

Supervision: Critical Reflection for Transformational Learning, Part 1

MICHAEL CARROLL

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

If many lives encapsulate a theme, then mine revolves around the theme of learning. This is how I would locate myself in both my personal and professional worlds. I have always been fascinated by learning. All my jobs have had as their focus helping myself and others learn. I have been a teacher and a trainer all my life. My continual challenge has been, how can I set up the kind of relationships, create the sort of environments, and provide the right interventions so that my learning partners emerge with further learning? Learning for me means increased knowledge, new or more finely tuned skills, capability, competency, change of behaviors or values or mind-sets or mental maps. Simply, but hopefully not simplistically put, for me learning = growth = development = change.

All of the roles and tasks involved in the jobs I have held over the past 30 years have coalesced into providing learning environments for individuals, teams, and organizations. I know this now as I look back and become “retrospectively introspective” (Ray & Myers, 1986). As Kierkegaard once said, “You live life forwards, you understand it backwards.” He could, of course, have been talking about supervision, which is concerned with making sense of past experiences and past practice. And he could have been talking about my own making sense of learning from an early age. As I look back over 30 years of being a supervisor, and indeed of studying supervision, I want to gather or glean my learning from those experiences and see if they resonate with your supervisory learnings.

I grew up in the docks area of Belfast, Northern Ireland, in the late 1940s, the second eldest of nine children from a Catholic family. My parents both left school at 14 and, as you can imagine, spent all their lives and time devoted

This is an adaptation of a keynote address with the above title given at the Fifth International Interdisciplinary Conference on Clinical Supervision in Buffalo, New York, June 2009. I have tried to keep the tone of the spoken work intact while changing the text to make it more readable for the written word.

to bringing up nine children. My father was a laborer and my mother looked after the children, so we were quite poor with few of life's luxuries. It was in Belfast that my first learning emerged.

LEARNING

Learning No. 1

What struck me from an early age (though I could not have articulated it at that time) was how polarized and locked into their lives our two resident communities in Northern Ireland were: the Catholic and Protestant groups. It struck my child mind that most people around me died with the same thoughts they were born with, or had inherited. Little change, I noticed, took place in mind or heart over full life spans. I was quickly told, if I challenged the status quo or brought up questions about who or what was right, that every question had one right answer and any deviation from that right answer put in question my loyalty to the cause for which we Catholics had so many martyrs. My child mind wondered why people were prepared to die rather than learn how to live with difference. I learned then just how simple it is to lock into ways of thinking and living that are undigested, not reflected upon, and taken as the truth. This was my first experience of fundamentalism, of downloading (Scharmer, 2007), and was to have a profound effect on my later life. What it taught me about life and about supervision was how important it was to listen, to observe, and to begin to think for oneself. Inherited learning from others was not to be ignored but had to be reviewed and chosen or rejected. Had I known it then I would have adopted the Rumi motto, "Sell certainty and buy bewilderment." Create curiosity, keep questioning, and become inquisitive was a way of life I would have loved. Later, and now, I can apply it to supervisors, supervisees, and supervision.

Learning No. 2

I lived in a time and a community where there was no such thing as an inner life. Of course we had inner lives—we thought, we reflected on, we felt. But we lived life externally. Any thinking, any imagination, any creativity outside the norm and you were labeled as unrealistic, a dreamer, or, worse—deviant. Reflection was a luxury. In our extremely basic and poverty-driven lives, we had little time for being, spending all our time doing. Life was to be lived, not thought about, reflected on, questioned, or imagined. Anyway, what was there to think about? Fate (or in my case, God) had determined your life. Individuals were handed the script of their lives from an early age and their task was to live out those scripts as best they could. You didn't think for yourself and, if you did, you were in trouble. The scripts were written and you followed the role as laid out for you. From this emerged a major learning

for me: It is vital to go internal, be self-aware, and create an inner world of thinking, feeling, and imagining. Reflection was the way to turn life events into life experiences and move from mindless living to mindful and thought-through decisions about life.

Thomas Merton was asked at a conference before he died if he could capture his writings on spirituality in a few words. He said he could summarize what spirituality meant in three words: stop and think. He could have been talking about supervision. For me supervision and spirituality share reflectiveness in common, and both are about stopping to think (Carroll, 2001).

Learning No. 3

I learned from an early age that some people stop learning. They do this mostly for one of two reasons. For some, it's too dangerous to be open to new learning. It puts them into uncertainty and uncertainty confuses and often brings insecurity. Better to be right even if you are wrong than not to know. The second reason why people stop learning is that their environment or community does not support them in learning. Again, it's too dangerous to allow committed men and women to think for themselves with the possibility of them coming to their own conclusions and disagreeing with the establishment. Many groups and organizations discourage ongoing learning (while often publicly supporting it). They create parameters within which learning is acceptable but outside of which you may not go if you wish to remain within the group or the community.

From this I learned that my job, as a facilitator of learning and as a supervisor, is to *manufacture uncertainty*. Learning is risky and occasionally dangerous, and creating reflective environments engenders disagreement and debate. It has become important for me not to assume that supervisors or supervisees are open to learning.

Learning No. 4

Learning No. 4 took Learning No. 3 a step further, and I now see that some people cannot learn. It's not that they don't learn or stop learning; it's more that they cannot now learn. They have been so damaged, so abused, and so messed up by others that they are condemned to lives and lifestyles that imprison their minds and their bodies and their learning. Some cannot unlearn in order to learn. We can do that to people. One of the high-security prisons in Britain has set up a unit for prisoners with severe personality disorders. What is noticeable about the 80 men in this unit is their inability to learn in new ways. They have all been severely abused as children: emotionally, physically, sexually, and psychologically. The horrible principle here is that when power is abused, when domination takes place within relationships that betray the one less powerful, it affects the brain and learning often

in permanent ways. Trauma leaves indelible marks and effects on the brain, one of which can be the inability to learn in new ways. Machiavelli is credited as the patron saint of “power over” and when asked by the local Prince to write him an account of how to stay in power, Machiavelli rose magnificently to the occasion. His advice was simple: Keep them afraid, keep them divided, and you can rule as you choose. A key element for all those who would become facilitators of learning (e.g., supervisors) is that they need to deal with fear, especially manufactured fear. My learning is that we do create environments and relationships where power over is so dominant that it puts people into “survival mode” (rather than competency mode), which means they can only learn in certain restricted ways. For supervision this means ensuring that both supervisor and supervisee are in competency mode (i.e., can access the frontal cortex part of the brain). It means further that we look carefully at how power is used in learning situations to ensure that power over doesn’t negatively affect learning.

Learning No. 5

My work and experience have taught me that I cannot learn some things on my own. I need others. On my own I get stuck, I recycle the same issues and the same problems (Butler, 2007). It’s the same for all of us; there is that impasse place, that time of stuckness when we cannot move forward without some help. You may have to accept it as such or find someone to partner with you on a new learning journey. You won’t do it alone. Couples, teams, organizations are exactly the same. Where do you typically get stuck? For many men their stuck point is around emotions. Some women get stuck in envy (Chessler, 2001).

Lave and Wenger (1991) contend that most learning theories, by focusing primarily on the acquisition of knowledge by individuals, ignore or significantly underplay the essential role of social participation in the learning process (Sloop, 2009). Coining the phrase “communities of practice” in 1991, Wenger in a later publication (1998) outlines some of his principles of learning:

Learning is fundamentally experiential and fundamentally social
 Learning transforms our identities
 Learning constitutes trajectories of participation
 Learning is a matter of social energy and power
 Learning is a matter of engagement
 Learning is a matter of imagination (p. 226)

Learning is as much between people as it is within people. From a supervisory perspective our task is to create learning partnerships so that learning takes place within relationships, not just through relationships (Buber, 1984).

Learning No. 6

I learned from life and from supervision that often we don't use the best methods of learning available to us; quite the opposite, we shun them. In my experience feedback and coaching are at the heart of learning. In life these are the two methods most used to help us learn. As children we continually cycle and recycle these two—from potty training, to riding bicycles, to swimming and relating. We are told, "Here is how it is done; now you try it. That was good but you need to concentrate on . . . Now, try it again." Coaching and feedback are life's built-in ways of learning. Naturally, you would think we would use them more and ask for the feedback we need to learn. Most of us don't know what we are like to live with, what we are like as parents, or managers, or friends or next-door neighbors. We think we do, but we don't. However, some people do know. So let's ask them. Let's go home and say to our partners, "What's it like living with me? Tell me so that I can learn how to be a better partner." Managers can do the same thing. None of my managers ever asked me what they were like as managers. We shun feedback. We rarely ask for it, and by not doing so cut off one of our best methods for learning. Learning No. 6 is simple: Ask for feedback and keep asking for feedback. A key factor in effective supervision is learning how to give and receive feedback (Carroll & Gilbert, 2005). Hawkins and Shohet (2001) call it "fearless compassion."

I always ask my supervisees what I am like as a supervisor. They politely tell me they enjoy working with me and I am very supportive and challenging. I go further. What could I do differently, better? Pushed, they respond. "I notice you are a fast thinker," one of them tells me. "You come to conclusions about fifteen minutes before I do. I wonder if you could keep quiet and let me come to my own conclusion." What helpful feedback. I bite my tongue, I wait, and she comes to her own conclusions. Supervisees are so good at teaching us how to supervise them, if we let them.

Learning No. 7

We continually equate teaching and learning. I have come to see them as very different and not necessarily connected. Much of our educational systems are based on teaching, where the world of the teacher is transmitted to the world of the learner (what Freire called the banking concept of learning). How much is actually transferred is open to conjecture, and concluding that what is taught is automatically learned is a leap too far in many instances. Teaching involves inviting another into the ideas and world of the teaching: facilitating learning, on the other hand, begins with the world of the learning. One well-used phrase, in my opinion, has great validity: All learning begins from the learner's frame of reference. We join the learner in his or her world and begin the journey of facilitating learning.

The following story illustrates this: An old man sits on a park bench at lunchtime. He is joined by a 10-year-old boy eating his lunch. The boy eats one bar of chocolate, then another, then a third. As he unravels his fourth bar, the old man can contain himself no longer and decides to give his much younger companion a lecture on healthy eating. After 10 minutes or so on the ills of consuming so much chocolate, the little lad intervenes. "Did you know that my grandfather lived 'til he was one hundred and four?" he asks. "What?" asks the old man. "Are you telling me your grandfather lived to one hundred and four and ate chocolate like you do?" "No," says the 10-year-old. "He never ate chocolate, but he kept his nose out of other peoples' business."

I think we continually over-teach and are left with the uncertainty of what is being learned. Learning No. 7 for me has been "Become a facilitator for learning; teach if you must." This is especially true of being a supervisor.

Learning No. 8

One size doesn't fit all in supervision and learning. Tannenbaum's (1997) research unearthed the surprisingly low percentage of learning that is attributable to formal learning programs. Supervision has joined other professional learning interventions, such as coaching and mentoring, in being a form of "personalized" or "customized" learning. The emphasis in these learning interventions is clearly on the learning style, learning intelligence, and individualized learning formats of supervisees.

We do not facilitate the learning of others in the same way; we find the way that supports and helps their learning style. Question I ask supervisors include

What is your learning style?

How can I help you learn and support you?

What blocks your learning?

How might differences between us impact on your learning?

In brief, how can I best supervise you?

I have spent many years, much of my life, being taught. I now have certificates, diplomas, undergraduate degrees, and postgraduate degrees. Not once in those many years of being taught have I been asked how I learn.

I want to ensure that those I supervise are supervised in a way that connects to their gender, their race and culture, their individual learning style, their ability and disability. Sensitivity to the uniqueness of how each of us learns ensures that the learning environment and relationship is adapted and geared in a personalized and individual way to specific human beings.

Learning No. 9

Supervisors, not supervisees, are the ones who accommodate, who move, become flexible and adapt their supervisory interventions to meet the learning styles of supervisees. Peter Hawkins uses a telling phrase that makes this point: “If you are saying the same things to more than one of your supervisees, the chances are you are supervising yourself” (Keynote Address, British Association for Supervision Practice and Research [BASPR] Conference, July 2007). Flexibility in facilitation learning joins Learning No. 8 in accepting that one size in learning does not fit all learners. In bygone (and not so bygone) days, supervisees were the ones expected to adapt, to move toward the stances and styles of supervisors. Supervisor-led supervision works on this premise. It’s a premise that needs to change.

Learning No. 10

Many blocks to learning, both internal and external, exist (Moon, 1999, 2004). An internal block that has a negative effect on our ability to reflect and learn is “shame.” Individuals and groups that come from shame-based backgrounds (either shame-based family systems or shame-based education systems) find it extremely difficult to allow themselves to be vulnerable without being shamed yet again. Reflection means permitting the self to be open to disconfirming what is already known, what is not known, in being transparent about what can be known. These mental stances can be difficult to take for people from shame-based backgrounds. In admitting or owning their ignorance, doubts, and uncertainties, they leave themselves open to not living up to their own or others’ expectations. This then plunges them, as it did in the past, into a shame-based place that closes them down and makes them want to withdraw. For these people, learning to reflect in an open way often involves having a relationship they can trust not to shame them and being able to take the risks of being vulnerable. This is quite a relational journey when shame raises its ugly head.

People who come from shame-based family systems or shame-based educational systems often close down their learning. As supervisors we need to ensure that we don’t block learning without even knowing we block it through the conscious or unconscious activation of shame.

Learning No. 11

Learning is as much an emotional experience as it is a rational one. For too long we have seen learning as a totally rational and intellectual cognitive process. It is that, but more. Evidence from research on the brain shows just how many of our decisions and how much of our learning is based on emotions and feelings (Lehrer, 2009). Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2008) in an aptly titled chapter, “We Feel, Therefore We Learn: The Relevance of Affective and Social

Neuroscience to Education,” state that “connections between decision making, social functioning and moral reasoning hold new promise in breakthroughs in understanding the role of emotion in decision making, the relationship between learning and emotion and how culture shapes learning” (p. 183). If you need convincing on learning, decision making, and emotions, then look at the experts in decision making—the creators of advertising. Ads are made to generate a feeling, an emotional response. Those who design them know we make decisions and learn emotionally more powerfully than we do intellectually. We have forgotten this and often make supervision a purely cognitive experience. Your body exists to get your head to supervision. More and more, supervision is about dealing with emotional impacts (Moore, 2008; Carroll & Moore, in press).

LEARNING SUMMARY

These summary learnings have influenced me in how I see and conduct supervision. The biggest change for me has been the movement from supervisor-led supervision to supervisee-led supervision. In other words, the supervisee takes control of supervision as a director takes control of an orchestra and utilizes what is there to learn from experience. The supervisor takes on the role of facilitator of reflective learning whose job is to create relationships and environments and strategies that support supervisees in learning from practice. But the supervisee does the work, brings the agenda, reflects, learns, and goes back to his or her work supported, energized, and changed. The challenge is how to make the supervisee the central focus, emphasize learning, and bring out the elements of spontaneity, creativity, invention, and imagination that are part and parcel of interactive learning. Creativity and learning are not always emphasized in supervision. I did a brief review within the counseling psychology supervision literature (very quick, and I apologize for its inadequacy if I have overlooked any relevant publications) of about 10 supervision books published in the United States and found only one reference to creativity in supervision and none to humor. Two major textbooks in this field (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Falender & Shafranske, 2004) have no references to either. If the best learners we know are children who are safe, being challenged, and having fun, then why haven't we been more productive in creating supervision environments that have those three qualities in them (Lahad, 2000)? How can supervision involve learning if it's not fun?

From this perspective a number of supervisory principles emerge which I now believe are the foundation stones or anchors of clinical supervision:

- Supervisees do the work in supervision: their learning is the most important aspect of supervision (Carroll & Gilbert, 2005). Every supervision session should end with the words “What have you learned from the past hour here in supervision? What two or three learnings are you taking away with you?”

- Supervisors facilitate the learning of supervisees. “Am I doing that? How can I best supervise you?”
- Supervisees are supervised differently: How do we personalize or customize learning to individual supervisees?
- Learning in supervision is transformational (not just transmissional); i.e., it results in a change of mind-set or behaviour rather than simply being the transfer of ideas or knowledge alone. It is based on the ancient proverb “To know and not to act is not to know.”
- The medium of learning is critical reflection. Reflecting is the main learning tool used. Don’t assume that individuals can reflect. King and Kitchener (1994) trace the movements within reflection from zero reflection, through pre-reflection, to reflection.
- Experimental learning is the heart of supervision. Supervision is about your work, your practice. Bring me your work. Be transparent; lay it out in front of me. I will respect it.
- Supervision interrupts practice.
- Supervision aids unlearning as well as facilitating new learning. Sometimes it is necessary to unlearn before learning can take place.
- Supervision helps make new connections.
- Supervision helps think systemically.
- Supervision (similar to experiential learning) is for the future.
- Learning includes finding a voice. (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986, use the theme of voice to trace the stages of learning in *Women’s Ways of Knowing*.)
- Supervision is conversation-based learning.
- Supervision entails moving from “I-learning” to “we-learning.”
- Creativity flows from the supervisory relationship.
- Learning is for the future (“What do we need?”).
- In supervision the shift in the supervisee takes place in the supervision room and is then transferred to work (Hawkins & Smith, 2006).
- Supervisors move beyond their embarrassments and are able to admit their limitations, their not-knowing, their being lost, and, like supervisees, being transparent and honest.

CONCLUSION

Supervision has three major functions: (1) to support and help supervisees learn from their practice and to be effective in their work; (2) to build in an accountability factor so that their work is monitored and assessed; and (3) to serve in an administrative capacity, connecting to organizations and managing the supervisory processes. The learning/developmental aspects of supervision can, and often do, conflict with the accountability function, and these in turn can conflict with the administrative aspects of supervision. Supervision holds these three tasks in creative tension, building relationships

and creating environments that sustain learning while still monitoring the professionalism of the work. The first part of this article unapologetically reviewed the learning/developmental aspects of supervision and almost totally ignored the accountability aspect. It summarized my learning as a supervisor on how to be a facilitator of supervisee learning and the learning principles that underpin that role. In Part 2, I will continue the theme, taking a more in-depth look at what learning means in supervision and what different kinds and types of learning make up supervision. Part 2 will focus on experiential learning, critical reflectivity, and transformational (transform-actional) learning, and how all three connect to supervision.

REFERENCES

- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, R., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bernard, J., & Goodyear, R. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Buber, M. (1984). *I and thou*. Prentice Hall Publications.
- Carroll, M. (2001). The spirituality of supervision. In M. Carroll & M. Tholstrup (Eds.), *Integrative approaches to supervision* (pp. 76–89). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Carroll, M., & Gilbert, M. (2005). *On becoming a supervisee: Creating learning partnerships*. London: Vukani Publishing.
- Carroll, M., & Moore, R. (in press). The relationship in executive coaching supervision. *The Journal of Management Development*, Special Issue on “The Relationship in Coaching.”
- Chessler, P. (2001). *Woman's inhumanity to woman*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Books.
- Falender, C., & Shafranske, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: APA Publication.
- Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2001). *Supervision in the helping professions* (2nd edition). Maidenhead, Buckinghamshire: Open University Press.
- Immordino-Yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2008). We feel, therefore we learn: The relevance of affective neuroscience to education. In K. Fischer and M. H. Immordino-Yang (Eds.), *The Jossey-Bass reader on the brain and learning* (pp. 183–198). San Francisco: Wiley.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lahad, M. (2000). *Creative supervision: The use of expressive arts methods in supervision and self-supervision*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Leher, J. (2009). *The decisive moment: How the brain makes up its mind*. Edinburgh: Canongate Books.
- Moon, J. (1999). *Reflection in learning and professional development*. London: Kogan Page.

- Moon, J. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning*. Oxford: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moore, B. (2008). Group supervision with a multi-disciplinary trauma resource team in the north of Ireland: A participative inquiry into the application of a "process framework" D. Prof. London: Middlesex University.
- Ray, M., & Myers, R. (1986). *Creativity in business*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge, MA: SoL Publications.
- Sloop, M. (2009). *Public service employees' experiences in communities of practice*. Ph.D. Antioch University.
- Tannenbaum, S. I. (1997). Enhancing continuous learning: Diagnostic findings from multiple companies. *Human Resource Management*, 36, 437–452.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Supervision: Critical Reflection for Transformational Learning (Part 2)

MICHAEL CARROLL

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

INTRODUCTION

The heart of supervision is learning—the learning of the supervisee (Carroll & Gilbert, 2005). The medium of learning in supervision is reflection, hopefully critical reflection (Carroll, 2009a). The focus of learning in supervision is the work/the practice of the supervisee. The supervisor is or becomes a facilitator of supervisee-learning-from-practice (reflective practice). The what-is-being-learned of supervision is anything to do with the work: theory, skills, induction into a profession, professional savvy and wisdom, skills and competencies, self-awareness, ethical awareness and sensitivity, ability to use intuition and that array of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, and mind-sets that go to make up the professional in whatever profession. The methods used by supervisors to facilitate learning are many, ranging from teaching, training, and instruction through to role-play, skills development, self-awareness, feedback, challenge, insight, parallel process, and sharing their own experience. The acid test of how effective supervision is is simple: What are you (the supervisee) doing differently now that you were not doing before supervision? What have you learned from the past hour in supervision with me? What shifts have taken place in the supervisor room that have been transferred to your work? Transformational learning is about changes in action and behavior that endure over time.

My question is: *If supervision is an intervention to help supervisees learn from the actual work they do, then what do supervisors do to facilitate that learning process for supervisees? What does being a facilitator-of-learning-from-experience look like?* What interests me is what kind of learning is

This is Part 2 of a keynote address with the above title given at the Fifth International Interdisciplinary Conference on Clinical Supervision in Buffalo, NY, June 2009. Part 1 appeared in *The Clinical Supervisor*, 28(2).

Address correspondence to Michael Carroll, 73, Upper Church Road, Weston Super Mare, BS23 2HX United Kingdom. E-mail: mcarr1949@aol.com

appropriate for supervision and how can supervisors create and maintain a repertoire of “facilitating learning responses” that can be used to help supervisee learn in different ways and at different levels.

Part 1 of this plenary looked at some of my learnings from life and work about learning itself and how I apply these learnings to supervision (Carroll, 2009b). Part 2 of this article will focus on what kind of learning is basic to supervision and how supervisors can set up that kind of learning for supervisees. It will ask: What sort of learning does supervision support and facilitate? Further questions will look at: Is all learning of the same type or level?

A recent doctoral dissertation concluded that “. . . there was no coherent theory of learning which could be systematically applied to supervision” (Pampallis-Paisley, 2006, p. 10). Quite a statement and one, if true, that has mammoth implications for the practice of supervision. If accurate, then most of us who are supervisors and supervisees work with unconscious models of learning that influence our work but are probably never articulated and presumably never questioned. It would seem worthwhile to surface the underlying learning model and at least compare and contrast it with other learning models regarding its effectiveness.

Some of the principles or anchors on which my theory of learning is based (already articulated in Part 1 but worth mentioning as foundational principles for Part 2) are:

- Individuals learn in different ways, and one of the skills of being an effective supervisor is to “personalize” or “customize” learning to the individuality of the supervisee.
- Setting up the right kind of relationship and creating a suitable environment are key issues in facilitating learning for others.
- Learning takes place as much between people (a social event) as within individuals.
- If we supervisors are not careful, we can block and disable our own learning and the learning of others.
- Feedback and coaching are the two “inbuilt” human ways of supporting learning.
- Teaching and learning are not necessarily the same and not always connected (in the sense that the learner will automatically learn what the teacher is trying to teach).

THEORIES OF LEARNING

While it is beyond the scope of this article to go in-depth into the vast literature on learning, for our purposes it is worthwhile to contextualise supervision learning in a broader learning context. There are many theories of learning: behavioral, humanistic, psychodynamic, cognitive, existential

and systemic to name a few (Law, Ireland, & Hussain, 2007). There are also theories about the role of education and teaching within the learning process (Jarvis, Holford, & Griffin, 1998; Viall, 1996). Levels of learning have been another focus of literature and research: Bateson's (1972) single-loop, double-loop and triple-loop learning; Argyris and Schon's (1978) espoused theory and theory-in-use modes of learning; Scharmer's (2007) types of learning. A little later we will integrate these to create a synthesis around various levels of learning applied to supervision.

What is Learning?

Viall (1996) offers the following definition of learning: "Learning consists of changes a person makes in himself or herself that increase the know-why and/or the know-what and/or the know-how the person possesses with regard to a given subject" (p. 21). This definition covers learning that includes knowledge, information, theories and frameworks (know-what), as well as abilities, competencies and skills (know-how) to know-why (which takes a more meta-stance on understanding the processes that go to make up my way of knowing, mental maps, assumptions and meaning-making perspectives).

Voller (in press) describes learning as a "change in behaviour caused by experience" (p. 9). Another definition widens this: "Learning should be seen as a qualitative change in a person's way of seeing, experiencing, understanding, conceptualising something in the real world" (Ramsden, 1988, p. 271).

Each of the above definitions of learning use the term "change" or "changes" and see learning as a process of change in some dimension of life (perceiving, thinking, knowing, doing, understanding, etc).

Hawkins and Smith (2006) present a chronology of learning, connecting four types of learning to interventions used by different facilitators to bring about that particular learning. These are discussed in the following paragraphs:

Skills or competencies (they define a competency as the ability to utilize a skill or use a tool). By and large a skill is the ability to do something well. Skills training can be set up by supervisors, managers, friends, parents, etc., and usually is taught through instruction. Instruction is a form of coaching that tends to use the "knowledge–practice–feedback" cycle to embed learning how to do something. One method of teaching and learning skills is "imitation" learning where the supervisee learns from watching the supervisor. Holloway's definition of supervision captures this well: "Supervision provides an opportunity for the student to capture the essence of the therapeutic process as it is articulated and modelled by the supervisor, and to re-create it in the counselling relationship" (Holloway, 1992, p. 431). Whether imitation learning or direct instruction and coaching, supervision helps supervisees learn skills.

Esme is very supportive of her clients, wonderfully affirmative and positive. However, she finds it difficult to challenge them. Her supervisor, Allen, gently and firmly points this out to her, and the way he does it helps her try it with clients. She has learned how to challenge her clients more effectively while still being supportive of them through watching her supervisor do it with her and then coach her in how to intervene challengingly with particular clients.

Performance and capability (a capability is the ability to use a skill, at the right time, in the right way and in the right place). Allen helps Esme not just challenge this current client she is with but be able to gauge when is the right moment to challenge and how to pace challenging with different clients. Again, instruction, coaching and training are the normal interventions that help practitioners move from using a skill to being to adapt that skill across contexts and with different people.

Developmental learning is a somewhat longer-term intervention and learning strategy that helps individuals think and act more holistically: as a person, as a professional. Moving beyond skills and applying skills in wider contexts, developmental learning focuses on more emotional skills such as assertiveness, or managing conflict. This demands more of the supervisee and challenges them to look at how and why they practice (or in Esme's case don't practice) this particular skill. Coaching and mentoring are often the educational processes involved at this stage. Esme has learned to challenge this client; she has also learned how to adapt her challenging to different contexts: developmentally she now reviews and learns how to challenge her colleagues and even her boss. This entails a greater learning leap for her as she realizes how much this type of challenging is connected to her placating manner, especially around those in authority. Insights into the underlying patterns or the psychological themes underpinning non-challenging behavior gives Esme the springboard to significant change in her thinking and behaving.

Transformation learning enables individuals to shift gear into another way of perceiving. Part of the process in transformational learning is the evaluation of old mind-sets and mental maps. With transformational learning comes a new way of perceiving and looking at. It thinks more systemically and allows individuals to connect more to the bigger picture. Calling developmental learning a "capacity in level," Hawkins and Smith (2006) see transformational learning as capacity between levels. Esme traces some of her reluctance to challenge clients, colleagues and her boss to deep assumptions about what will happen to her if she does so (in her case she will cause conflict through challenging, as a result of which she assumes she will be made to feel an outsider and a failure). Helping Esme deal with this untested assumption and look at building new assumptions around her right to challenge and the value of causing conflict in the right manner enables her to transform old ways of engaging with individuals into new ways with new perceptions of herself (Kegan & Lahey, 2009).

AAR AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Two models of learning coalesce as we review the theme of learning in supervision. The first is called the After Action Review (AAR) and the second, better known, the Experiential Learning Cycle. Both are actually forms of the Experiential Learning Cycle.

The After Action Review (AAR) is a learning methodology devised by the American military as a way of learning from doing. Garvin (2000) reports on how, before heading back to barracks after a military operation, commanders gathered their troops in small groups of 9 to 10 soldiers. Having established the ground rules of confidentiality and taking responsibility, the commanders then led the troops briefly through the following questions:

- What did we set out to do?
- What happened?
- What went well?
- What went badly?
- What have we learned?
- What will we do differently?

The answers to the last two questions are noted by the commander and sent back to the Center for Army Lessons Learned (CALL), who then distributes these back into the field. The AAR is a variation on the experiential learning cycle. The process in the AAR is also the process of supervision:

We review our aims and goals in working with this client. These can be the overall aims of working with this person (as a counsellor, social worker, executive coach, etc.) or more particularly the aim of the last session.

Before moving into evaluation and assessment of our own work, we observe, notice and articulate what actually happened (or more precisely we tell our narrative of what happened). From a position of separateness and distance (both physical and emotional) we recount what took place as we remember it (we look back).

Now we evaluate ourselves and our work. We make judgments about what went well and what, in our estimation, did not go well, or even went wrong.

From this springboard we now gather together our learning. So what have we learned from doing, from noticing and observing what we did and from having evaluated what happened?

Our focus finally turns to the future: What will we do differently at our next session as a result of our learning from the past session/s?

The AAR is a useful tool to give both structure and process to supervision. It can be used for life review or work review, can be useful to individuals, couples, teams and organizations. Its strength is that we learn from doing and allow experience itself to become our teacher.

The Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb, 1984) has long been used as a framework for understanding how learning from experience takes place. Its four elements (doing, reflecting, learning and applying learning) work together to make learning from experience possible. The Experiential Learning Cycle integrates these four ways of knowing:

Tacit knowledge (knowing what) is the foundation of “doing” our work. In practicing, we delve into the font or pool of knowledge and skills that we already possess intuitively. We hopefully do our job well from an “unconscious competence” perspective. Called in educational circles “automaticity,” intuitive knowing is the most effective way of engaging in work. We know automatically and we practice intuitively. The difference between the amateur and the professional or the beginner and the more experienced practitioner is this intuitive ability. Beginners think about what they are doing, they watch themselves perform; they hover above themselves rationally deciding their next steps. Experienced practitioners tend not to do that. They dip unconsciously into their pool of tacit knowledge and intuitively know what the best course of action is (Atkinson & Claxton, 2000; Gigerenzer, 2007).

There is some evidence from sports coaching and sports psychology that the more we think about what we are doing when we are actually doing it, the more our performance deteriorates. The time for thinking and reflection is not during the process but before and after it. “Just do it” is a sensible injunction to those of us who over-reflect or monitor our actions as we do them. Schon (1983, 1987) calls this “knowing-in-action” or “knowing-in-use” (the ability to access our knowledge while behaving) and sees reflection-in-action as the process that allows us to do so.

Reflective knowledge (knowing why): Experiential learning involves using reflection as a method of learning. Reflection and critical reflective learning involves supervisees in honest consideration and investigation of their work (Mezirow & Associates, 2000). Using “exquisite curiosity” and “respectful attentiveness” (quoted in Bond, 2007), supervisors facilitate this reflection by setting up an environment of inquiry in order to help supervisees learn from their own practice. With open mind, open heart and open will (Scharmer, 2007), supervisees are transparent, honest, aware and alert to what is happening as they reflect on the procedures, processes and relationships involved.

Propositional or declarative learning (knowing that . . .) now emerges from critical reflection. Learning is articulated and connected to theory, frameworks, models and other intellectual definitions and descriptions. Learning is captured in words and voices—articulating our learning in propositions and theories focuses that learning. Propositional knowledge also allows us to compare and contrast our own knowledge with that of others and often to begin to synthesize our own thinking with those theories and frameworks.

Practical or procedural knowledge (knowing how) emerges in the final section of the Experiential Learning Cycle in finding ways to translate propositional learning into skills, capabilities, competencies and qualities of the supervisee that enable him or her to return to his or her work. The application of knowledge is itself a form of knowing as we learn the practice skills of translating our theories into our work. Procedural knowledge cannot be taken as a “given”—there are wide gaps between what we know and what we put into practice. Kegan and Lahey’s work (2009) is an exercise in what they call “immunity to change”—how what we want to do is often not done because there are underlying stronger commitments than our commitment to implement what we know.

In their application of the Experiential Learning Cycle to coaching, Law et al. (2007) outline three movements:

1. An internal to external movement. The internal movement involves reflection and conceptualization of new learning. This, in turn, leads to the second external movement from action/application of learning to new practice.
2. A past, present and future movement. Past experience is reflected on in the present, which gives rise to new meaning that is then integrated into future work. We combine these. As Gilbert (2006) remarks: We access the past through memory, we access the present through perception and we access the future through imagination. Gilbert also points out how flaws in these three (memory, perception and imagination) can affect our ways of working.
3. A “movement within,” which results in changing meaning—the meaning and interpretation of our experience changes as we hold it up to critical examination.

A further movement could be added which, like the other movements, is very applicable to supervision: from unconscious competence (accessing our pool of tacit knowledge) through conscious incompetence (allowing ourselves vulnerability as we reflect on our work and translate that vulnerability into new learning) and into new applications of learning to our work.

SUPERVISION AND LEARNING

From the above, reflection and critical reflection can be seen to be the medium of learning in supervision. Reflection is the “ability to step back and pose hard questions about: why are things done this way? How could I do it differently?” Voller (2009) continues her definition and describes reflection as, “Purposeful focusing on thoughts, feelings, sensations and behaviour in order to make meaning from those fragments of experience.

The outcome of this reflection is to create new understanding which in turn may lead to: increasing choices, making changes or reducing confusion” (p. 21). Creating the conditions for critical reflection is not easy. It demands openness and “indifference” to where the outcome will lead. For those already committed to an existing outcome or destination, critical reflection can become impossible. These are also the stages in transformational learning in supervision: moving from experience (our practice) to reflection on that practice (the underlying meanings), which results in learning. Critical reflection then permits us to engage in a procedure that asks us to challenge how we make meaning itself.

ACTIVATING CRITICAL REFLECTION

The springboard for critical reflection (what activates us to reflect) can appear in a number of ways:

- A disorienting experience or dilemma that makes us rethink our existing ideas and theories (we disconfirm)
- Strong feelings and emotions that start the process of thinking through again (a health scare, redundancy, a failed relationship)
- The discovering of assumptions on which I have based my values, life and thinking (e.g., that we are right and everyone else is wrong)
- A feeling of discontent with what I have inherited from others
- An awareness that I am living out other peoples’ values and scripts
- A realization that there are other psychological truths besides mine (Carl Rogers recounts how his visit to China as a young man resulted in a transformational learning experience helping him make the distinction between psychological truth and objective truth)

Critical reflection combines both an emotional experience and a cognitive one, very often in that order. With unrest, confusion, unease, dissatisfaction, shock or even wonderment come a process of thinking through what values and principles and untested assumptions underpin our life and beliefs. Transformational Learning results from critical reflection. It has been called “subjective reframing...the process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference (meaning making perspectives, habits of mind, mind-sets etc.) to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change and reflective so that they can generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action” (Mezirow & Associates, 2000, pp. 7–8).

Critical reflection allows us to become aware of how we come to our learning and knowledge, puts us in touch with our “blind spots, deaf spots and dumb spots,” brings to the fore the conversations we do not have with

ourselves and helps us get in touch with our own integrity and authenticity. Using critical reflection as the medium of experiential learning, we can now outline some stages in this process of transformational learning.

STAGES IN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEARNING

The following stages are not necessarily chronological steps through which learners proceed. They are more like types of learning rather than stages but define positions we adopt vis-à-vis learning.

Zero Learning. This kind of learning consists of information that does not lead to change or action. Zero learning is about information or knowledge that may be interesting in itself but has little or no impact on the person or on change or action within the life of the person. Factual knowledge can have this impact. Knowing that Paris is the capital of France rarely brings significant change into a person's life. Changing a light bulb involves little reflection. Performing a complicated surgical operation need not demand any personal changes in lifestyle or values. More critical information (knowing that if you don't change your life, habits can increase your risks of a heart attack) may also result in zero learning. Kegan and Lahey (2009) outline an example: "Not long ago a medical study showed that if heart doctors tell their seriously at-risk patients they will literally *die if* they do not make changes to their personal lives—diet, exercise, smoking—still only one in seven is actually able to make the changes. One in seven!" (p. 1). Presumably, six people heard and understood what the doctor said—but it made no difference or change impact on their lives. In supervision, zero learning can occur when supervisors make insight or knowledge contributions that are not understood or make no sense practically to the supervisee. (I remember one of my psychodynamic supervisors talking to me of countertransference at a stage of my development when it made no sense to me—I listened politely, thought it interesting and quickly forgot it. Later on, I realized its importance.)

Learning Stage 1: Downloading (from fear—Closed mind, closed heart, closed will). Single-loop learning moves zero learning on a bit. It involves learning new skills and competencies. The new learning adds to an existing pool of knowledge or skills or to the accumulation of existing information. Scharmer (2007) has named this process "downloading" where the emphasis is not on changing substantially but learning within what already exists. Unlike Zero Learning, which does not use new knowledge at all, this form of learning projects existing knowledge onto new knowledge and molds it to fit in with what already exists. It answers the question: How can I do what I do better from within the existing skills and knowledge I have? By and large, it is concerned with the *what* of learning and focuses on accumulating further ideas, theories, knowledge, skills and competencies to fit within existing frameworks. It makes for more efficiency.

With single-loop learning or downloading, we think as we have always thought—new knowledge and information confirms habitual judgements. We project our models onto the world and learn within existing frameworks and assumptions. We listen, see and hear from within our own story. We see what we know and know what we see a bit better. We make the new fit the old. In safe certainty I keep fear at bay, and I can so easily take the moral high ground of being right, certain and having the truth. At worst, I am engaged in fundamentalist learning. I only hear what confirms my commitments and my certainties. Actually I am not a learner. Called *I-in-me* learning (Scharmer, 2007), I recycle what I am committed to.

Downloading is based on authority (as all fear is). Other learning is based on experience where we ask: What is my experience teaching you? At this stage we fall into the trap reportedly outlined by Ruth Benedict: “We don’t see the lens through which we are looking.” As a result we are not in touch with how we make meaning or the mental maps that process our information gathering, selection and interpretation.

Learning Stage 2: Curiosity—and debating (open mind). *Double-loop learning* is the same as Scharmer’s “Debating” (2007) or “I-in-it” learning where we shift from single-loop learning to our ability to take a stance outside ourselves and see other perspectives. We get some distance from our own perspectives and begin to look at other ways of doing things. We now look at the effectiveness of what we have and that review involves *how* we learn and not just *what* we learn. We begin to see how we download and begin to question the assumptions, values and beliefs that make us learn the way we do. We become aware of psychological truth as different from objective truth.

With this kind of learning, I move away from me, and I take another stance. I now debate. I wonder if. What if . . . I argue, discuss and allow other opinions, values, perspectives into awareness. I allow some disconfirmation of my thinking, my pet theories. I probably won’t murder my best ideas but at least I am open to other intellectual ways of thinking. For a time I get outside the prison of my own story and realize other stories exist. Experience becomes a teacher to us. The movement from downloading to noticing and observing in a more detached way can happen through some of the triggers for critical reflection we mentioned above. This stance is mostly intellectual and the forms of conversation relevant to it are debate and discussion. Much teaching is based on this form of intellectual exercise as we critique and debate the various possibilities. I had a good friend at university who was a master debater. He prided himself on arguing any side of the debate and would say, which side do you want me to take? He was equally eloquent arguing either (didn’t matter what it was). It was an intellectual game.

Learning Stage 3: Relationships—Open heart. *Triple-loop learning* or generative dialogue characterizes Learning Stage 3 and puts us within a much bigger domain asking bigger questions. What is the purpose of this, why am I doing it, how is it connected to other aspects of life? If Level 1 moves from

inside out (to project onto the world our own thinking) and Level 2 moves us outside our frameworks to begin looking at other ways of thinking and learning, then Level 3 pulls us inside again to help us see the poverty of our systemic thinking. It then moves us outside to reconnect to the bigger picture with an awareness of new ways of thinking. The change now is in the *process* of learning where mind shifts and mental maps and meaning-making processes are examined and changed. This has been called the movement from helicopter to satellite thinking (Hawkins & Smith, 2006). If Level 2 is still about *where* we are looking, then Level 3 is about *how* we are looking.

A Sufi maxim states, “Fear knocked on the door. Love answered and there was no-one there.” Learning Stage 3 moves away further from fear. The third stance is *I-in-you* learning. I listen to myself reflectively and I listen to you empathetically (the I-in-you bit). And now I connect emotionally and have an open heart as well as an open mind. Can I begin to see it from others’ perspectives? Speak to me. I am not buying your truth but I am certainly prepared to rent it, to walk in it, to see it from your perspective. Empathetic learning (Moore, 2008) permits us the ability to leave the comfort of our own stories and join story of the other. I interrupt my own stories: I leave my comfort zone, I am unsafe. I can now reflect on this—I have the ability to allow you and your thinking and your ideas and your values to be an open subject for me.

We open ourselves to new ideas, thinking, theories, etc. We use empathy to understand from other perspectives. We listen sincerely, with integrity, allowing the new to influence what is already in our lives. This “I-in-you” stance provides us with new perspectives from which to evaluate our own theories and makes us able to adapt and blend our theories with other approaches. Stage 3 is characterized by reflective listening and dialogue where we are open to the psychological truths of others not just with an open mind but also with an open heart. Triple-loop learning is concerned with the process of learning: learning how to learn.

Learning Stage 4: Courage (open will) critical reflection. The fourth stance is *I-in-now* learning, transformational learning based on generative dialogue. How can we talk together in ways that change us all? Can we listen from the perspective of the whole system? With generative dialogues, we co-create new realities together. This stance can be characterized by a quote from Rumi: “In the field beyond right and wrong, I will meet you there.”

In the field beyond tribalism, I will meet you there. In the field beyond competition, in the field beyond who is better, in the field beyond what the research says... I will meet you there. In the field beyond... whatever and whatever, I will meet you there. We will meet and, as someone said, camp out beside the questions for a while. We will stop talking and listen more. We will be open. We will be prepared to see our own prejudices and mind-sets and mental maps that keep us where we are. We will see the thinking behind our thinking, the learning behind our learning. We will try to see the bigger picture. We will reflect, and reflect more and even more. And we will be

courageous to go with where the experience is taking us. I will see myself as part of the problem and part of the solution. We will let go of pet theories and well-worn dictates. This approach has been captured well by Abrashoff (2002, p. 3), a Navy captain who is talking about leadership when he writes, “When I could not get the results I wanted, I swallowed my temper and turned inwards to see if I was part of the problem I discovered that 90% of the time, I was at least as much a part of the problem as my people were.”

With critical reflection we now begin the process of considering, sifting, thinking through, connecting, discussing and debating. We see our meaning-making processes and we recognize the meaning-making frameworks of others. We question the very way we make meaning. The “I-in-now” stance permits us to be systemic in our thinking and be open to the demands of the present. Generative dialogue (Isaacs, 1999) opens doors to collective wisdom and communities of action.

We are now in touch with the frameworks that help us understand the processes by which we learn. We are in a position to change these to make them more open to new living or to adapt to new insights or learning. We have new ways of making meaning of our experiences and the experiences of others. We are in touch with the assumptions underpinning our learning and more, we are in a position to change these assumptions to more helpful ones. With transformational learning comes openness to the contexts in which we have learned to make meaning and the awareness that we have the power to change the ways in which we make sense of our world and the world of others.

Scharmer (2007) talks about the process of “letting go” and “letting come.” This notion traces the process of what happens in transformational learning. The learner has to “let go” of much of what has sustained learning up to now. Courage is often needed to commit what Zuboff and Maxmin (2002) have called “small murders”—saying goodbye to values, ideas, theories and ideologies that have been central to our lives for so long. “Letting come” also involves courage and “indifference” that with open mind, heart and will, we are prepared to embrace the consequences of this new way of thinking. Courage and resilience play a part when our new meaning-making process puts us at odds with our own community, the loyalties and relationships that pre-exist and are sustained by communal beliefs and psychological contracts (Carroll, 2005).

AND SO, TO SUPERVISION

How do the above apply to supervision? Let’s take a few definitions (less traditional ones) as a starter:

Supervision interrupts practice. It wakes us up to what we are doing. When we are alive to what we are doing we wake up to what is, instead of falling asleep in the comfort stories of our clinical routines and daily

practice. We have profound learning difficulties when it comes to being present to our own moment to moment experiences. Disturb the stuck narrative. The supervisory voice acts as in irritator interrupting repetitive stories (comfort stories) and facilitating the construction of new stories. (Ryan, 2004, p. 47)

Supervision is the creation of that free space where the supervisee lets herself tell back so that she hears herself afresh and invents in imagination how she can best be for her client in their next session. (Houston, 1990, p. 7)

Here we have a different modality of supervision: Supervision is not a given. It's not something someone called a supervisor does to someone else called a supervisee. It's a process about a way of looking at and how with super-vision—new eyes, new perceptions, new visions—we can see things differently. Supervision is about a new way of looking, a super way of visioning. With new visions come new perspectives and new meanings. I notice new things. Supervision is always about the quality of awareness. With reflection comes meaning at different levels. As I step outside my comfort zone and take an open stance, without judgment or shame, without blame or assumption, and am open and indifferent to the outcome, what would I allow myself to think and reflect upon? Can I look beyond, beside, beneath, above, below, against, for—what would happen if I looked at myself, my client, our relationship in another way?

Supervision is about paying attention to our practice. It is the dancing partner of our work (Murphy, 2009). We stop doing; we pull back from our work: we start thinking/reflection. We move from subject (where we are identified with or attached to our work) to object where we can take a perspective outside ourselves. Supervision is a strategic withdrawal to meditate, contemplate, and think about our work. In the attention to and the reflection on, we learn how to do our work differently and better. That's the purpose of supervision: it's a "respectful interruption" of our work to set up reflective dialogues through which we learn from the very work we do—we sit at the feet of our experience; we allow our work to become our teacher (Zachary, 2000). The medium through which we do this is reflection; reflection becomes the method through which we learn. Reflection is the discipline of wondering about What if . . .

FOUR SUPERVISORY CONVERSATIONS (FROM PROBLEM SOLVING TO TRANSFORMATIONAL LEARNING)

From the above, it would appear that there are a number of supervision conversations, all of them involved in learning and each a step on the ladder toward transformational learning. All these conversations are worthwhile and all valuable in their own right. A supervisor's task is to know which

conversation to have with a particular supervisee and be able to engage in that conversation when needed. Let us run an example through the four supervision conversations below.

I have been asked to see and support a senior executive (George) who is coming back to work after a six-month absence due to severe depression and stress. The contact is through his HR director (Nicholas), whom I have worked for before. Nicholas's hope is that with coaching and support George will gradually build up his resilience and strength and gradually get back to full-time employment. George contacts me and we make an executive coaching contract to work for three months and then review the work together.

After two months and eight sessions with George, I am telephoned one day by Nicholas. Nicholas understands about the confidentiality of my work with George and doesn't ask about that but briefly comments about the change he has seen in George and how settled and happier he seems at work. However, Nicholas says, I do have a request from you. What George doesn't know yet is that he will be made redundant (the decision has been made), and his request from me is that I tell him whether or not George is robust and psychologically sound enough to hear this news. If my assessment suggests he is not yet ready for such news, then Nicholas will postpone telling him about his redundancy. If, on the other hand, I assess that George is able to hear the news and will be able to deal with it emotionally and psychologically, then Nicholas will set up a meeting with him in a few days' time and deliver the news.

I will now have four different supervisory conversations aligned to the four levels of learning outlined above.

Supervision Conversation 1 (Level 1: Single-Loop Learning)

In supervision my supervisor and I look at the contract I have with the company of which George is an employee. The contract is clear and contains nothing about feedback to the organization. We agree that were I to agree to Nicholas's request (without the permission of George, whom I cannot tell about his impending redundancy) that I would be breaking confidence. My codes of ethics would back me up on not giving Nicholas the information he needs. I get back to Nicholas and tell him this. I have learned nothing new from the experience and simply used knowledge and skills I already had. I have solved my problem.

Supervision Conversation 2 (Level 2: Double-Loop Learning)

In supervision, my supervisor suggests I take another stance on this. Can I see from Nicholas's point of view? I can. I know Nicholas. I am impressed about his concern for his executives and the time and effort he puts in to ensure their well-being. He would not ask me to compromise my position

and yet he knows that after eight sessions with George I am probably the best person to assess his resilience in hearing news of his redundancy. Perhaps I should reassess my ethical stance to include the concerns of Nicholas and his anxiety about not adding further to George's distress. Furthermore, I know that companies make people redundant and so I don't have a negative ethical stance on that. I get back to Nicholas to look at the implications of what this could mean for both of us (if I shared my assessment with him) and am open to the outcome. I have changed my behavior.

Supervision Conversation 3 (Level 3: Triple-Loop Learning)

With my supervisor, I try to hold the system and the needs of the subsystems within the company together. I am aware of the stakeholders involved: the company, the HR director, George, me, my professional body (with its code of ethics). Particularly, I am concerned with what is best for George. My supervisor helps me have an imaginary conversation with George in which I share with him the request from Nicholas (and of course the news of his redundancy). I imagine (based on my experience and relationship with George) what he might say. After about 10 minutes of imaginary dialogue with George, he concludes, "Michael, I trust you. I believe that you would not do anything that wasn't in my best interests. I would be unhappy if you ruled out not talking to Nicholas about me since I think you are the best person to make that assessment. I trust you to do what is best for me." After this supervision, I get back to Nicholas and tell him I think George is strong enough to hear the news. I also tell him that if George asks him if he has talked with me then he must tell him he has. As I will do if George asks me the same question. We agree that I will continue to see George after the news has been delivered to continue to support and coach him as he looks toward a new job. I am aware that I have taken a risk in sharing information with Nicholas that I do not have permission from George to share. I take that risk. I have changed my thinking.

Supervision Conversation 4 (Level 4: Transformational Learning)

With my supervisor I begin a meta-conversation triggered by the experience above. I noticed that my first reaction (ethically) was to safeguard myself and my first imaginary reaction was of George taking out a complaint against me for breach of confidentiality. Hence my Level 1 thinking solved this issue. However, I was rather embarrassed that my first thoughts were for me and not for what was best for George. Why was that? Do I tend to move to what is safer rather than what is best? As I unraveled my ethical mind-set and process of making ethical decisions I realized that mine was more an ethics of duty rather than an ethics of trust, fidelity and relationship. I traced this back to my "good boy" image and my security in being safe. I tackled some of the

assumptions on which this was based (I will lose my job, I will be struck off the register for psychologists, I will be seen by peers as a failure, no one will come to me again for coaching or counseling, and many others). I held these untested assumptions up to the light. Where was the risk-taking Michael that could push out the boat for the sake of his clients? It was quite a transformational journey as I moved toward a relational ethics rather than an external ethics that kept me right and safe and secure.

These different supervisory narratives and stories focus on different forms of learning: from problem solving to transformational learning. They move through solving a problem (Level 1), to changing my behavior (Level 2), to changing my thinking (Level 3), to changing the thinking behind my thinking (Level 4).

With transformational openness we begin new ways of thinking and talking and making space for wider concerns. Now other voices join the supervisory pair (or group) in the supervisory room—the quiet, unspoken voices, the powerless voices, the underprivileged voices, the abused voices, the hurt voices. In supervision we (supervisor and supervisee) ask together in dialogue and transparency:

What voices need to be heard?
 What words need to be spoken?
 What truth needs to be acknowledged?
 What connections need to be made?
 What assumptions need to be challenged?
 What beliefs need to be reviewed?
 What emotions need to be expressed?
 What actions need to be taken?
 What relationships need to be named?
 What secrets need to be uncovered?
 What strengths need to be seen?
 What limitations need to be articulated?
 What victories need to be celebrated?
 What losses need to be grieved?
 What mental maps need to surface?
 What is the shift that needs to be enabled?
 What fears am I not facing?

Transformational learning in supervision is about shifts in mentality:

- From the unexamined life to continual reflection
- From the same things over and over again (mindlessness) to new ways (mindfulness)
- From individual to communal
- From isolation to connectedness

- From sameness to surprises
- From static to developmental
- From head to head and heart
- From competition to cooperation
- From greed to generosity
- From denial to facing monsters
- From authority to experience
- From teaching to learning
- From the what of learning, to the how of learning, to the process of learning
- From fear to courage

CONCLUSION

Reflection leads to different forms of learning, all of which are the appropriate domain of supervision. The deepest form of learning used in supervision is transformational learning, which combines both personal and professional learning. In transformational learning, supervisees critically reflect not just on their experience but the way they construct their experience. In doing so, they open themselves up to new transformational learning, which creates new mental maps or meaning-making frameworks that help interpret their experience, learn from it and go back to their work with new insights and new behaviors. This is supervision at its creative best and most courageous. Charles Péguy, a French writer, told the story of a man who died and appeared before the Recording Angel to give an account of his life. The Angel asked, "Show me your wounds." "Wounds" the man replied. "I don't have any wounds." And the Recording Angel said, "Didn't you find anything on earth worth fighting for?" Supervisors and supervisees have many wounds as they fight together and separately for transformational learning.

REFERENCES

- Abrashoff, D. M. (2002). *It's your ship: Management techniques from the best damn ship in the Navy*. New York: Warner.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1972). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Atkinson, T., & Claxton, G. (2000). *The intuitive practitioner: On the value of not always knowing what one is doing*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to ecology of mind*. London: Palladin.
- Bond, T. (2007). Ethics and psychotherapy: An issue of trust. In R. E. Ashcroft, A. Dawson, H. Draper, and J. R. McMillan (Eds.), *Principles of health care ethics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 435–442). New York: Wiley.
- Carroll, M. (2005). The psychological contract in organisations. In R. Tribe and M. Morrissey (Eds.), *Professional and ethical issues for psychologists, psychotherapists and counsellors* (pp. 333–345). London: Brunner-Routledge.

- Carroll, M. (2009a). From mindless to mindful practice: On learning reflection in supervision. *Australian Journal of Psychotherapy*, 15(4), 38–49.
- Carroll, M. (2009b). Supervision: Critical reflection for transformational learning, Part 1. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 28(2), 210–220.
- Carroll, M., & Gilbert, M. (2005). *On becoming a supervisee: Creating learning partnerships*. London: Vukani Publishing.
- Garvin, D. A. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organisation to work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2007). *Gut feelings: The intelligence of the unconscious*. London: Penguin.
- Gilbert, D. (2006). *Stumbling on happiness*. London: Harper Press.
- Hawkins, P., & Smith, N. (2006). *Coaching, mentoring and organisational consultancy: Supervision and development*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Holloway, E. (1992). Supervision: A way of teaching and learning. In S. Brown and R. Lent (Eds.), *The handbook of counseling psychology* (pp.). New York: Wiley.
- Houston, G. (1990). *Supervision and counselling*. London: Rochester Foundation.
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jarvis, P., Holford, J., & Griffin, C. (1998). *The theory and practice of learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Kegan, R., & Lahey, L. L. (2009). *Immunity to change: How to overcome it and unlock the potential in yourself and your organization*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Law, H., Ireland, J., & Hussain, Z. (2007). *The psychology of coaching, mentoring and learning*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, B. (2008). Group supervision with a multi-disciplinary Trauma Resource Team in the north of Ireland: A participative inquiry into the application of a “process framework”. Middlesex University, London.
- Murphy, K. (2009). *Keynote address at the British Association for Supervision Practice and Research*. London, July.
- Pampallis-Paisley, P. (2006). *Towards a theory of supervision for coaching—An integral approach*. Middlesex University, London.
- Ramsden, P. (Ed.) (1988). *Improving learning: New perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ryan, S. (2004). *Vital practice*. Portland, UK: Sea Change Publications.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge: SOL.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Viall, P. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Voller, H. (in press). Developing the understanding of reflective practice in counseling and psychotherapy. D. Prof, University of Middlesex.
- Zachary, L. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zuboff, M., & Maxmin, J. (2002). *The support economy: Why corporations are failing individuals*. New York: Penguin.