational interventions such as empathy and reflection are required. Arguably it is these transactional measures, which might include supervision, that are more likely to offer this empathy and the space for teachers to reflect on the demands placed on them.
2.2 The purpose and function of supervision

Supervision has been used in many helping professions for some time, such as health professions, social workers, and educational psychologists, and Carrol (2007) notes terms such as clinical, professional, and reflective supervision are commonly used interchangeably. For the purpose of this study the term ‘supervision’ will be used to denote professional supervision.

There are many definitions of the functions of supervision, but Hawkins and Shohet (2012) identified the main functions to be developmental (developing skills through reflection and discussion), resourcing (supporting the supervisee personally, emotionally, and physically), and qualitative (focusing on the ethical boundaries, responsibilities, and considerations of any supervisory relationship). Underpinned by a person-centred philosophy and the core conditions of empathy, communication, and unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1951), supervision should arguably be collaborative, non-judgemental, and designed to be empowering and supportive, rather than concerned with standards, monitoring, and accountability (Reid & Soan, 2019). Supervision differs from other forms of professional learning and development such as PSGs, coaching and mentoring in that supervision typically focuses on the emotional aspects of the supervisee’s work and explores how this might be influencing their practice. Muchenie and Kelly (2021) suggest PSGs can mirror some functions of supervision however they suggest that in PSGs, and arguably other forms of professional learning, the promotion of wellbeing is an indirect benefit of problem solving but not the primary aim. Whereas supervision is a process where the emotional aspects
of an individual’s work can be addressed, offering a direct influence on wellbeing, with problem-solving as a potential by-product.

2.3 Supervision and its use in schools

Welsh Government’s (WG) “Framework on embedding a whole school approach to emotional and mental wellbeing” (2021) document notes education staff “need to be supported to maintain their own well-being and have access to appropriate supervision, particularly when dealing with more challenging issues that have the potential to impact on their own well-being” (pp.50-51). TIS UK (2021) highlight how supervision can provide teachers with space away from the classroom, to reflect on their work, and gain a deeper understanding of what might be happening under the surface for themselves and the CYPs they work with, and in turn this can protect them from the emotional impact of their work. Nevertheless, few schools have safe spaces for teachers to reflect and process their experiences (TIS UK, 2021)

Research evidence on supervision in schools is limited. Despite this, evidence from recent small-scale studies of supervision in schools for Special Educational Needs Co-ordinators (SENCo) (Additional Learning Needs Co-ordinators (ALNCo) in Wales), Headteachers and other professionals, and teachers working in schools for children with SEMH/SEBD, have reported encouraging results (Austin, 2010; Willis & Baines, 2018; Carroll et al, 2020; Reid & Soan, 2019), suggesting supervision provides a purposeful and restorative space to develop personally and professionally (Reid & Soan,
Benefits include providing a framework for discussing real-world challenges in a real-world context (Reid & Soan, 2019); time and space to explore and reflect on complex problems (Bainbridge et al, 2019); and opportunities to nurture a greater sense of camaraderie between colleagues (Willis & Baines, 2018). These findings suggest supervision can protect against the effects of the emotional strain associated with teaching (Reid & Soan, 2019) by offering opportunities for teachers to experience autonomy, receive feedback, and experience high-quality relationships, which Bakker et al. 2005 argue buffer the effects of work-related stress, and in turn play a key role in promoting wellbeing. Despite the small sample populations, and the context within SEBD schools, the findings arguably have direct implications for mainstream teachers who are likely to be facing some of the same challenges as teachers in SEBD schools (TIS UK, 2021).

Despite these encouraging findings and WG documentation supporting the use of supervision to support the wellbeing of teachers, Barnardo’s Scotland (2019) highlight those working in education have limited experience of supervision, perhaps more used to the traditional line management approach and are therefore arguably not familiar with the term (Barnardo’s Scotland, 2019; Callicott, 2011; Cassedy, 2010; Feltham 2010). This can lead to misunderstanding and create barriers to teachers’ engagement in the process (Cassedy, 2010; Austin, 2010). In addition to this, Callicott (2011) investigated factors involved when EPs supervise other professionals and suggests that supervisees and supervisors have competing views when it comes to how supervision should be conducted. It is therefore important to understand
teachers’ perceptions of the term in order to demystify the concept (Carroll et al., 2020) and ensure experiences and expectations are shared.

2.4 Supervision model used in the study

The use of a structured process for supervision creates a safe space to respond to individual needs appropriately, and assists all members, including the supervisor, to maintain appropriate boundaries (McNicoll, 2008). Haynes et al. (2003) suggests a model that draws on two or more theoretical approaches can provide a fuller outcome than that of a single theory. By drawing on multiple approaches the supervisor has flexibility to respond to the supervisee according to the context and the specific issue being discussed.

Page and Wosket’s (2014) Cyclical Model offers a comprehensive explanation of the typical pathway through a supervision session, with the content being informed by multiple models, and a framework for considering the elements that may be relevant throughout a supervisory relationship. Based on humanistic, psychodynamic, and cognitive-behavioural principles (Callicott & Leadbetter, 2013), it consists of five stages subdivided into five steps (see Figure 4) and is firmly grounded in the assumption that supervision is a holistic process, underpinned by person-centred principles (Rogers, 1951), which contains and enables the supervisee in their practice through the “space” and the “bridge” stages. A more comprehensive discussion of the Cyclical Model can be found in Part A.
2.5 Role of EP in supervising others

Rae et al, (2017) explored the EP role in providing supervision for teacher in SEBD schools. Their findings suggest within schools the role of the EP has been perceived more as reactive rather than proactive or preventative. Rae at al. (2017) further suggest EPs are not recognised as having the skills to promote teacher wellbeing via supervision. Yet Dunsmuir and Leadbetter (2010) provide evidence that EPs have increasingly been asked to supervise
other professionals as long as 10 years ago. In an online survey of 246 EPs, Dunsmuir et al., (2015) provided evidence of EPs supervising a variety of professionals including school staff.

WG (2016) describes EPs as working in a range of situations and settings. The British Psychological Society (BPS) and the Department for Child and Educational Psychology (DECP) (Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, 2010) in their guidelines for practice for EPs, notes that “multi-disciplinary and multi-agency supervision is a growing area and one which offers many opportunities for EPs to develop and enhance their supervisory skills” (p.11). In addition to this, WG (2021) also notes wider school support staff, such as the EP, have a specific role to play in relation to promoting/supporting wellbeing and acting as sources of advice and support. Due to the professional training undertaken by EPs, Rae et al, (2017) suggest EPs are uniquely qualified to provide universal and targeted wellbeing interventions at multiple levels. One area of the EP role that highlights this is their role within the supervision of ELSAs (ELSA Network, 2017). According to the ELSA Network (2017) receiving supervision from a qualified EP enables ELSAs to develop their knowledge, and understanding, of the psychological development of Children and Young People (CYP) and apply these psychological principles to facilitate change. Arguably, the EP can and should support teachers to do the same.

2.6 Academic and Professional Rationale

Supervision is not a routinely used resource to support teacher wellbeing, and as such is arguably a concept that creates mistrust (Cassedy 2010; Callicott,
2011). Whilst the current evidence base has begun to capture the views and experiences of teachers on supervision, this has mainly been in relation to teachers of children in SEMH/SEBD schools or those in senior leader positions, rather than teachers of children in mainstream school. Even fewer have sort to directly gather the views of teachers in terms of the impact supervision has on their own wellbeing. Given that mainstream schools are increasingly being asked to manage pupils with increasingly complex social, emotional, and behavioural difficulties (TIS UK, 2021), and that supervision has been found to buffer the effects of the emotional strain associated with this (Reid & Soan, 2019), the current study aimed to explore the impact of group supervision in supporting the wellbeing of mainstream teachers. This was addressed via an open-ended questionnaire in phase one, an intervention facilitated by the researcher for phase two, and an open-ended questionnaire and one-to-one semi structured interviews in phase three. Phase three allowed for further exploration and a deeper understanding of participants experiences. The study aimed to address the research questions (RQ) below.
3.0 Methodology

3.1 Ontological and Epistemological position

This research was underpinned by a critical realist’s perspective which emphasises that knowledge is constructed through social environments and influenced by structures within the system, including previous experience and knowledge, and personal constructs of participants as practitioners, and the researcher as a supervisor and Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP).

Since teachers bring unique perspectives to the way they view and understand the world, multiple realities exist which we cannot presume to speak for all teachers, however new knowledge can be generated based on these realities. However, from a critical realist perspective, we are not able to create positive change solely through language or dialogue, we also need to engage in practical action (Fleetwood & Ackroyd, 2004). By enabling teachers
to experience supervision in the real world, perceptions will be influenced by real-world events and real-world experiences.

3.2 Design

In this study, a critical realist perspective was employed through a qualitative research design which offered multiple methods for gathering participants' perceptions on how their wellbeing changed over the course of the intervention. Participants engaged in six 60 – 90-minute group supervision sessions over a period of 10 weeks. School A received six consecutive weekly sessions, except for half term, during school hours. The delivery of sessions for the School B was interrupted for numerous reasons and sessions were therefore not delivered on consecutive week. Sessions were delivered after school hours. All sessions were undertaken face-to-face within the school environment. All participants attended all six sessions.

Open-ended questionnaires were used pre and post intervention to gather participant perceptions and understanding of supervision and any perceived benefits. Participants were requested to complete the questionnaire in the week prior to the intervention and the week following the final session. The full questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted over video calls to explore the views and experiences of the participants further. The full interview schedule can be found in Appendix 3. Interviews took place in the two weeks following the completion of six supervision sessions and all participants took part. To
encourage transparency and to assist participants in preparing their thoughts for the interview, the semi-structured interview questions were attached to the invitation to take part in the interview, which was emailed to participants following receipt of consent to take part. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes. Consent was sought to record the interviews, and these were transcribed in real time via Teams. The recordings were saved for checking of transcription accuracy and deleted following this.

3.3 Recruitment and Inclusion Criteria

An initial gatekeeper letter was sent to head teachers of all primary and secondary schools within the researcher’s placement local authority in the UK (see Appendix 4). Due to an initial lack of responses, the researcher widened the offer to other local authorities. One primary school and one secondary school responded, and the researcher was granted a meeting to discuss the project. Access to teaching staff across the partnership primary schools and the secondary school was granted and information was emailed to all by the headteacher (see Appendix 5 & 6). Potential participants were asked to contact the researcher to express interest in participating in the research. Subsequent briefing and consent collection procedures took place. The inclusion criteria used to select schools and participants can be seen in Figure 5.

Several attempts to successfully recruit a control group for the study were made. Despite this no participants came forward; therefore, no control group
was established. Participants were informed of this during their first group supervision session.

Figure 6 Inclusion criteria used to select schools and participants

- Where possible the researcher held no other role in the school selected, to avoid any difficulties or confusion with dual relationships (Tannenbaum & Berman, 1990).
- Participants must not be participating in any form of group supervision but can be participating in alternative wellbeing initiatives offered by the school. These may include but are not limited to, and will remain unique to the individual school, activities such as health related support staff to talk to, union representatives, Mental Health First Aid training, mentoring schemes, training or awareness raising of common mental health conditions, resilience or stress management classes and massage or relaxation approaches such as mindfulness (Teacher Wellbeing Index, 2019; 2020).
- All participants must be a member of the teaching staff. They will be a fully qualified teacher or working towards the qualification.
- Participants must not be members of the senior management team (Jackson, 2008).
- Gender, age or length of service was not stipulated
3.4 Participants

Self-selection was used in relation to the participant teachers, ensuring they met the inclusion criteria. School A consisted of five participants (three females and two males) from two partnership primary schools for pupils aged 3-11; School B consisted of two participants (one female, one male) from one secondary school for pupils aged 11-16. All participants had varying lengths of service and experience of supervision. All were provided with information for each stage of the study and consent to take part in each stage was gathered (see Figure 7).
3.5 Procedure

*Figure 7 Procedure for the current study*
3.5.1 Procedure of group supervision sessions

Contracting at the start of the process was viewed at vital and this was undertaken with both schools and both supervision groups independently (see Appendix 18 & 19 for examples). All supervision sessions took place in a private and confidential space in school. Sessions ran for 60 – 90 minutes in each case. The Cyclical Model (Page & Wosket, 2014) was used to guide the process of supervision but the content and how this was explored was guided by the supervisees. Supervisees were encouraged to think about what specific area they would like others to help them think about and the ‘space’ was used flexibly (Helen & Douglas House, 2014). Models used to inform the content included COMOIRA (Gameson & Rhydderch, 2003) and Solution Circles (Inclusive Solutions, 2015). To help this, each session began with each supervisee sharing their feelings about their day or week. This enabled the supervisees to set that aside and focus on the issues identified as priority for them. It also enabled the supervisor to assess the level of energy and mood within the room and facilitate the session accordingly. In some instances, previously discussed issues were revisited but often new material was presented. It was common for the supervisees to take time to offload emotional issues during the sessions, but sessions also focused on discussing practical strategies. The supervisor’s role was to help supervisees explore the issues deeper through active listening and open questioning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Approx. times</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Reminder of group agreement and check in from previous session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>Identify issues for discussion, this may include re-visiting previously discussed issues or new issues. If more than one issue identified for discussion allocate time to each issue prioritised. Supervisee who brings the issue decides how to present the information and any specific area/s they would like others to think about (sometimes group discussion may start with no focus supervisee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>30-50 minutes</td>
<td>Issue/s presented (10 minutes) and explored together using flexible approaches appropriate for the issue being discussed. This might include, for example, COMOIRA, Solution Circles, Work Discussion Groups (WDG), Sculpting, role play, drawing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>The group thinks together about possible solutions and ways forward for the supervisee/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>Check in and reflect on the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Data Analysis

Analysis of data from the questionnaires and the interview responses took the form of thematic analysis (TA). Since many of the issues in the literature were relevant to both primary and secondary group supervision, it was decided to combine the data across the two settings. Thematic analysis was carried out following the guidelines and recommendations set out by Braun and Clarke (2013) and Clarke (2021) and was conducted in six phases (see Figure 8).

The method involves the coding of raw data from each interview transcript into a subset of data (appendix 20), these subsets are then combined to represent an entire data set for the purpose of analysis (appendix 21). It was intended to highlight the specific themes that were common across the data set by providing a set of key themes. This approach offers an accessible and flexible approach to understanding how teachers actively construct their experiences and convey their ideas of participating in supervision in relation to their wellbeing.

**Figure 8** Six phases of Thematic Analysis

- *Familiarisation with the data*
- *Coding the data*
- *Generating initial themes*
- *Reviewing and developing themes*
- *Refining, defining, and naming themes*
- *Producing the report*
An inductive approach to generating themes was taken. Using themes generated directly from the data ensured that all viewpoints, including these not expected, were represented in the findings. In relation to the codes, five major themes were identified, each of which contained a wide range of subthemes. To exemplify key themes and sub-themes, selected quotations were used.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

This project was reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC) at Cardiff University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Consideration</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>Gatekeeper letters (see Appendix 4) emailed to Headteachers asking permission to conduct the research in their schools. Information sheets (see Appendices 5 &amp; 6) containing the necessary information for participants to make an informed choice to take part in the research were emailed by the headteacher to all teaching staff. Participants were given the opportunity to ask the researcher any questions. Participants were provided with information forms, consent forms and debrief forms at each stage of the research (see Appendices 7 – 16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Participants were provided with an anonymous link to the questionnaire via Qualtrics. Participants were informed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issues presented in supervision and during interview remain confidential to all except that the researcher-supervisor who may discuss issues with their own individual supervisor, where confidentiality agreements are already in place, unless concerns for safety were raised (see Appendix 19). Participants were informed interviews would be stored on a password encrypted device. These would be transcribed within 4 weeks of the interview taking place. At this point all records were made anonymous and all recordings were permanently deleted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymity</th>
<th>Participants were reassured that any identifiable data would be made anonymous when transcribed and that only anonymised data would be presented in the form of quotes to illustrate themes. For confidentiality and anonymity, each participant was assigned a number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>A contract between the school and the researcher was agreed, which set out dates and timings for the subsequent supervision sessions (see Appendix 18). A contract was also agreed with the participants which laid out the expectations and limitations of supervision (see Appendix 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to withdraw</td>
<td>Participants were reminded of their right to withdraw, up until the questionnaire had been submitted or at any time prior to the analysis of the interview data, without having to give a reason (see Appendices 7 &amp; 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research-supervisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief forms were made available to participants at the end of the pre- and post-measure questionnaires (see Appendices 9 &amp; 14). Debrief forms were emailed to participants following the completion of six supervision sessions (see Appendix 12) and the completion of the interviews (see Appendix 16). These forms fully informed participants about the study and ensured participants fully understood their right to withdraw. All participants were provided with a wellbeing leaflet following the completion of the study (see Appendix 17). Contact details of the researcher, supervisor and ethics committee was provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision for the supervisor is important to ensure supervisors continue to work within the boundaries of their competencies and professional role. It is a way of exploring the conscious and unconscious thoughts and feelings that occur during the supervisory relationship, and to think about how these impact on the relationship and the work done during the session. The researcher engaged in regular supervision and was guided by the British Psychological Society’s (BPS) (2018) and the Health and Care Professionals Council’s (HCPC) (2019) ethical guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Results

This section will discuss the main themes and subthemes that were generated by TA.

4.1 Themes and subthemes

The following two themes were identified: Understanding of group supervision, and practicalities of implementing group supervision. Each theme contained sub-themes. Figure presents a thematic map of these themes and sub-themes.
Figure 9 Thematic map showing the two major themes and corresponding subthemes

- Understanding of group supervision
  - Lack of clarity
  - Guilt and Stress
  - Wellbeing and professional development

- Practicalities of implementing group supervision
  - In-session challenges
  - Practical challenges

Themes and Subthemes
4.1.1 Theme 1: Understanding of group supervision

Figure 10 Main theme 1 Understanding of group supervision and corresponding subthemes

**Lack of clarity**

Supervisee’s lacked clarity of the supervision process in the initial stages of the study, however perceptions of supervision changed following active participation in the supervision process. At the start of the study, questionnaire responses suggested supervisees saw the purpose of supervision as a way of monitoring and overseeing their practice and competency by someone more senior to them. They referred to supervision as offering an opportunity to “reflect and talk through events” to “have confidence in your own practice”. It was also hoped supervision would reduce
the feeling of being ‘stressed’. During the interview some supervisees reported either never having heard the term supervision or having had no experience of the process prior to the study. Responses during the interview reflected those from the questionnaire, with supervision being perceived as hierarchical, where feedback on practice and competency is given. The overall perception of the term supervision and the supervision process was a negative one. Following participation in group supervision perceptions appeared to change, as one participant reflected “the opportunity I had with you, …. kind of opened the thinking about supervision in a way that I haven’t thought about it before” (P4, line 20).

Questionnaire and interview responses following the intervention suggested supervisees viewed the supervision as a supportive, non-judgemental, and equitable process. It offered them time to talk, learn from others, and reflect on their own practice in a solution focussed way. One supervisee explained the process “felt different” (P3, line 17) to previous experiences and was a much more positive experience. Another described supervision as a pragmatic approach to support teachers in their day-to-day experiences. Another suggesting experiencing it made the difference, making the distinction between line management and supervision, and suggesting the differences in these might be explained by the positions of the people taking part.
Wellbeing and professional development

Results indicated a small but positive change from pre (min = 4; max = 8) to post intervention (min = 6; max = 8) rating of personal wellbeing. However, this theme highlighted that prior to the supervision sessions there was a sense that supervisees were managing their wellbeing alone. Many of them reporting to use exercise to support their wellbeing, others seeking support from family and friends or placing boundaries in terms of their work-home life balance, although there was a sense that this was not always successful.

All supervisees felt supervision had a positive impact in allowing them to offload the pressures of teaching and reflect on their practice and themselves. It was felt supervision provided an opportunity to voice concerns, in a supportive environment, that might otherwise go unspoken. One supervisee reflecting that “when you teach it’s so isolating because you don’t hear from others ‘cause nobody ever voices something if something is going wrong” (P5, line 86).

The literature supports the idea that teachers are often concerned with presenting a professional face to senior staff and other colleagues (TWIX, 2021), and supervisees’ perceptions of supervision offering a space for ‘open and honest conversations’ to address concerns might suggest this is a concern for the supervisees in this study. However, it could be argued the reason behind this may not simply be to impress others, but also to protect their own sense of professional competence (Sweeney et al., 2001). Keeping a positive self-view, seems to be important for psychological well-being (Hoefler et al., 2015) and to safeguard their own sense of professional
competence within teaching, many teachers may adopt a passive role by refusing to seek advice and guidance from others. Supervision sessions that had purpose and were solution-focused were important, enabling supervisees to gain multiple perspectives and practical ideas helping to build their confidence and self-efficacy as a teacher, one supervisee reflected that getting “some feedback, some ideas to go away with, something that you can actually try, and you know help improve the situation” (P1, line 71) had a positive impact on their wellbeing.

One supervisee described how supervision had empowered them to request a change in working arrangements having previously felt uncomfortable to do this. This suggests that beyond coping better, there is a growing sense of ‘agency’ for this individual and encouraging individuals to seek support more readily from colleagues and senior managers.

Supervisees spoke of feeling that teachers were expected to be “100% devoted all the time to be worthy of the job” (P4, line 87). Enjoying time away from school seemed to carry feelings of guilt. Creating a work/life balance reoccurred throughout the interviews and there was a sense that this space between work and home was needed for supervisees to keep going. One supervisee spoke about how supervision had helped them reflect on the need to take “time for [themselves], not taking everything on [their own] shoulders and spread it out a bit”, how “teachers…are not used to taking time out for [themselves], we give our time to our staff, we give time to the children, but we don’t give time for ourselves” (P5, line 106), and how they now work more
collaboratively with other staff. There was however a sense that the wellbeing of others was being promoted at the expense of teachers’ wellbeing and through increased self-awareness and self-reflection supervisees recognised the need to take care of themselves to take care of others in their work.

One supervisee expressed how ‘offloading’ in supervision allowed them more “time to take their (team) stuff on and help the team” (P1, line 103). Suggesting that supervision can free up ‘space’ to take care of others. There was a sense that an important part of the process was helping others. There was also a sense of a developing group cohesion. Staff cohesion has been found to be positively related to team effort, team effectiveness, and work satisfaction (Forrester & Tashchian, 2006), and positively influence wellbeing (Sharrocks, 2014). Helping others can promote a sense of empowerment and increase self-esteem (UCL, 2020). It can also increase work satisfaction and create a sense of belonging (Ryan & Deci, 2001) and reduce feelings of isolation.

Sharrocks (2014) demonstrated that when relational interventions are used staff relationships improve and positively effect staff wellbeing. There was a sense in this study of supervision developing cohesion of staff, not just between those within the session but also the wider school, enabling supervisees to feel more confident to ask for support and reducing the stigma of speaking up about difficult issues and concerns of being perceived negatively. The opportunity to separate the ‘teacher’ from the ‘individual’ seemed particularly important and helpful in promoting wellbeing, and group
supervision helped supervisees to “feel like there’s stuff [they] do that is good and it’s ok to feel like you don’t love your job every second of the day” (P4, line 79). Group supervision provided space to be “able to sit and speak about it…where everyone totally understands that you’re moaning, still love being a teacher, still love the children, but you’re having a [bad] day…. you knew there’d be no judgement there” (P1, line 26).

Supervisees alluded to the pressure of the emotional labour (Kinman et al, 2011) attached to their job. This was particularly in relation to them feeling pressure to align their internal emotional state with perceived desired emotions during interactions with others (Kariou et al., 2021). Kariou et al. (2021) suggest emotional labour comprises of two types of ‘acting’: surface acting (SA) and deep acting (DA). They suggest that during SA the individual does not attempt to align their felt and displayed emotion; whereas during DA individuals attempt to change their internal emotional state to conform to the emotion being displayed. There is evidence in the literature that lends support to the idea that unresolved emotional dissonance or internal emotional conflict (Cox, 2012) can lead to feelings of stress (UCL, 2020), burnout (Kinman et al, 2011; Noor & Zainuddin, 2011) and challenges to our sense of self (Hochschild, 1983). Group supervision was seen as safe and containing way of expressing and discussing these internal emotions.

Noor and Zainuddin (2011) note that because SA requires conscious regulation on the part of the individual, it is only possible if the primary task is interrupted (e.g., a teacher who is trying to stop feelings of anger at a difficult
student might leave the situation and talk to her colleagues). Noor and Zainuddin (2011) suggest that in most cases, teachers do not have the luxury of time to do so and will often resort to SA. It could be argued that providing time away from the classroom with others who ‘understand’ helped the supervisees in this study to feel validated in their experiences as a teacher and feel less pressure to present a professional face.

In addition to allowing them to reflect on their practice and offload their teaching pressures, supervisees felt supervision positively affected their teaching practice and, in turn, their wellbeing. One supervisee spoke about being able to better regulate their own emotions and responses, which had a positive impact on their management of difficult behaviour in the classroom, suggesting an increased awareness and understanding of the dynamics of their interactions with young people.

Another perceived benefit of supervision on supervisees’ wellbeing is that the support continued outside of supervision. Knowing there was a supportive network of peers available decreased feelings of isolation and being alone. For one supervisee, supervision highlighted the importance of sharing with colleagues “rather than just being in a bubble and being in isolation from each other” (P6, line11). Supervisees were more aware of their colleagues and had an increased awareness of supporting their wellbeing too, highlighting the importance of ‘checking-in’ with others. Reflection continued outside of the sessions, individually and between group members, highlighting the ongoing
reflexive learning and professional development that develops from supervision.

**Guilt and stress**

Not everything had a positive impact on wellbeing. All supervisees in the primary group expressed feelings of guilt and stress in relation to leaving their class to attend supervision. They also expressed feelings of needing to be contactable and available to deal with situations in the classroom. These feelings of guilt were supported by the secondary group but more in a reflective, than an experiential, way. One supervisee spoke about this “guilt” being “a teacher thing” (P5, line117). A view echoed by another supervisee. Feeling guilt seemed to be an accepted emotion and part of the teachers’ role and arises from their commitment to care for those they teach. Feelings of guilt appear to be generated when teachers feel they are not meeting their pupils needs or failing to give them sufficient attention by being absent from the classroom but to ‘care for’ children is to teach well and to do this teachers’ need to continue to develop professionally and personally. There was also a sense that individual accountability and responsibility placed on teachers by the wider system (TWIX, 2021) added to worries and fears that mounting expectations have not been or will not be met, and time out of the classroom placed additional demands on an already stretched teacher. There was however a sense that when supervision is undertaken away from the classroom or the school environment these feelings of guilt can be alleviated to some extent.
4.1.2 Theme 2: Practicalities of implementing group supervision

**Figure 11** Main theme 2 Practicalities of group supervision and corresponding subthemes

---

**In-session challenges**

In-session challenges included the importance of an external supervisor in maintaining confidentiality and open discussion, and the importance of group composition and group dynamics. Supervisees felt that an external supervisor offered a non-judgemental and safe space where people felt able to discuss school and practice related concerns without worrying that it would be discussed with others or brought up in appraisals outside of the session. Including senior leaders or managers within the group, whether as a group member or as a supervisor, left supervisees feeling uncomfortable. All supervisees expressed they would not feel able to be as open or honest about
their practice as they would not want to appear as if they were ‘struggling’ and may feel like their competency was being evaluated.

One supervisee expressed that a supervisor external to the school may bring a unique and different perspective and that “sharing of that practice is going to be much more beneficial” (P5, line 170). Confidentiality and the trust of the rest of the group members was also highlighted as important.

Supervisees also highlighted the benefits of increased diversity within the group. There was a sense that this offered an opportunity to develop relationships within the wider context of the school. One supervisee reflected they “liked working with people from [their] school who were form different phases as well ‘cause it kind of keeps you in contact with those parts of the school” (P4, line 56). There was also a sense that diversity within the group could offer an additional and valuable perspective.

**Practical challenges**

Most supervisees believed the groups should meet no more than fortnightly. There was a sense that there needed to be enough time to reflect and implement any strategies between sessions but not so long that emotions build up to unmanageable levels. However, there was a sense that teachers have enough to do and if not implemented sensitively supervision may increase stress and be seen as ‘another thing’ that must be done. Another supervisee suggested that over time skills to support themselves would develop and therefore the frequency of the session may decrease, suggesting
a sense of autonomy and developing ways of managing the pressures of teaching.

The problematic nature of undertaking supervision during the school day was highlighted. In addition to the guilt associated with leaving class, the emotional component of supervision and returning to the classroom afterwards was highlighted. One supervisee reflected on the stressful nature of some of the topics in supervision and how going “back into a classroom then after that, it’s not a good thing, you know” (P7, line 252).

It was also suggested that the ability to focus on the supervision process might be compromised due to staff having “101 things on their mind” (P7, line 248). The multifaceted role of the teacher has been highlighted in the literature (McBearty, 2019), placing an additional expectation on them to attend supervision too often may add to the pressures they already experience.

The importance of a neutral venue, or a venue away from the classroom, was highlighted, providing an opportunity to take a step back from the day-to-day teaching and taking supervisees out of what has essentially been “quite a stressful environment” (P7, line 299). The ability to ‘park work’ appears to be an important aspect to be able to fully engage in supervision.

The end of the school day was suggested as a good time to undertake supervision, allowing time to reflect on the discussions and suggestions, and
increasing the likelihood of changes being made. When this was done towards the end of the week supervisees felt they were able to “offload” prior to the weekend and felt more confident to be able to effect change the following week.

Overall supervision was received positively, and all supervisees offered positive recommendations for the future of group supervision. All indicated they would continue to attend and expressed a desire to continue the groups. One supervisee expressed how supervision was relevant to all teachers regardless of experience or years teaching. The use of supervision as a proactive approach to wellbeing was emphasised. It was felt supervision should be embedding it into the profession, as it is with other helping professions, and accessed throughout a teaching career, something that does not currently take place in many schools.

4.2 Summary
This chapter presented the findings of the study including a thematic analysis of the qualitative data from the questionnaire and the semi-structured interviews. Overall, there was a positive shift in terms of participant understanding and expectations from the supervision process, with it being experienced as a positive process. Findings indicate attending group supervision reduced feelings of isolation through opportunities to offload and share experience, it promoted self-awareness and self-reflection, and positively impacted professional development and wellbeing. Wider implications were also found in relation to support continuing outside of the supervision sessions for both participants and wider school staff. An element
of stress and guilt in relation to attending during the school day was also expressed. These themes will be discussed in relation to the research questions in the following discussion section.

5.0 Discussion

This study aimed to explore the perceived wellbeing effects of group supervision and how these impacts on practice. Seven mainstream teachers took part in semi-structured virtual interviews and the two main themes that emerged for the TA were “understanding of group supervision” and “practicalities of implementing group supervision”. The subthemes included lack of clarity in relation to the term ‘supervision’, benefits to wellbeing and professional development, guilt and stress associated with attending the supervision sessions, and in-session and practical challenges of implementing group supervision. The resulting themes from the TA will be discussed in relation to the three research questions and the literature. The implications for EP practice will then be discussed, followed by a discussion of the strengths and limitations of this research.

5.1 RQ 1) What do teachers understand by the term ‘supervision’?

The responses to the questionnaires and the interviews demonstrated how supervisees’ understanding of the supervision process changed over time. The findings of this study indicate a negative connotation towards the term ‘supervision’, including from those who perceived themselves as having had never heard of it or received it. Pre-intervention data suggests teachers in this
study viewed supervision as managerial, a way of monitoring and overseeing their practice and competency, by someone more senior to them. Given that previous literature has highlighted that those working in education have limited experience of supervision (Barnardo Scotland, 2019), and that the term supervision can raise concerns and mistrust in competencies (Cassedy, 2010; Callicott, 2011; Callicott & Leadbetter, 2013), this was not wholly unexpected. This is not to say there was a lack of care for teachers in these schools, but rather their previous experiences are more likely to have been akin with line management than supervision (Dunsmuir & Leadbetter, 2010) and they therefore may be unaware of the purpose of supervision.

There was a positive shift in terms of supervision being experienced as a positive process following the intervention phase. Post-intervention data suggests an increase in the perception of supervision as being a supportive, non-judgemental, validating experience and offering positive impacts on wellbeing and practice. The opportunity to take part in the process of group supervision enabled the teachers in this study to reframe and reconstruct their perception of the term, and the process of, supervision.

Brady and Wilson (2021) highlight the importance of choice in taking up these measures and warns against forced participation which can exacerbate rather than alleviate causes of stress. Willis and Baines (2018) also warn that implementing any new provision could initially increase stress levels, being perceived as another tool for assessment, performance management or 'policing'. Therefore, establishing any supervision, including group
supervision, should first establish an understanding of the models, expectations, and limitations of supervision (Rae et al, 2017). Highlighting Carroll’s (2020) point on the importance of agreeing and clarifying what supervision is and isn’t and the importance of the contracting stage in doing this (Page & Wosket, 2014). Frameworks, such as the one used in this study (Page & Wosket, 2014), can be useful in guiding the supervisor through this process of contracting.

It could be argued that for some supervisees in this study the term ‘supervision’ is being used interchangeably to describe a variety of types of support, including mentoring, coaching, and line management. A finding supported by other researchers (Barnardo’s Scotland, 2019; Carroll, 2007; Rae et al., 2017). In this respect the term ‘supervision’ appears to be an overarching term within which these types of support exist, rather than professional supervision as utilised in this study. The importance for those taking part in group supervision to have a robust understanding of the purpose and limitations of supervision has already been highlighted by Brady and Wilson (2021). Given that misunderstandings of supervision are likely to discourage teachers from engaging in it voluntarily (Willis and Baines, 2018), raises the question of whether the term ‘supervision’ is the right term to be using in relation to teachers. Perhaps a different word under which we attempt to introduce this concept would create a more positive and encouraging perception and reduce confusion and resistance.
5.2 RQ 2) What impact does engagement in supervision have in terms of teacher wellbeing?

Supervisees in this study identified the restorative function of supervision, expressing an increase in self-reflection and self-awareness. This was in terms of how they are impacted by their work i.e., their capacity for self-management and self-care and contextual factors that influence this, and in terms of becoming more aware of their own reactions and responses to CYP and of the dynamics of their interactions with them. Effective emotion management has been linked to teacher self-efficacy, perseverance with challenging behaviour, and improved classroom behaviour (Chan, 2004; Robertson & Dunsmuir, 2013). In this respect, by offering an opportunity to reflect on their emotional responses, supervision can support teachers to manage their emotions, promote DA and mediate against the longer-term effects of stress and burnout that can arise from negative interactions with pupils (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Montgomery & Rupp, 2005; Chan, 2006).

Supervisees in this study also identified the formative functions of group supervision. Supervision was viewed to offer in-depth conversations which were otherwise unachievable in a busy school environment. Supervisees valued the solution-focussed approach taken during the sessions, and embraced the peer support and collaboration and the opportunity to develop their practice. Although according to Muchenie and Kelly (2021) problem-solving in a by-product of supervision, being able to come to some form of resolution by the end of the session appears important. The importance of
time to reflect during, after and between sessions was also highlighted. This increased reflexivity and the discussion of potential solutions appeared to positively impact supervisee wellbeing in that they felt more able to manage the demands of the classroom following group supervision. Bakker et al (2005) suggest when an individual’s perception of work-related demands outweighs an individual’s perceived ability to deal with them the risk of stress and burnout increases. This perceived ability to cope as expressed by the supervisees in this study is arguably promoted by the development of personal and professional resources developed through group supervision.

Supervisees expressed misgivings about the confidential nature of undertaking supervision with someone in a senior position to them, suggesting asking for help or discussing concerns or problems may be seen as ‘struggling’ and these concerns may be brought up at another time. This view is reflected in the literature, with several researchers suggesting school staff are less likely to take risks in sharing anxieties and difficulties in front of their line manager (Austin, 2010; Jackson, 2008; Willis and Baines, 2018), Additionally, the TWIX (2020) reports teachers’ reluctance to ask for support in fear of being perceived negatively. The supervisees in this study highlighted that the confidential, non-judgemental space created by the supervisor and the group was vital for ‘open and honest’ conversations to take place. It was felt this could only be achieved with a supervisor external to the school system. In addition to the confidentiality, an external supervision who knows less about the school was seen as a benefit, bringing an additional perspective. As Beddoe (2012) highlights, an external supervisor would less
likely be involved in any internal issues of the organisation, and supervisees are more likely to feel at ease. Some research suggests cross-discipline supervision undermines professional development and can lead to resentment (Royal College of Nursing, 2019), however supervisees in this study reflected on the external supervisor as being able to contribute new and different perspectives and ideas. Hitchings (2004) suggests that cross-discipline supervision is not only possible but is in fact advantageous, and Pack (2012) suggests that discussion about the organisation and the dynamics of interpersonal relationships are enabled by external supervision.

The importance of where and when supervision is offered was significant. Supervision was offered to School A during the school day, and School B once the school day had finished. All supervisees from School A reflected on how engaging in supervision during the school day evoked feelings of guilt in relation to leaving their classroom and the stress associated with planning for, and trusting others, to undertake work with their class. Although not undertaken during school time, School B supervisees reflected on how they might feel if this was the case. They reflected the feelings of ‘guilt and stress’ experienced by school A, but also identified that the ability to focus on the supervision process might be compromised during the school day due to staff having ‘101 things on their mind’. In addition to this, the emotional component of supervision was highlighted as a difficulty in returning to class afterwards. Providing staff with supervision which is supported with clear protected time has been found to be most well received (Brady and Wilson, 2021) and is likely to indicate that teachers and their wellbeing are valued (Kenny and
Allenby, 2013). Not being valued and supported by school leaders can be detrimental to teachers’ wellbeing (Brown, 2012). However, supervision arranged outside of school hours appears likely to be better received by teachers. In addition to this, supervisees in this study suggested supervision sessions should be regular enough that ‘emotions don’t build up’ but have enough time between them to reflect on discussion and implement suggestions from the session. The suggestion that supervision that occurred fortnightly would be the optimum frequency is supported by the literature as likely to be the most effective (McMahon & Errity, 2014; Taylor, 2013).

5.3 RQ 3) What other aspects of the teacher’s role benefits from engaging in a process of supervision?

The data highlights that supervision can evoke difficult feelings and have a high degree of emotional impact. This appeared as a result of reflecting on the teacher personally as well as professionally. From the perspective of Bion’s (1984) container/contained concept (French & Simpson, 2010), for teachers to provide emotional and practical containment for the CYP they work with, and the staff they support, they need to feel containment themselves. Through the opportunity to ‘offload’ and the containment they felt through arriving at some form of resolution, appeared to allow them more ‘time to take their (team) stuff on and help the team’, suggesting that supervision can free up ‘cognitive space’ to take care of others.

As a consequence of their own experiences of supervision, supervisees had gained sufficient knowledge of supervisory principles to begin applying these
to their own management of staff, highlighting the formative function of supervisions and developing the practitioner’s wider skills. It might be argued that supervision, whether individual or group, cannot directly address the systemic and organisational difficulties teachers identify (TWIX, 2021), however, developing a school culture which promotes positive relationships between colleagues and empowers teachers to facilitate positive change can contribute to staff resilience and promote their wellbeing (Ofsted, 2019) and supervision appears to be a valuable way of encouraging this.

5.4 Summary

The findings of this study suggest there was a positive shift in terms of supervisees’ understanding of supervision over time, one that was promoted through the lived experience of attending group supervision. Supervisees valued time to reflect on themselves personally as well as professionally which empowered them to make changes to their practice. The non-judgemental, purposeful, and safe space supervision offered, in which to reach some form of resolution to problems with the support of colleagues, was highly valued and the wider benefits of this were acknowledged.

5.5 Implications for EP practice

Results of this small-scale study suggest that teachers in mainstream school value the role of the EP as an external supervisor. Hitchings (2004) suggests that cross-discipline supervision is advantageous and Dunsmuir and Leadbetter (2010) highlight that “facilitation skills and problem-solving skills
are key to helping individuals from different professional backgrounds enhance their practices and work in reflective ways” (p.11). Through receiving regular supervision and their knowledge and skills in consultation and facilitation of reflection, EPs are well equipped to act as supervisor in inter-professional supervision (Callicott & Leadbetter, 2013).

In order to proactively promote teachers’ wellbeing and promote the use of supervision, EPs may need to rethink how they can foster a shared understanding of supervision’s purpose and benefits with school leaders and management teams. Although the current study did not seek the views of those in senior management positions, previous research suggests the finding of the current study are similar to the findings from studies that have gathered the views of senior leaders in schools in relation to supervision (Reid & Soan, 2019). Misunderstanding of the term ‘supervision’ can create barriers to its implementation and EPs might wish to consider a different word under which the concept is introduced in the hope of creating a more positive and encouraging perception of the process and reduce confusion. Terms such as ‘reflective supervision’ (Parlakian, 2001) or ‘reflecting on practice’ may be more appropriate, however these may also be conceptualised differently by different professions. Therefore, further research into what term sits well with teachers whilst retaining the core principles of supervision may be needed.

EPs need to also consider how they encourage schools to utilise the EP role within the process of supervision. EPs are able to fulfil the role of ‘external supervisor’ and at an individual or group level, they are able to provide direct supervision to teachers that enables them work in a reflective manner and
develop a deeper understanding of psychological principles to facilitate change. At a more systemic level, EPs are well placed to offer training in the core competencies of supervision. WG (2021) suggests school pastoral leads, Welsh Network of Healthy School Schemes (WNHSS) (n.d.) coordinators and other well-being leads exist and could fulfil such a role, and it is not to say others cannot learn the skills needed for successful supervision. Therefore, EPs need to reflect on their role in upskilling and/or their role in supervising these professionals which may in fact build greater capacity and be more cost-time effective for Educational Psychology Services (EPS). Future research may wish to explore how the validity of supervision can be retained when the EP trains others to facilitate it.

EPs should be reminded of the importance of the contracting stage in setting the scene for successful and ethical supervision. EPs need to be aware that many teachers may not have an accurate understanding of the purpose, functions and aims of supervision, and that supervisees and supervisors can have competing views when it comes to how supervision should be conducted (Callicott, 2011). Supervision frameworks such as Page and Wosket’s (2014) Cyclical Model can be a helpful and useful guide to establish expectations, responsibilities and maintain ethical boundaries.

5.6 Strengths and limitations

Some of the strengths and limitations of the current study are summarised below. A more comprehensive discussion can be found in part C.
The main limitation of this study is the failure to provide a voice to those teachers who did not participate in the group supervision. Gathering a wider range of viewpoints would provide a greater degree of validity, offer an alternative perspective and a more rounded assessment of the value of supervision in supporting practice, reducing stress, and improving wellbeing. Future research may want to explore the views of those that choose not to take part in supervision.

The lack of representation of teachers working in secondary school is limitation of this study. Several measures were taken to collect equal numbers of views from both primary and secondary school teachers. It is disappointing that this group is not more represented, but it does raises important questions about how secondary school perceive and support teachers. It is possible that the systems operating within these settings might be different to those in primary schools and further exploring the views of teachers’ specifically within these settings is important. Further exploration of potential systemic structures may be worthy of future research.

The small sample of participants recruited from two local authorities may limit the wider generalisability of the findings. Therefore, it is important to view the current research as being specific to this context, rather than generalisable to the whole teaching population. However, establishing a baseline data of evidence from the outset of the groups (Bubb & Earley, 2009), arguably enabled a more robust and nuanced interpretation (Willis & Baines, 2018).
This research may assist others, within education, to consider how teachers can be supported and the benefits that might be offered via supervision.

The researcher was less experienced at conducting interviews and thematic analysis, as they were a first-time doctoral researcher. Additionally, using an inductive approach to thematic analysis, the researcher is not neutral. Whilst steps have been taken to maintain the validity and reliability of the research, the researcher, by choosing how and what to code, and how and why data/findings are presented, actively influences the data and the findings (Swain, 2018). In this respect biases in the research process are inherent and the analysis of the data will be subjective and influenced by the researcher’s experiences.

In addition to this, the researcher’s role as researcher and supervisor may have further influenced perceptions and interpretations of the data. However, it was felt the dual role of the researcher gave a deeper understanding and interpretation of the views of teachers having lived the experience with them. It is believed this was more beneficial to the research than any bias was harmful.
6.0 Conclusion

This small-scale study, although limited in its generalisation, showed teachers valued the space and time to reflect on their own wellbeing. They valued the non-judgemental, validating, and supportive context in which group supervision is set, through which ‘open and honest’ conversations could be generated, supporting them to develop personally and professionally. To achieve this, they emphasised the need for an external facilitator, independent of the school. Given the training undertaken by EPs, and their skills in reflection and consultation, EPs are well placed to support schools and teachers to enhance the wellbeing of their staff at multiple levels.

The supervisees provided evidence of how group supervision has a positive impact in improving interactions with staff and pupils, and how strategies and skills learnt in supervision can be applied in practice. Evidence was provided of how supervision can empower teachers to make positive changes personally, in terms of work/life balance, and professionally, such as breaking down the stigma of asking for help and building confidence. This in turn had a notable positive impact on supervisee wellbeing. However, it also highlighted the need to consider when supervision is undertaken and the emotional and practical implications of this.

The contracting stage of supervision has been highlighted as vital in establishing a shared expectations and experiences (Page & Wosket, 2014). Frameworks for supervision can be helpful in guiding this, and the whole
supervision process. The researcher found the use of the Cyclical Model (Page & Wosket, 2014) helpful and would encourage any EP offering supervision to others to consider which model they might use to guide them.
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‘As teachers we are not used to taking time out for ourselves. We give our time to our staff, we give time to the children, but we don’t give time for ourselves’.

Exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of teachers in mainstream school.

**Part C: Critical appraisal**

Word count: 5,534
1.0 Abstract

This critical appraisal aims to provide a reflective and reflexive account of my research process. The rationale behind the research topic, the structure of the literature review, the theoretical approach chosen to conduct the research, and how this affected my research are discussed. A critical account of the development of the research partitioner is offered which will include decisions about participants, the supervisory process, data analysis and ethical consideration. Finally, the contribution to knowledge and dissemination of the research will be considered, alongside future research opportunities.
2.0 Rationale

2.1. Researcher positionality

Shohet and Shohet (2020) recall a poem by a 13th Century Persian poet called ‘The Great Wagon’: ‘Out beyond our ideas of wrongdoing and right doing, there is a field. I’ll meet you there’ (Rumi, 2004, p.40). For me this line sums up what supervision should be. The ‘field’ is the supervision space, it is void of labels and judgments, of right and wrong, black, and white. It is a safe space, a time to think and reflect, and in this space an opportunity to be curious and interested in another. It is empowering and supportive, rather than concerned with standards, monitoring, and accountability.

My previous experience in a wide range of roles, including as a teacher working in mainstream school, and anecdotal stories from friends, of issues of isolation, stress, and burnout within the teaching profession, encouraged me to focus on this field.

Training and ongoing CPD was available to me as a teacher, however, there was no official arrangement or requirement for professional supervision and being more familiar with line management, which often left me more stressed, feeling more accountable, with more items on my to-do-list than before, I wasn’t aware how supervision could support me in my work. Becoming a Trainee Educational Psychologist (TEP) promoted a real appreciation of professional supervision and its role in supporting practice and wellbeing, and
I wonder what difference access to this would have made to the quality of support I was previously offered.

In addition to this, during my second year as a TEP, I carried out a research project which sought to gain the views of Emotional Literacy Support Assistance’s (ELSA) of the supervision they received from the educational psychologist. My background reading for this, drew my attention to the amount of research available on the impact of supervision in professions such as nursing, counselling, and social work. Less research appeared to have been undertaken with educational professions, but the research that was available in relation to the impact of supervision appeared positive, and was supported by my own research, suggested to me that supervision was already being used successfully in many professions. I was also aware that there was a worrying picture in relation to teacher wellbeing emerging from surveys such as the Teacher Wellbeing Index (TWIX, 2021), and the anecdotal evidence I was hearing from friends. It felt, to me, that supervision could help alleviate some of the challenges teachers were experiencing. Given that teachers are working with the same Children and Young People (CYP) as Emotional Literacy Support Workers (ELSAs), if seemed sensible to think that supervision could also support teachers in their practice. However, a simple search of PsychInfo produced few research articles into the impact of supervision for teachers, and a further search of the grey literature appeared to confirm that this was an area that was being highlighted but not addressed. I attended a thesis development session with the university and discussed my idea and the rationale behind it. I suggested offering teachers the opportunity
to experience supervision was the best way for them to be able to offer an informed perception and that trialling this would be a good measure of the impact it could have. I was encouraged at that time to undertake a simpler research design and that my proposal to undertake an intervention would be fraught with difficulties. This, as it turns out, was not inaccurate, however my research topic was conceived, and at this stage it was important to establish an understanding of the existing literature in relation to supervision for teachers, and identify how this topic could be approached, and how it might address a gap in the literature.

2.2 Reviewing the Literature

The rationale for conducting the literature review has been discussed above, but I found the prospect of undertaking this a daunting prospect. I sought advice from the subject librarian and my research supervisor who suggested I undertook some reading on how to approach a literature review. Advice from Cooper (1988) and Randolph (2009) proved helpful.

An initial search of the literature on databases held by the university generated an unmanageable number of papers, most of which appeared to relate to professions outside of education. Cooper (1988) suggests that literature reviews can be classified according to five characteristics: focus, goal, perspective, coverage, organisation, and audience. In terms of analysis, Cooper (1988) proposes four scenarios: an exhaustive review, an exhaustive review with selective citation, a representative sample, and a purposive sample. An exhaustive review proposes to locate and consider every
available piece of research on a certain topic. However, to conduct an
exhaustive review that is time constrained, it is essential to limit the number of
articles to a manageable number by defining the population in a confined way.
Cooper (1988) calls this an exhaustive review with selective citation. For
example, the reviewer might choose only to look at articles published in
journals, but not conference papers, but should provide a theoretical reason
for the exclusion of these.

To select papers to analyse an inclusion criterion involving the application of
supervision with teachers, and directly measuring the impact on perceived
wellbeing, was applied. This generated one paper. Given the research on
supervision I had previously read it felt unlikely that other papers did not
evaluate the impact on wellbeing in some capacity. To widen the scope the
search term 'wellbeing' was removed. Only five papers were generated that
met the criteria. The inclusion criteria, whilst restricting the breadth of
analysis, illustrated a clear lack of research into my chosen topic, thus
recommending further research.

Randolph (2009) suggests electronic searches lead to only about ten percent
of the articles that will comprise an exhaustive review but offers guidance on
how the remaining 90% might be found. Following his guidance, the reference
section of the most relevant articles was analysed to determine which of those
seemed relevant. These articles were then found, and the process repeated
until the ‘point of saturation’ was reached. In addition to qualitative research
reports, a search of the grey literature was undertaken, as this should not necessarily be regarded as having less value (Ogawa & Malen, 1991). Ogawa and Malen, (1991) emphasise the importance of creating summary databases, and Gall et al., (1996) cited in Randolph (2009) wrote that the researcher “will need to develop narrative summaries and coding schemes that take into account all the pertinent information in the documents” (p.10). I used the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative checklist to help me think about the identified papers systematically (see appendix 1).

Cooper (1988) suggests the three of the most common ways of organising a literature review are the historical format, the conceptual format, and the methodological format and in some cases, it may be most effective to mix and/or match these organisational formats. Taking this into account I decided to organise my literature review conceptually, covering the propositions in my research rationale, and, where appropriate, present the theories chronologically to show change over time.

As previously described my decision to focus on supervision was influenced by my personal experiences and my second-year research project. It may be argued that favouring this approach hindered the possibility of addressing teacher wellbeing in other ways. The inclusion of a more comprehensive comparison of supervision vs other approaches may have gone some way to negate this bias, nevertheless supervision as an approach to supporting teacher wellbeing was prioritised in the literature review. However, there is
value in providing a comprehensive discussion of supervision in the context of other approaches, rather than a weaker analysis of every possible approach.

3.0 Critical account of the development of the research practitioner

3.1 Theoretical approach

When thinking about research, researchers are encouraged to think about what the nature of knowledge is and how knowledge is created (Epistemology) and what there is to know (Ontology) (Willig, 2013). A researcher’s epistemological stance determines the specific approach taken (methodology) and the specific techniques used to gather data (method).

Firstly, I sought advice from my supervisor and from the literature. Willig (2013) encourages researchers to consider three epistemological questions, which are: what knowledge does the methodology aim to produce, what are its assumptions about the world, and what role does the researcher have in the process? Before exploring my epistemological position, how we know things, I considered my ontological perspective, what things are there to know. I initially explored the perspective of interpretivists, positivism, and critical realism. Interpretivism shares the view that social experiences rely on individual perception and need to be interpreted, however neglects to consider social influences and critically consider that which remains unobservable (Willig, 2013). Positivism maintains there is an observable truth that can be measured objectively, however fails to consider individual
interpretations of this ‘truth’ (Willig, 2013). Arguably there is an objective reality that is possible to know, and just because it’s not observable doesn’t mean it does not exist. I believe gathering the views of others will continue to better our interpretations of this reality and that which is unobservable. Therefore, I felt a critical realist ontology was most appropriate (Fleetwood & Ackroyd, 2004).

In keeping with this ontology, a critical realist epistemology which emphasises that knowledge is constructed through social interactions and influenced by structures within the system, was employed. Within this my interpretation of participants’ views and experiences will be shaped by my own experiences and perspectives.

Since teachers bring unique perspectives to the way they view and understand the world, multiple realities exist which we cannot presume to speak for all teachers, but new knowledge can be generated based on these realities. However, from a critical realist perspective, to create positive change we need both dialogue and practical activity (Fleetwood & Ackroyd, 2004). By providing a real-world experience of supervision, teachers’ perceptions are based on real-world events and influences.

During group supervision the experience is shared by the group, but everyone will construct it differently based on existing knowledge and previous experiences. The use of the word wellbeing is also a challenging concept to define, and difficult to measure, neither is it fixed, so it is important to allow
individuals to interpret the concept in an individual way. Exploring these experiences through individual interviews and enabling the participant the flexibility to take the research in any direction according to their construction, will enable themes to be ‘created’ as the research proceeds, and will provide a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject.

A qualitative methodology was deemed the most appropriate way to ascertain teachers’ perspectives, as they are concerned with “how people make sense of the world and how they experience events” (Willig, 2013. p.8) and allow us to dig into the “real” (Sayer, 2000). A qualitative approach additionally promotes a rebalancing of the relationship between the researcher and participant, as well as a focus on marginalised perspectives and experience, something I highly value. The objective of a qualitative methodology is not to predict, but to describe, and possibly explain, events and experience. I chose to explore these experiences through a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The open-ended questions in the questionnaire allowed for flexibility and individualised responses, except for one scaling question. Although generally associated with a positivist approach (Young, 2016), it can be useful for clarifying the strength of feeling attached to a specific issue. With a positivist perspective I could arguably have maintained a greater distance between myself and the data, however, in keeping with my ontological and epistemological viewpoints, I approached this with a view that although there may be some truths in terms of how people interpret numbers (i.e., 0 is the worst it could be, 10 is the best it could be), their response to their personal value is based on their construction of what that ‘worst’ and
‘best’ is for them and therefore cannot be compared to another individual. From a critical realist perspective, researchers with different experiences and beliefs could arrive at different ‘realities’ even with the most transparent qualitative method (Willig, 2013). Whilst I have taken steps to maintain the validity and reliability of my research, it is impossible to be objective when we can never truly detach from our own experiences. In this respect biases in the research process are inherent and the analysis of the data will be subjective and influence by my presence as a researcher.

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Participant recruitment

Willig (2013) likens the research process to “a form of adventure,” suggesting something new and unknown, something that is positive yet unsettling and challenging. There was certainly some trepidation in terms of myself as a researcher but also as a supervisor, and whether I had the skills to make this a positive experience for those involved. However, after further discussion with my supervisor who encouraged me to ‘be brave’, I decided to go ahead with my proposal.

A major barrier to conducting this research was gaining access to participants. In the initial stages, attempts to recruit schools to take part were made through contacting head teachers in my placement authority by email. Due to the number of schools in the authority it was decided that a blanket email would be sent. On reflection there were several problems with this. The timing
of the emails was poor, as it was approaching the end of the academic year and staff were likely to be preoccupied and not yet thinking about the autumn term. In addition to this some did not go directly to the head teacher, therefore relied on other staff forwarding the information. Given supervision in schools is a relatively under researched area, it is possible the importance of what I was proposing was undervalued, and emails went unread and ignored. Those that were read by head teachers or other senior staff would have relied on their interest and motivation for the research area. Pre-liminary discussions with schools, prior to sending the information by email, may have improved the response rate. On reflection this is something that could have been achieved through headteacher cluster meetings. Also, my own investment in, and value of, supervision may have resulted in the preconceived notion that schools would welcome this support and perhaps the original information sheet did sufficiently emphasise the benefits of participating. In the future I would spend more time considering the most effective way to approach and engage schools. It has also made me reflect on the busy environment of the school and how something that might be viewed as ‘additional’ might be perceived negatively, and convincing schools otherwise is likely to require a trusting relationship which I had not had time to build.

I was eventually granted a meeting with a head teacher and a senior staff member of a primary school in one local authority, and later a senior staff member of a secondary school a different local authority. Recruitment is one area of the research that is ‘controlled’ by the researcher in terms of how the research is introduced, and how the research goals and the position of the
researcher is explained (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2006). The initial research design proposed that once head teachers had indicated an interest in their school participating, I would speak with potential participants directly during an information giving session. Unfortunately, this did not happen, and I relied on participants reading the information forwarded and being motivated enough to contact me from this. Disputably this could have biased my results in terms of those who chose to take part already had a positive view of supervision, however, I would argue this was not the case. Participants expressed varying views and experiences of supervision and reasons for taking part in the study. However, had I had an opportunity to speak with a wider audience, the number of participants may have increased.

In the initial research design, a control group was proposed. Due to the difficulties encountered with initial recruitment, not enough participants were recruited to allow for a control group. This was unfortunate and would have allowed for comparison to the intervention group, however arguably their views of supervision, gathered through the questionnaire, would have been similar to those in the intervention group prior to taking part in the supervisory process, and would likely have not changed in the post-intervention questionnaire. Although it may have been better to have a control group, I do not feel that not having one has significantly impacted my data analysis or results.
3.2.2 Data collection and analysis

Data was collected via pre- and post-measure questionnaires and one-to-one interviews. In terms of the interview, the British Psychological Society (BPS) (2011) suggests participants should set the parameters of the topic, not the other way around, this is so that the researcher does not impose their understanding of the phenomenon on the participant’s narrative (Smith, 2003). Balancing the need, and want, to preserve the participants’ meanings and “bracketing off” previous experience and preconceptions (Sultana, 2014) was challenging. Whilst it is impossible to completely avoid subjectivism (Daly, 2017), it is important to be mindful of how this may affect the direction of questioning. Being mindful of this, and my inexperience and confidence as a researcher, perhaps constrained the ‘flow’ of the interview and my relative reluctance to defer away from the pre-designed questions.

In addition to this, the interviews were conducted online via Teams. This offered convenience to both me, due to the location of the school, and to participants in terms of time away from the classroom. Face-to-face interviews has typically been viewed as the ‘ideal way’ to collect interview data; however, researchers are increasingly using virtual methods as extensions to the more traditional methods (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Given the recent circumstances in relation to COVID-19 this is likely to have accelerated. Many of the disadvantages suggested by Braun & Clarke (2013), such as building rapport, did not apply due to my active involvement in the research up to this point; and conducting interviews online allowed me to record and transcribe immediately, with no loss of raw data, and therefore saved time. However,
Weger (2014) suggests participants who receive active listening responses feel more understood than participants who receive simple acknowledgements. I would argue my active listening skills were hampered using online interviews and on reflection may have limited the richness of the data collected, however the open-endedness of the questions arguably encouraged participants to provide in-depth and detailed responses and discuss that which is important to them.

To encourage the interviewee to share their personal experiences, the interviewer aims to create a welcoming, nonthreatening environment, where both parties are equal (de la Croix, 2018). An environment I had strived to create throughout the process. However, I feel there is inconsistency between this and the more formal publication of data later, and I was keen to reflect on this and how I could ensure this was done with integrity and compassion. Karnieli-Miller et al. (2006) suggest that participants should be asked to read their written transcripts and be involved in the gathering and confirmation of themes. They suggest this decreases the risk of misinterpretation. However, participants’ reservations may lead the researcher to omit or revise the research findings and although coming from a desire to empower may be perceived as threatening (Forbat and Henderson, 2005). This was something I considered at the proposal stage as I felt apprehensive about accurately interpreting other people’s views and reporting these within the research. I also felt that any negative participant reactions would be better dealt with collaboratively than if left to read the final paper. After careful consideration I felt the practicalities of revisiting every interview to negotiate themes was out
of the scope of the current research. However, on reflection the relationship between myself and the participants matters as much as the final analysis, therefore I think a follow-up group session to discuss, not the content of interviews, but the themes that I had extracted might have been helpful, and this is something that I will be mindful of in future research. In the future I might also consider how I include participants in other aspects of the research, such as generating research questions and selection of the supervisory model used, thereby encouraging a more participatory approach to the research. As Ryan and Deci (2000) suggest, it is important to be mindful of what the participant is, or isn’t, gaining from the research, as this can also affect motivation to participate (Ryan & Deci, 2000), and co-constructing the goals of the study may have increased response rates and participation.

In keeping with social constructionism, the language we choose to use is significant, and research within psychology tends to use the terms ‘interviewee’, ‘participant’ and ‘interviewer’, which imply a hierarchical relationship (Karnieli-Miller et al., 2006). As EPs we generally take a collaborative stance, one where relationships are equal, therefore using the term ‘collaborator, ‘coparticipant’ or ‘coresearcher’ or ‘facilitator’ may indicate a more collaborative and co-constructed experience and data analysis. By offering a participatory experience through the activity of supervision, I believe at the time I felt I was offering an experience and a process that was collaborative and co-constructed. On reflection however, perhaps some of the
language and terms used created barriers to this. I might be more mindful of the language I chose to use in the future.

During viva it was suggested that my analysis of the data was more descriptive than analytical. It was suggested a review of Braun and Clarke’s more recent work on thematic analysis would be helpful and returning to the ‘refine and rename’ stage would aid me in creating more conceptual themes rather than domain summaries. Having reflected on their work further I feel that my concerns in relation to misinterpreting the voice of my participants hindered my coding and analysis of the data. Braun and Clarke (2021) suggest the subjectivity of the encoder is seen as integral to the analysis of the data. Whilst re-visiting my themes and codes I have tried to embrace this subjectivity and make positive changes to how the chapter is presented. I feel perhaps I did not engage with the data in a truly active, reflexive, and flexible way from the beginning, rather using TA in more procedural way. I have also reflected on the questions I chose to ask during the interviews. Whilst driven by the literature and my research questions I feel they perhaps restricted the scope of the data gathered and a more flexible and responsive approach to the interviews would have provided a richer data set. I have already reflected on my inexperience and confidence as a researcher, and I feel the viva and the subsequent advice has offered a valuable learning experience that I can build on with future research opportunities.
3.2.3 Researcher as supervisor

I spent a lot of time reading about different models of supervision available and the advantages and disadvantages of these. As I had found many of the approaches used in teaching sessions with the university helpful, I was keen to find a framework that allowed me to be flexible enough in my approach that I was able to make use of these, but still offered me enough structure and guidance due to me being a novice in terms of facilitating supervision. I decided the most appropriate model of supervision for me was the Cyclical Model (Page & Wosket, 2014). I believe this model served me well and offered me guidance through the process as a whole and within sessions.

However, some sessions were less structured than others, highlighting the importance of individuals coming to supervision prepared to get the most out of their time. I found this difficult to navigate, balancing not wanting to put pressure on teachers to feel it necessary to ‘bring’ something to supervision, with ensuring there was a purpose to our sessions. I wondered if my need for the security offered by the more structured sessions impeded my flexibility. Arguably, this is likely something that would develop as my experience and skills as a supervisor develop. On reflection, the reduced structure was not necessarily a bad thing, I believe we had some helpful and insightful conversations that led to discussion in relation to practice that we may not have had otherwise. However, it is also possible that my own agenda in terms of the research outcomes influenced the direction these sessions took. I had already given some thought to my role as the researcher and the supervisor, and how these two roles interacted, and the affect they potentially had on the
research. I discussed this with my research supervisor and concluded that, although my role as researcher and supervisor may influence my perceptions and interpretations, it would give me a deeper understanding and interpretation of the views of teachers having lived the experience with them. I believe this is more beneficial to the research than any bias is harmful.

Page and Wosket (2014) suggest that personal and professional development cannot be separated and talk about the practitioner’s ‘shadow’. That is, the aspects of self that are currently and consistently out of conscious awareness. They refer to two ‘shadows’; a personal one and a role one. These aspects can influence our thoughts, feelings, and actions. In addition to this Shohet and Shohet (2020) suggest there are no resistant supervisees, and in such circumstances the supervisor needs to look at themselves and what assumptions they might be making or aspects they have not considered and suggest some helpful questions that can be used as a form of self-supervision. To think about and reflect on my ‘shadows’, what I might overlook unconsciously, and how this might influence me as a researcher and a supervisor, and the supervisory relationships, I looked at the social GGRRAAACCEEEESSSS framework (Burnham, 2012). The acronym describes aspects of personal and social identify which affords people different levels of power and privilege. This helped me be more aware of how my experience might impact on my understanding of and approach to children and teachers.

As a novice supervisor supervision was important to ensure I was working within my competencies and professional standards. It also helped increase
my awareness of interactions with and responses to supervisees both in relation to their pupils and myself. Having separate research supervision allowed for the time to be used constructively without being distracted by other matters. It was helpful for me to recognise the importance of identifying areas that were going well as well as areas of improvement and development, and the way my supervisor constructively challenged me helped me feel listened to, supported, and valued. It also helped me think about research, theories, and models to explore difficulties and gaps in my knowledge and explore my decision-making throughout the process. Supervision provided me with an opportunity for personal and professional growth. I always left the sessions feeling that I had a way forward with the issue I had brought to the session. The ideas and plan I generated in the supervision session were usually helpful in moving an issue forward to some sort of resolution, which, like the supervisees in this research, I felt was important.

3.3 Ethical consideration

In addition to the consideration of participants involvement in the study, the most prominent ethical consideration for this research was the emotional and mental health of participants by being asked to discuss personal issues to them within in a group context. Pressure to participate was also an identified concern. To minimise the risk of this, information forms clearly stated the voluntary nature of the study and again highlighted the right to withdraw at any stage of the process should they choose to take part. During the contracting stage all stakeholders were again reminded of this and asked to confirm they were participating voluntarily. Dates and times for sessions were
agreed and a commitment to these were confirmed. Through collaboration with an identified member of senior staff the implementation of sessions was proposed to minimise the impact on academic learning and on school resources. Safeguarding processes were also established, as were the issues of confidentiality. In addition to this, participants were given access, via email, to the researcher outside of planned sessions and, as the researcher, I engaged in regular supervision with both my university research supervisor and my fieldwork placement supervisor to understand and manage the limitations or extent of my own abilities, in line with the BPS (2018) and the Health and Care Professionals Council’s (HCPC) (2019) ethical guidelines.

Each session began with a ‘check-in’ to assess level of need to prioritise time allocation and ended with a final review to ensure group members felt contained (Bion, 1984) and unharmed (McNicoll, 2008). Records of each session were kept as a reflective tool in terms of moving forward for the next session. Debrief forms were developed for participants, including information sheets for those not selected to take part in the supervisory sessions, which included links to other resources.


4.0 Contribution to knowledge and dissemination

4.1 Contribution to knowledge

I feel this research study was successful in eliciting the views of teachers about the supervision they received and how this support has impacted on their practice and wellbeing. However, there are some limitations to this research and areas that may warrant future research.

In terms of teacher wellbeing, I believe this research has offered a greater understanding of how supervision can support teachers in mainstream schools. It is particularly important to note the findings relating to increases in support seeking behaviour and improved staff relations, as this demonstrates the additional benefits of implementing supervision with teachers in mainstream schools. Additionally, findings that were not necessarily expected emerged from the interpretation of the data. For example, how teachers believe they are perceived by others outside the profession. If perceived negatively, this could impact their confidence and commitment to the role. I feel this is an area that warrants further exploration in the future.

The lack of representation of teachers working in secondary school is one of the gaps within this research. Several measures were taken to collect equal numbers of views from both primary and secondary school teachers. The delivery of sessions was also inconsistent due to the timing of the sessions. It is disappointing that this group is not more represented, but it does raises
important questions about how secondary school perceive and support teachers. It has made me reflect on how the systems operating within these settings might be different to those in primary schools. In my view, exploring the views of teachers’ specifically within these settings is important, as well as examining potential systemic structures is worthy of future research.

Validity and reliability arguably rely on the replicability of a study. However, in line with a critical realist perspective people’s perspectives are constantly changing through their experiences, and as a result it is unlikely that this research could be replicated, and exact same results produced. The interpretation of the data is also likely to have been influenced by my own experiences Therefore, it is important to view the current research as being specific to this context, rather than generalisable to the whole teaching population. However, this research may assist others, within education, to consider how teachers can be supported and the benefits that might be offered via supervision.

4.2 Dissemination

Disseminating the findings of this study may help raise EP and senior managers understanding of how they can support teachers’ wellbeing. It may also help raise awareness for teachers in terms of what might be helpful in managing their own wellbeing. With this in mind, the relevant stakeholders for the dissemination of this research are likely to be mainstream primary and secondary schools, and trainee and practicing educational psychologists. Publication through forums such as TES (formerly known as the Times
Education Supplement), EPNET and relevant journals are likely to be the most accessible ways, together with presentation of the study in headteacher forums and relevant conferences. As I am taking up employment in the authority where the idea for this study first emerged, there will be opportunities to promote staff wellbeing through the findings and hopefully an opportunity to evaluate the longer-term impact and practicalities of implementing supervision in mainstream schools.

5.0 Conclusion

This reflective summary has aimed to reflect critically on the research process, exploring the strengths and limitations at each stage of the process, and how it has contributed to knowledge. The process has been challenging but rewarding and has taught me a lot about myself and the decisions I have chosen to make. I am certain that what I have learnt will not only inform any future research I conduct but will also influence my own practice as I go out into the ‘field’.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Search terms for the literature review

A scoping exercise was undertaken between July 2021 and November 2021 using the search terms in Figure 1 (the asterisk (*) was used in some of the searches to broaden the search on some of the words), and the inclusion/exclusion criteria found in Table 1, to search the following databases: ASSIA, Scopus, PsychINFO and the British Index of Education (BRI).

Figure 1

Illustration of search terms

Supervision OR group supervision OR professional supervision OR clinical supervision

Education* psycholog* OR educator* OR teacher* OR education OR school OR education OR headteacher OR head teacher OR head teachers OR senco OR teaching staff

Teaching staff wellbeing OR teaching staff wellbeing OR teacher* wellbeing OR teacher* well-being
Table 1

**Inclusion/Exclusion criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies pertaining to the views of supervision of teachers within the school setting.</td>
<td>Studies pertaining to other professions such as social workers and Health practitioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies pertaining to the implementation of supervision for teachers within the school setting.</td>
<td>Studies conducted outside of the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies published in peer-reviewed journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist for qualitative research was used to appraise the most relevant articles (see table below).

The inclusion criteria, whilst restricting the breadth of analysis, illustrated a clear lack of research into my chosen topic, thus recommending further research. The reference section of the most relevant articles was analysed to determine which of those seemed relevant. These articles were then found, and the process repeated until the ‘point of saturation’ was reached. In addition to qualitative research reports, a search of the grey literature was undertaken using Google Scholar and the Cardiff Library book search. Internet searches into relevant legislations were also conducted. Relevant journals such as ‘Educational Psychology in Practice’ were also explored for relevant articles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Aims to explore how teachers in SEBD schools understand and experience supervision and the importance they give to it. Explore the role of the EP in providing supervision.</td>
<td>Yes - Understand the perceptions of staff in a SEMH school in relation to the strengths and weaknesses of involvement in supervision groups. Aim of the groups were to support staff working in difficult circumstances by providing opportunities to discuss with their associates the social and emotional pressures and challenges that working in a SEMH special school pose and, though the process, improve cohesion amongst colleagues.</td>
<td>Yes - Project identified by author from previous experience as a SENCo and need for development of professional skills. 5 RQs identified inc. understanding of purpose of supervision, impact on practice and well-being.</td>
<td>Yes - Follow-up study from Reid &amp; Soan (2019). Aim to provide in-depth narrative of the lived experience of headteachers</td>
<td>Yes - Research uses 'consultancy' supervision interchangeably with 'clinical' supervision. Facilitate wellbeing of participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Is a qualitative methodology appropriate? | Yes - Social constructivism - exploring how feelings, thoughts and behaviours may be constructed within a relevant social context. Interviews only. | Yes - Group supervision offered by independent experienced supervisor. Case study - Focus on the experienced of those attending the groups | Yes - 6x2 hour sessions to four participants on a one-to-one basis, and to three participants in a group setting over one academic year. | Yes - interviews. | Yes - 1:1 supervision so staff did not need to be 'mindful' of others in the first instance. Discussion of contracting process. |
rather than the content of the groups. Relativist perception of reality in keeping with the constructivist research paradigm.

Independent, experienced supervisor delivered either on school premises or alternative location. Egan's (2007) model of supervision used.

| Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research? | Yes - 2 SEBD schools in England – school A 5-11; school B 6-16; convenience sampling was used (n=8) | Yes - Potential participants provided with information via posters and emails as to how the groups would run, sign up was voluntary, allocation to group was in order of take up. 5/6 in each group which remained constant (apart from to replacements) – 17 members of staff – 3 male, 14 female (6 teachers, 10 TAs, 1 office manager) – 12 participated in the interviews (11 female) | Yes - Participants identified through the Diocese and all participants were voluntary. Participants were provided with information sheets and opportunity to discuss the research. Headteacher: Senco not stipulated. | Yes – Participants were recruited by Reid & Soan during the first phases of the research. However, only headteachers were interviewed – an explanation for this is not given. | Yes - Some staff, play therapists, were familiar with supervision, others were not. First session was compulsory after which all staff were given the option to continue or not. Participants for intervention and completed 175 (n= 7 teachers, 8 TAs, 1 non-teaching; 15 female, 2 male. Interviews = 5 teachers, 4 TAs; 8 females, 1 male). |

<p>| Were the data collected in a way that would allow an accurate analysis? | Yes - | Yes - | Yes - | Yes – | Yes - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>way that addressed the research issue?</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews adapted from Austin (2010) semi-structured 1:1 interview, 45 minutes, undertaken by 2 independent research assistants on behalf of the 176 researchers. Supervisor interview was undertaken by first author. Interview questions were provided prior to interview (Hart and Bond, 1995). Interview questions not provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data were collected, at the end of a three-year period of supervision, via interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre and post questionnaires and post intervention interviews. Participants must have engaged in supervision for a minimum of two a half terms. Qualitative and quantitative data collected, open and closed questions. Data presented using combination of approaches. Different supervisor and interview but no details given. Questionnaires consisted of multiple-choice statements on the nature of supervision, and open-ended questions. Pre-supervision questionnaires had 5 questions. Post-supervision questionnaire had the same format but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an in-depth description of the analysis process?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a clear statement of findings?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1. participants perceived their well-being was threatened when dealing with challenging behaviour - relational stress identified as a key factor of high levels of stress 2. school organisational climate - paperwork, resources and unsupportive SLT + stress inducing; supportive climate + less stress and source of nurture and professional development 3. need for school based, collaborative problem-solving through staff sharing was highlighted - provides practical and supportive function in reducing anxiety and stress. 4. need for nurturing context in which to rationalise and reflect on emotional components within context of team support was highlighted, also need to develop personal support mechanisms. 5. lack of</td>
<td>- 1. See table on pg. 269. 1. Due to confidential nature of supervision it may have limited potential to influence policy or organisational change, however this research suggest that it can empower those involved to instigate change outside of supervision (indirect influence). Researchers suggest a nominated spokesperson could feedback general, anonymised information to the headteacher which would enable a feedback mechanism whilst maintaining trust within the group. 2. Although half of participants referred to an infrequency of sessions (fortnightly) as a drawback, researchers suggest this 'infrequency' may prevent the negative effects of co-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consensus as to what supervision for teachers looked like in the real world of an SEBD school. 6. EPs generally seen as a reactive, 'within' child role, rather than proactive and preventative/systemic level; limited perception of how EP could play role in promoting emotional well-being of teaching staff through supervision, no understood or seen as a skill of the EP.

- rumination from taking place (haggard et al., 2011). 3. all felt able to contribute and this was down to the skilled supervisor but acknowledged the importance of the need to feel included. 4. Disturbance to group dynamics if new members join the group. (Researchers suggest it is important to replenish the group but that that how this is done needs to be considered at the contracting or reviewing stage). Also suggest need to consider if existing member gets promotion considering Jackson (2008) - not include SLT in group (compromise others).

Can the results be generalised? | Yes (with caution) - SEBD school. No experience of supervision. Convenience sample therefore need to exert caution in terms of generalisability; small, self- | Yes (with caution) - Specific school context (SEMH school) with specific supervisor, however highlights what can be achieved and | Yes (with caution) - Small sample population. Across school supervision. Senior leaders rather than classroom | Yes (with caution) - Specific and specialist context. 1:1 supervision (rather than group). Not all teachers. Highlights similar

leading to change, self-esteem generally, self-esteem specific to workplace, opportunity to offload/de-stress (no info on how themes were generated). Interviews: identified as a place for 'offloading' and opportunity to see things from another perspective. Positive impact on the children either directly or indirectly.
selected sample; 7 of the 8 were female. Varying lengths of service/experience - may have impacted on the responses. Therefore may be relevant to other school contexts. Researchers acknowledge limitation in that the voices of those who did not attend the groups was not heard, a wider range of viewpoints would have provided a greater degree of validity, offer an alternative perspective and a more rounded assessment of the value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety. No baseline data was collected therefore no comparative data on which to judge the effectiveness of the initiative. Pre & Post data was collected by Austin (2010) teachers, however, data supports national data concerning professional and emotional feelings within teaching. Authors also suggest supervision may help with staff retention.

| Has the relationship between researcher and participants been | Yes - Researchers acknowledge the subjective nature of their data collection and analysis/interpretation; participant bias (self-selected); linguistic | Yes - Authors acknowledge first authors position as deputy headteacher and as line manager to some of the supervisees. | Yes – One author has previous experience as a SENCo in a school – not stipulated if this is a school taking part in the research. Supervisors | No – But this was a follow-up to Reid & Soan paper therefore assumption is researchers are external to the school. | Yes - Researcher acknowledges the potential biases that can arise from same supervisor and interviewer and that needs and supportive function of supervision therefore likely to be relevant to other populations. |
| adequately considered? | variability in terms of understanding of the term 'supervision'; and the limited scope and generalisability (small sample). However, considering limited research in this area the research felt the research highlight some useful areas. | were external to the school. | this could not be the same, however doesn't offer any further details on who these are. Suggestion that the supervisor is from another profession, no further info offered for supervisor or interviewer. Duplication of information from questionnaire and interview however perhaps provides for more robust findings, deeper and richer meaning (triangulation?) (Fuller and Petch, 1999). |
| Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? | Yes | Yes – To avoid possible biased responses and ethical concerns, interviews were conducted by two independent research assistants. Transcription was completed by a third partly to ensure anonymity. | Yes – Data was analysed by each author separately and then shared/discussed. | No – But addressed in original research by Reid & Soan. | Yes |
| Is there any other information would like to have been included? | Yes - Unclear why they chose school that currently do not embed supervision - reference to effective processes in other schools not part of the study. No information provided in relation to what the structure of supervision looked like currently, participant experiences of supervision, supervision model, who supervises etc, if any. What other well-being initiates were being offered by the school? | Yes - No details of supervision model used or details of supervision sessions e.g., duration, number of sessions etc. No details of school composition other than number of pupils. No copy of interview questions or how these questions were composed. No background of independent supervisor given. No background information in relation to what participants currently/previously received in terms of supervision. No information on contracting etc. | Yes - No details of supervision model used. Participant experience of supervision or what school already offers. Information in relation to the supervisor and the interviewer. How the ‘themes’ were generated. |
| How valuable is the research? | Valuable Although no intervention provided and research conducted in SEBD school, it offers insight into the perceived role of the EP and teachers' understanding of supervision. | Valuable Participants highlights value of supervision groups on their functioning within the work context and their practice however few explicit reflections as to how the groups have influenced this. | Valuable Research ran over three years offering insight into the benefits of supervision over a longer period. | Valuable |
Researchers suggest this might be because of the focus of the groups and research question.
Appendix 2: Questionnaire for pre- and post-data collection

Pre-measure questionnaire

(1) What is your understanding of the purpose of supervision?

(2) What aspects of your role do you think benefit from/would benefit from engaging in a process of supervision?

(3) What do you think the impact of engaging in supervision has/would have in terms of your wellbeing³?

(4) What do you currently do that supports your wellbeing? How effective do you feel this is?

(5) On a scale of 0 – 10, where would you rate your current wellbeing? *(where 0 = the worst it’s ever been and 10 = the best it’s ever been).*

Post-measure questionnaire

(1) What is your understanding of the purpose of supervision?

(2) What aspects of your role do you think benefit from/would benefit from engaging in a process of supervision?

(3) What do you think the impact of engaging in supervision has in terms of your well-being?

(4) What are you doing now to support your wellbeing that you were not doing before?

(5) On a scale of 0 – 10, where would you rate your current wellbeing? *(where 0 = the worst it’s ever been and 10 = the best it’s ever been).*

---
³ Well-being is the experience of health, happiness, and prosperity. It includes having good mental health, high life satisfaction, a sense of meaning or purpose, and ability to manage stress. *(Davis, 2019)*
Appendix 3: Interview schedule for semi-structured interviews

Prior to starting, participants will be reminded about the aim of the study and their right to withdraw.

1. In what way has your understanding of supervision changed?
2. How have your expectations of supervision changed?
3. In what way has supervision supported your wellbeing?
4. What are you doing now that you weren’t doing before?
5. Is there anything else you have noticed?
Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Dear Headteacher,

I am a second-year trainee educational psychologist studying in the School of Psychology, Cardiff University. For my doctoral thesis, I am carrying out research on the impact group supervision has on teacher wellbeing. While supervision groups are increasingly being recommended in order to support the development and wellbeing of staff in schools, there has been little research examining the efficacy or perceived effectiveness of these groups for practice or staff wellbeing.

In the current climate of pressures faced by teachers, rising levels of poor mental health and having experienced the benefits supervision can provide first-hand, I feel strongly about the need for evidence-based practice in the support of teachers’ wellbeing.

---

Well-being is the experience of health, happiness, and prosperity. It includes having good mental health, high life satisfaction, a sense of meaning or purpose, and ability to manage stress. (Davis, 2019)
Why do teachers need supervision?

Supervision is a form of support and professional development that can assist teachers to manage both the personal and professional demands of their work, supports the wellbeing of individual professionals by allowing them to address elements of their practice that are of direct concern to them and allows for structured reflection on practice, which in turn has shown to benefit children and young people, increase productivity of staff members, enable staff to manage stress better and develop healthier coping strategies, improve job satisfaction which can support retention and reduce burnout of staff. Please find further information on supervision attached.

A supervision programme based on robust evidence-based research has been designed and aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

What taking part of the research will involve

I hope to recruit two small groups (3-4) of teaching staff. Participants will be asked to attend one hour-long group supervision a week/fortnightly for a total of six sessions which would be delivered by myself and take place in school. Participants will be asked to complete a pre- and post-measure questionnaire (which will take no longer than 10 minutes) and will be invited to take part in a
1:1 interview at a time convenient to them following the completion of the group supervision sessions.

An additional ‘control’ group will be recruited, who will be asked to complete a pre- and post-measure questionnaire in the same time frame as the intervention group. This is to compare the impact of the group supervision sessions against teachers who did not receive any input. The control group will be contributing to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools and will also receive information in relation to available wellbeing resources.

I anticipate your response to this exciting opportunity to be a part of the growing research into group supervision in schools, and the potential impact it can have on the wellbeing of staff and young people. If you are interested in your school taking part in this research, please contact me via the contact details below to arrange a meeting to discuss this further. I am happy to provide an information or question and answer session to school staff if this would be helpful.

Warm regards,

Louise Murray

Email: Murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk
Supervised by: Dr Jonna Hill

Email: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC). Any complaints should be directed to:
Secretary of the Ethics Committee, School of Psychology Cardiff University, Tower Building, Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3AT. Tel: 029 2087 0360. Email: psychethics@cardiff.ac.uk
Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

You are being asked to take part in a research project exploring the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing.

What is the research about?
While supervision groups are increasingly being recommended in order to support the development and wellbeing of staff in schools, there has been little research examining the efficacy or perceived effectiveness of these groups for practice or staff wellbeing (see information sheet attached). The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

Why have you been invited to take part in the research?
You are being asked to take part in the research because your school has elected to take part in this exciting project. It is believed that you will be able to make a valuable contribution to this research.

**Do I have to take part in the research?**

You do not have to take part in this research, neither do you have to give a reason why you do not want to take part. Should you agree to be part of this research you will be free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason.

**Who is the researcher?**

My name is Louise Murray. I am a trainee educational psychologist studying in the School of Psychology, Cardiff University. This research is for my doctoral thesis. My email address is murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk. Please contact me should you have any concerns or questions.

**How will I be involved in the research?**

I hope to recruit two small groups (3-4) of teaching staff (intervention group). You will be asked to attend one hour-long group supervision a week/fortnightly for a total of six sessions which would be delivered by myself and take place in school. It will be an opportunity for you to address elements of your practice that are of direct concern to you and will provide you with time to reflect on your practice. You will also be asked to complete a pre- and post-measure questionnaire (which will take approximately 10 – 20 minutes) and
you will be invited to take part in a 1:1 interview at a time convenient to
yourself following the completion of the group supervision sessions.

An additional control group will be recruited, who will be asked to complete a
pre- and post-measure questionnaire in the same time frame as the
intervention group. This is to compare the impact of the group supervision
sessions against teachers who did not receive any input.

If you agree to take part in this research, you will be randomly allocated to
either the intervention group or the control group.

**Will the information/data I provide be confidential?**
The only person that will have access to any of your personal data will be the
researcher. Any data provided by participants will be treated and stored in
accordance with GDPR regulations. The pre- and post-measure
questionnaires will be completed via an anonymous link to an online Qualtrics
questionnaire. No identifiable information will be requested in the consent
form or the questionnaire. Any data provided by participants will be stored on
the secure server for Qualtrics.

All records from the supervision sessions will be confidential and will not be
shared with anyone other than the researcher unless there is a risk to yourself
or other. Any audio recordings of interviews will be transcribed, anonymised,
and deleted. Any reports or publications generated from the research will be
anonymised. It will not be possible to identify any individual by anyone other
than the researcher.
How long will the research last?
The six group supervision sessions are expected to take place in the summer term over six-twelve weeks. Senior management have agreed to support the prioritisation of participation in supervision. Follow-up interviews are also expected to take place at the end of the summer term.

What will happen to the results of the research?
The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
Your participation will be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools.

Who do I contact if I have a complaint?
If you have any questions about the research you can contact the research supervisor at Cardiff University, Dr Joanna hill via email: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk @cardiff.ac.uk.

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC). Any complaints should be directed to:
Secretary of the Ethics Committee School of Psychology Cardiff University
What are the next steps?
If you are happy to participate in this research, please contact myself at murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

This research is conducted within the requirements of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and in accordance with both the British Psychological Society’s Ethical Code of conduct (BPS, 2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC, 2016).
Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 6: Additional information for participants

What can support staff wellbeing?

The diagram below has been taken from ‘Supporting staff wellbeing in schools’ from the Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families. https://www.annafreud.org/media/11451/3rdanna-freud-booklet-staff-wellbeing-new-address-april-2020.pdf

It outlines universal, targeted and specialist support services which can be incorporated into a school’s staff wellbeing strategy.

![Diagram showing support services]

- **Specialist Support**
  - Employee Assistance programmes
  - Crisis support
  - Referrals to occupational health

- **Targeted Support**
  - **Supervision**
    - Training around mental health
    - Regular wellbeing check-in meetings for all staff using a personal or peer support model
    - Wellbeing events for staff

- **Universal Support**
  - Staff wellbeing policy
  - Dedicated staff rooms
  - Drop-in sessions for any concerns
  - Staff wellbeing team established and supported to offer regular events
  - Staff education on child and family mental health
  - Culture of no blame and stigma for mental health needs of school community
  - Feedback boxes where staff can share (anonymously) ideas for improvement of school
It is important to clarify what supervision is and what it is not and how it differs from some of the more common professional development activities such as coaching and mentoring (see figure 1 and figure 2 below).

Figure 1: Defining supervision: The cornerstone for all stakeholders including the supervisee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision is...</th>
<th>Supervision is not...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Affirming</td>
<td>• A performance management tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• About listening and being heard</td>
<td>• Therapy (although it may be therapeutic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A distinct professional learning and development tool</td>
<td>• Counselling or an opportunity to practice as a counsellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A safe space to question and challenge</td>
<td>• Part of the reporting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A structured framework for process and reflection</td>
<td>• A teaching session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supportive</td>
<td>• A judgement or assessment of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-driven/self-owned by participants</td>
<td>• Mentoring or coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supportive of personal accountability</td>
<td>• A place for blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An exploration of the relationship between actions and feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Helen and Douglas House (2014). Clinical Supervision Toolkit.
Figure 2: Supervision and other forms of professional learning and development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Mentoring</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enables the development of a specific aspect of a professional learner's practice*</td>
<td>• Supports professional learner through significant career transitions</td>
<td>• Development of knowledge, competence and confidence in everyday practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coach is usually chosen by professional learner</td>
<td>• Led by experienced colleagues with knowledge of the requirements of the role</td>
<td>• Explores the relational aspects of the professional role across the different working contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coach has knowledge and expertise relevant to the goals of the professional learner</td>
<td>• Broker access to a range of increasingly self-directed learning opportunities</td>
<td>• Explores and helps to process the emotional impact of the professional role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on individual 'cases' (pupils, practitioners, organisational structures and systems) related to SEND provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Process not expert/same experience led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Agenda participant led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• On-going throughout career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carroll (2020) Professional Supervision: Guidance for SENCOs and school leaders

https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10090818/1/Carroll_SENCO%20Supervision%20Guidance%20February%202020.pdf
Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

You are being asked to take part in a research project exploring the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing. Before you decide whether you would like to participate, please take your time, and read the following information carefully.

What is the research about?
The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting. Questionnaire responses will be used to compare the perceptions of supervision and its impact on teacher wellbeing before and after the intervention. They will also be used to compare the impact of the group supervision sessions against teachers who did not receive any input.

Why have you been invited to take part in the research?
You are being asked to take part in the research because you have previously indicated it is something you would like to participate in.

**Do I have to take part in the research?**

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You can withdraw at any stage and there may be some questions you cannot answer, but you are encouraged to carry on with questions can. Before you decide whether you would like to participate, please take your time and read the following information carefully.

**Who is the researcher?**

My name is Louise Murray. I am a trainee educational psychologist studying in the School of Psychology, Cardiff University. This research is for my doctoral thesis. My email address is murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk. Please contact me should you have any concerns or questions.

**How will I be involved in the research?**

At this stage, regardless of whether you are in the intervention or control group you are being asked to complete a pre-measure questionnaire. The questionnaire should not take longer than 10 minutes. You will be asked to complete a second post-measure questionnaire at a later date.

**Will the information/data I provide by confidential?**

No identifying information will be requested in the consent form or questionnaire. Any data provided will be treated and stored in accordance
with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below). This also applies to any reports or publications generated from the research. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, without given a reason, however once you have submitted the questionnaire, the data will not be traceable to you and so it will not be possible to recover it, and it will no longer be possible to remove it.

What will happen to the results of the research?
The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

What are the next steps?
Please read the consent form below. If you agree to each statement, click ‘agree’ and begin the questionnaire. If you do not, click ‘disagree’. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Supervised by: Dr Joanna Hill (Department of Psychology, Cardiff University); E-mail: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.
This research is conducted within the requirements of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and in accordance with both the British Psychological Society’s Ethical Code of conduct (BPS, 2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC, 2016).
Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
## Appendix 8: Consent form – pre- and post-measure questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research Title:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Researcher:</strong></td>
<td>Louise Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for participants for the above study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I am free to ask any questions at any time (contact details provided above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my participation is voluntary, and I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. However, withdrawal is only possible up to the time the questionnaire is submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that examples of my experiences will be noted and analysed but only presented in an anonymous state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that completed questionnaires will be treated and stored in accordance with GDPR regulations (see privacy statement below), and any reports and publications generated from this data will not have any identifiable information in them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the researcher must work in accordance to the Ethical Code of Conduct set by the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and The British Psychological Society (2009).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in the above research project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer.
(inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 9: Debrief – Pre-measure questionnaire

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Thank you for taking part in this study.

Purpose of the research
The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

Your participation is not only greatly appreciated by the researcher, but the data generated will be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools. The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.
What happens next

You will be sent another link to a questionnaire in approximately 8 weeks’ time. The purpose of this will be to compare the perceptions of supervision and its impact on teacher wellbeing pre- and post- intervention.

If you are part of the intervention group, you will be contacted via email shortly and provided with further information. In the meantime, should you have any further questions, the researcher is contactable via the following email address: Louise Murray: murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk. Alternatively, you may contact the research supervisor, via the following email address: Dr Joanna Hill: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

You are reminded that your responses will be kept in accordance with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below) and that any reports or publications generated from the research will not contain any identifiable information. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for your time.

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 10: Information sheet for participants – intervention

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

You are being asked to take part in a research project exploring the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing.

What is the research about?
The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

Why have you been invited to take part in the research?
You will have already completed a pre-measure questionnaire; you are now being asked to take part in group supervision to which you have been randomly allocated.

How will I be involved in the research?
You are being asked to undertake six one-hour long supervision sessions facilitated by myself. There will be a maximum of 4 people in the group, all of whom will be from your school and will not include any member of senior management. It is hoped these sessions will be undertaken face-to-face within school; however, they may take place via an online platform such as Microsoft Teams.

**Do I have to take part in the research?**

You do not have to take part in this research, neither do you have to give a reason why you do not want to take part. Should you agree to be part of this research you will be free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason.

**Will the information/data I provide be confidential?**

Your name will be shared with (name of headteacher/senior member of staff) in order to make appropriate arrangements for you to attend supervision. The only person that will have access to any of your personal data will be the researcher. Any data provided will be treated and stored in accordance with GDPR regulations.

Issues presented in supervision and during interview remain confidential to all except that the researcher-supervisor may discuss issues with their own individual supervisor where confidentiality agreements are already in place. However, if the researcher has concerns about the safety or risk to the supervisee or their clients, and the concerns cannot be resolved through
supervision in an appropriate timeframe, the supervisor will notify the headteacher or appropriate staff member and notify the supervisee that they are taking this action. In this situation confidentiality and anonymity may not be maintained.

What will happen to the results of the research?
The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
It is hoped you will find personal benefits to your practice and wellbeing, which in turn, will benefit the children and young people you work with. Your participation will also be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers' wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools.

What are the next steps?
If you have any concerns or questions, please contact me on the email below. If you are happy to participate in the research please complete the attached consent form, ticking the boxes and returning to myself at murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk by (insert date).
Alternatively, you may contact the research supervisor, via the following email address: Dr Joanna Hill: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.

This research is conducted within the requirements of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and in accordance with both the British Psychological Society’s Ethical Code of conduct (BPS, 2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC, 2016).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 11: Consent form – intervention

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Researcher: Louise Murray
Email: Murrayl4@cardiff.gov.uk
Address: School of Psychology, Cardiff University Tower Building 70 Park Place Cardiff CF10 3AT

Please tick the boxes and sign and date if you consent to take part in the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have read and understood the information sheet dated ____, and had the opportunity to ask questions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I confirm that I am choosing voluntarily to take part in the research project.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that all data collected in this research is confidential and anonymous unless there is risk to me or others.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to group supervision being undertaken via Microsoft Teams if deemed necessary by the researcher.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to take part in a 1:1 interview following the completion of the intervention.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree that the interview can be audio recorded and will be kept securely until transcribed and then deleted.

I agree to direct quotes being used anonymously in the final report.

Signed

Date

Name in block letters

This project is supervised by: Dr Joanna Hill; email: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC). Any complaints should be directed to:
Secretary of the Ethics Committee, School of Psychology Cardiff University, Tower Building, Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3AT. Email: psychethics@cardiff.ac.uk. Tel: 029 2087 0360

Privacy Notice:
The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 12: Debrief form – Intervention group

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Thank you for taking part in this study.

Purpose of the research

The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

What happens next

You have now completed the group supervision sessions. It is hoped that you found these valuable and have found the process positive. Prior to the commencement of these sessions, you agreed to take part in a 1:1 Interview with the researcher to discuss the impact supervision has had on your wellbeing and your practice. Further information will be emailed to you in relation to this.

You are reminded that information you provided in your group supervision and interview will only be available to the researcher unless there is a risk of harm.
to yourself or others. Should you have any concerns regarding this or if you would like any of your information to be shared with anyone else, please speak to the researcher to discuss this further.

Should you have any further questions, the researcher is contactable via the following email address: Louise Murray: murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk
Alternatively, you may contact the research supervisor, via the following email address: Dr Joanna Hill: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk@cardiff.ac.uk

You are reminded that your responses will be kept in accordance with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below) and that any reports or publications generated from the research will not contain any identifiable information. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for your time.

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 13: Information sheet for participants - post- measure questionnaire

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

You are being asked to take part in a research project exploring the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing. Before you decide whether you would like to participate, please take your time, and read the following information carefully.

What is the research about?

The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting. Questionnaire responses will be used to compare the perceptions of supervision and its impact on teacher wellbeing before and after the intervention. They will also be used to compare the impact of the group supervision sessions against teachers who did not receive any input.

Why have you been invited to take part in the research?
You are being asked to take part in the research because you previously completed the pre-measure questionnaire.

**Do I have to take part in the research?**

Participation in this research is completely voluntary. You can withdraw at any stage and there may be some questions you cannot answer, but you are encouraged to carry on with questions can. Before you decide whether you would like to participate, please take your time and read the following information carefully.

**Who is the researcher?**

My name is Louise Murray. I am a trainee educational psychologist studying in the School of Psychology, Cardiff University. This research is for my doctoral thesis. My email address is murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk. Please contact me should you have any concerns or questions.

**How will I be involved in the research?**

At this stage, regardless of whether you are in the intervention or control group you are being asked to complete a pre-measure questionnaire. The questionnaire should not take longer than 10 minutes. You will be asked to complete a second post-measure questionnaire at a later date.

**Will the information/data I provide by confidential?**

No identifying information will be requested in the consent forms or questionnaire. Any data provided will be treated and stored in accordance
with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below). This also applies to any reports or publications generated from the research. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, without given a reason, however once you have submitted the questionnaire, the data will not be traceable to you and so it will not be possible to recover it, and it will no longer be possible to remove it.

**What will happen to the results of the research?**

The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

**What are the next steps?**

Please read the consent form below. If you agree to each statement, click ‘agree’ and begin the questionnaire. If you do not, click ‘disagree’. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

**Supervised by:** Dr Joanna Hill (Department of Psychology, Cardiff University); E-mail: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

**Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.**

This research is conducted within the requirements of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and in accordance with both the British Psychological Society’s Ethical Code of conduct (BPS, 2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC, 2016).
Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (infoquest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published
Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Thank you for taking part in this study.

Purpose of the research
The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

Your participation is not only greatly appreciated by the researcher, but the data generated will be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools. The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

What happens next
The researcher will now start to evaluate any differences in the pre- and post-questionnaires filled out by all participants in all conditions, to highlight any effects on wellbeing of taking part in group supervision. The researcher will also be conducting follow-up interviews with participants for the intervention group. The purpose of these interviews is to evaluate the longer-term impact of group supervision on teacher wellbeing. You will be notified via email if you are invited to interview, along with further details about the interview process, and a suitable time will be arranged.

Should you have any further questions, the researcher is contactable via the following email address:

Louise Murray: murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Alternatively, you may contact the research supervisor, via the following email address: Dr Joanna Hill: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk @cardiff.ac.uk.

You are reminded that your responses will be kept in accordance with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below) and that any reports or publications generated from the research will not contain any identifiable information. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

**Thank you for your time.**

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This
information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for
the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this
information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 15: Information sheet for interview

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

What is the research about?

The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

Why have you been invited to take part in the research?

You have already taken part in a series of group supervision sessions. You are now being asked to take part in a 1:1 Interview with the researcher. The interview will explore your perceptions the supervision process and any benefits you perceive to your wellbeing. The interview should take no longer than 90 minutes and can be arranged at a time and venue (school or Teams) that suits you. A copy of the possible interview questions has been attached as a guide.

Do I have to take part in the research?
You do not have to take part in this research, neither do you have to give a reason why you do not want to take part. Should you agree to be part of this research you will be free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason up until the interview has been transcribed and confirmed as an accurate representation by yourself.

**Will the information/data I provide be confidential?**

Interviews will be audio recorded. These will be transcribed within 4 weeks of the interview taking place and sent to participant to review and agree true and accurate record. At this point all records will be made anonymous and all audio recordings will be permanently deleted. Up until this point, audio recordings will be held in a password encrypted recording device. Only anonymised data will be presented in the form of quotes to illustrate themes. Issues presented during interview remain confidential to all except that the researcher-supervisor may discuss issues with their own individual supervisor where confidentiality agreements are already in place. However, if the researcher has concerns about the safety or risk to the supervisee or their clients, and the concerns cannot be resolved through supervision in an appropriate timeframe, the supervisor will notify the headteacher or appropriate staff member and notify the supervisee that they are taking this action. In this situation confidentiality and anonymity may not be maintained.

**What will happen to the results of the research?**

The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report
will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

Your participation will be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools.

**What are the next steps?**

If you have any concerns or questions, please contact me on the email below.

If you are happy to continue to participate in the research and the 1:1 interview please let contact me at murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk by (insert date) with your availability dates.

**Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet.**

This research is conducted within the requirements of the School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee at Cardiff University and in accordance with both the British Psychological Society’s Ethical Code of conduct (BPS, 2009) and the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC, 2016).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 16: Debrief form – interview

Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Thank you for taking part in this study.

Purpose of the research
The research aims to examine the perceived benefits in introducing and sustaining supervision groups, for teachers working in secondary mainstream school, in relation to their perceived wellbeing. It aims to explore their ability to cope with stressors and, in turn, their perceived value of supervision in supporting practice and reducing stress and anxiety within the setting.

What happens next
Audio recordings of the interviews will be transcribed within 4 weeks of the interview taking place and sent to participant to review and agree a true and accurate record. At this point all records will be made anonymous and all audio recordings will be permanently deleted. Up until this point, audio recordings will be held in a password encrypted recording device. Only anonymised data will be presented in the form of quotes to illustrate themes.
Your participation is not only greatly appreciated by the researcher, but the data generated will be helping to add to the existing body of research into the impact of group supervision on teachers’ wellbeing and may help to inform the implementation of supervision within schools. The anonymised results of the research will be written up into a research paper for submission at Cardiff University. A summary of this research report will also be shared with the school headteacher. There is a chance that this paper may be published in an academic journal in future.

Should you have any further questions, the researcher is contactable via the following email address: Louise Murray: murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk. Alternatively, you may contact the research supervisor, via the following email address: Dr Joanna Hill: HillJ21@cardiff.ac.uk

You are reminded that your responses will be kept in accordance with GDPR regulations (see privacy notice below) and that any reports or publications generated from the research will not contain any identifiable information. If you have any questions, please contact Louise Murray for further information by emailing murrayl4@cardiff.ac.uk

Thank you for your time.

This project has been reviewed and ethically approved by the School Research Ethics Committee (SREC).

Privacy Notice: The information provided will be held in compliance with GDPR regulations. Cardiff University is the data controller and Matt Cooper is the data protection officer (inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk). The lawful basis for processing this information is public interest. This
information is being collected by Louise Murray. The research information you provide will be used for the purposes of research only and will be stored securely. Only Louise Murray will have access to this information. Anonymous information may be kept indefinitely or published.
Appendix 17: Wellbeing leaflet

WHAT IS WELLBEING
Well-being is the experience of health, happiness, and prosperity. It includes having good mental health, high life satisfaction, a sense of meaning or purpose, and ability to manage stress. (Bös, 2015).

Research demonstrates that well-being is not only valuable because it feels good, but also because it has beneficial real-world consequences. Compared to people with low well-being, individuals with higher levels of well-being:

WHAT IS STRESS

HOW DO WE RESPOND TO A STRESS?
As humans our bodies have specific responses that can occur during times of stress, crisis and uncertainty. These reactions are a natural response and can change the way our bodies feel, think and behave. Our bodies react in these ways as a way to prepare us for dealing with threats.

TAKING CARE OF EACH OTHER
As a school community, staff are skilled in supporting the wellbeing of children and young people. These skills can be used to support each other with wellbeing. Psychological First Aid (PFA) is an approach used immediately following a disaster or traumatic event and this quick response is often thought of as applying a psychological bandage. Some of the principles of PFA may be useful in considering how staff can support each other through this difficult time.

- Ask simple questions to understand what will help
- Emphasise the support available – both informal and formal services
- Listen with compassion – use active listening, show you care and allow time for talking.
- Make them a cup of tea and coffee – a very simple way to show support and give them the opportunity to relax.
- Reflect the words of the person – don’t try to interpret what they are saying, simply reflect the words they use in describing their experiences.
- Engage in non-intrusive and non-judgemental conversations – avoid questions that might be personal or could come across as judgemental.
- Keep the discussion based on facts – try to avoid ‘what ifs’ or discussing ‘woulds shoulds’ could have happened, stick to what actually happened.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT
- Education Support: A free, confidential helpline that offers counseling, coaching and support to education staff. https://www.education-support.org.uk/telephone-support-counselling-wales/
Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.

Supervision contract with school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of parties to the contract</th>
<th>Contract between: Supervisor (name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff Member: (name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of contract</td>
<td>Commencement date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of supervision</td>
<td>• To monitor and promote the welfare of those using the services of the supervisee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To promote reflective practice and on-going professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To promote professional competence and ethical practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To provide support for the supervisee in their role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency, duration, location</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any changes must be formally notified to all parties by the person initiating the change. Requests for additional sessions must be authorised through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation’s responsibilities</td>
<td>Supporting the supervisee to participate in supervision. Respecting the confidentiality of supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>The content of supervision will be confidential to the supervisee and supervisor except in the following circumstances: If the supervisor has concerns about any of the safety and risk to clients, the supervisee and/or the organisation and the concerns cannot be resolved within supervision in an appropriate timeframe, the supervisor will notify the employing organisation and notify the supervisee that they are taking this action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Personal issues                 | • The supervisees’ personal issues may be explored in supervision in so far as these are impacting on professional practice.  
• The supervisee is responsible for raising issues that may be impacting on practice.  
• The supervisor is responsible for supporting the supervisee to reflect on the impact of personal issues on practice and for guiding the supervisee to seek assistance to manage personal issues appropriately. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date signed</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 19: Example contracting template for supervision group

**Group supervision for teacher wellbeing: exploring group supervision to support the wellbeing of mainstream schoolteachers.**

This contract is between:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Review date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of supervision**
A structured process that supports the development of knowledge, competence and confidence on the part of the supervisee in order to address provision for pupils within their school.

**Supervision arrangements Time, date, location, duration, postponement, and non-attendance**
We agree to being on time and committed to the times set for supervision. If I am not able to attend, I will inform the supervisor of this.

**Confidentiality agreement**
We agree that issues presented in supervision remain confidential to all except that:
- a) I (the Supervisor) may discuss issues with my own individual supervisor
- b) if I (the Supervisor) have concern about the safety of your work with clients I will (in this order):
1. let you know at the time that I notice the concern and together with you, record actions and time frame required to rectify the situation
2. re-check that the situation has resolved
3. communicate unresolved concerns or safety issues to your line manager.

**Record keeping - Who keeps records, where kept, who has access, how to access?**

The supervisor will record the dates and summary points of supervision sessions to be used by the supervisor/research for reflection.

**Agreed expectations of group members** Attendance and punctuality, sharing time, honesty and openness, safety, session structure, facilitation role, model of feedback, conflict resolution, what to bring, personal issues etc.

The supervisor will provide you with:
- a) a safe non-threatening environment in which to openly reflect upon and develop your professional practice
- b) feedback in order for us to discuss your strengths and any areas that may need further development
- c) references to appropriate resources – books, articles, etc

Supervisees are responsible for:
- a) being on time and committed to the times set for supervision
- b) informing our supervisor of:
  1. any other supervision I may be having
  2. any serious concerns about client safety straight away
  3. any personal issue big enough to impact on my work
  4. anything that may impact upon our supervision relationship
  5. any training needs I am aware of.

**Evaluation of our process will occur as part of each session.**

**Signed by all**

**Date**
Appendix 20: Example of initial codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of interview 1</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer: Uh, OK, so we'll just get straight into it as I know you are busy and so in terms then, the first question is, in what way has your understanding of supervision changed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1: Yeah. And I think. You know the LSAs started doing it a couple of weeks before we did, so none of us really had a really clear understanding of what you know what it was and what we would be doing. But obviously now I understand that you know you can share something, you can work together with your colleagues to find a solution, um, you know you can share. It doesn't need to be work stuff we kind of before may have thought it just had to be kind of work stuff, but obviously you can share whatever it is you know that you need to share so so yeah so and and through going through it myself understanding that the benefit of having that chance to to talk to other colleagues about things and feeling that it's not just you I think.</td>
<td>Understanding of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing and finding solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide range of topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in understanding through experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chance to talk to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewer: Yeah, yeah, I think that came across quite a lot, didn't it? That it's it's nice to be able to share and to know that other people are kind of experiencing similar things.
P1: Yeah, ‘cause sometimes I, I, you know, if you share something that’s not with someone who works in teaching or education, it can sound like you’d be in a bit, not nasty to the children, but you know you love the children, you love your job. But there are days when you know that it is a lot and and being able to sit to speak about it, where not people would judge you, but where everyone totally understands that you’re moaning, still loved being a teacher. Still love the children and but, but you’re having a day where it’s been, over situation, should you know there’d be no judgment there. You knew that they’re in the same boat as you and they know.

Interviewer: Yeah, so it’s kind of that non-judgmental space to discuss?

P1: Yes. Like yeah, yeah. And knowing that no one’s gonna gonna judge you for how you’re feeling, yeah.

Interviewer: Great, has that, do you think that your understanding supervision has changed from what it was previously?

P1: Yeah. I know, yeah, I think it has because I I just imagined sort of people going in there and just kind of moaning about everything under the under the sun. And it’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others don’t understand</th>
<th>Non-judgmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separation of teacher &amp; person</td>
<td>Non-judgmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same boat, shared experience</td>
<td>Non-judgmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured way to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not like that is it? You know you do have someone who has a something that's concerning them, and you go through steps of how to help them and and give them ideas and suggestions. So, it's not just, uh, moaning session like you know and just people just you know. And if you haven't got something that week you can still add to the session by saying something to someone else, so you know even if you go and you think, well, I haven't got anything that I want to say. You can still be of benefit and use, you know, with a suggestion you might bring up for a colleague or something like that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of interview 5</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P5:</strong> Truthfully, I'd say is it a Louise type of supervision?</td>
<td>Understanding of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cause if it is then yes, I will. I think I'd kind of ask what the supervision would entail and and if it was, if it was down the respect of what we've been doing. Definitely, definitely. I was really getting to the point I was looking forward to Friday and Xxx and myself were both saying exactly the same thing. It was just a time that we felt relaxed. It's a time that we could just sort of sit and realise that it's not just us that all these things are happening too. It's happening to everybody. And we had people, we had each other's backs, and you could get solutions for things. Whereas my version of</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not alone/same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solution focussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding of supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervision before it's not one I'd want to do again, so I think
I'd have to check that out.

Interviewer: Yeah, OK, in terms of the supervision that we
had was in a group and you said about kind of checking
things out with other people and using their experience. Did
you find it in a group beneficial?

P5: I did, and I also found it good being in the group 'cause I
felt like I could trust them. I think it would be very different
with different members of staff, but it was a group that I felt
very easy and open that I could quite easily bring up
something and talk about and the chance to give ideas
'cause I might see something in a different way than they
did.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm

P5: And just being able to help them that little bit. Or, you
know, I could go and ask Xxx now, remember we were
talking about that, what about this or that, was nice.

Interviewer: So, the support carried on outside of the
sessions?
P5: Yeah, ‘cause you know you could just catch each other and see how things are. Xxx and I bump into each other quite a lot. We worked together last year and he’s always how you are doing Xxx, so we’d all like have the little check in now every time we see each other at lunch time and it’s, it’s been good.

Interviewer: That’s nice. We ran it on a Friday afternoon. How was that time wise?

P5: Perfect because as you go through the week is when you start to have those issues and being able to discuss them on a Friday afternoon, you could put things to bed and not worry over the weekend because you had strategies and think right when I go in on Monday, I’m going to give that a go and that was nice and you could just you could go home and relax and not worry about some of the things that were being brought up.

Interviewer: So, towards the end of the week was good so that you can offload prior to the weekend.

P5: Yeah, those things were going through in the weak thinking oh, I gotta log that one in my head and we can have a chat about that. Might bring that point up on the Friday and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation for following week</th>
<th>Practical implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home/work balance</td>
<td>Multiple perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same year groups</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt and stress</td>
<td>leaving class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to talk</td>
<td>Wider impact of support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perhaps see what xxx has got to say about it, 'cause she teaches the same age range and just checking that.

**Interviewer:** What about the frequency of the sessions, we were doing them weekly, how did you find that?

**P5:** It was lovely, something we really look forward to. If it was just in normal everyday life, I would probably like fortnightly. Would be better because it's, it's, I always felt a bit guilty leaving the class and, and what it put on the LSA's, but every fortnight could be done very easily. To have that time just to go and be able to talk. In fact, um, I've actually met together with my co buddy that I work with now, we're actually taking 20 minutes out during our Friday session for us to talk like we were doing in the supervision meeting. So, we're going to talk to each other honestly and openly and discuss problems and and see what we can come to a conclusion with on a Friday.

**Interviewer:** That sounds really positive.

**P5:** Yeah. Yes. 20 minutes session. Every Friday we're going to do.
**Interviewer:** Perfect. Have you found, and if so, in what ways, has the supervision supported your well-being?

**P5:** It's just that confidence of knowing that it's not just you. That everybody else has bad days. Everybody else has difficulties in the classroom. They have similar problems. ‘Cause when you teach it's so isolating because you don't hear from the others 'cause nobody ever voices something if something is going wrong. So, it would, that was really relaxing, and then also being able to put things to bed before the weekend that had a massive impact. They just gave you that confidence of a few strategies that you know that right next week I'm going to give that a go. And see how that one turns out, and then if that doesn't work then I'll try the next one and it just just sort of puts you on on sort of a bit more relaxed.

**Interviewer:** So perhaps reduces that pressure a little bit.

**P5:** Yeah, it's just having that support. You know that you've got somebody there that you can go and speak honestly to, and you know you don't get judged for it.
Appendix 21: Example of code combining

Timing of sessions

Career long

Prevent escalation

Reward should be proactive and relate to the readiness of the staff

Check-in

Safety and organisational feedback

Impact of product

Support continues outside of the session