



The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 11
Issue 2 June

Article 4

June 1984

Measuring Ecology in Social Work Supervision: The Relationship Between Work and Treatment Environments and the Quality of Supervision in Israeli Public Welfare Agencies

Ron Maier
University of Haifa, Israel

Edna Guttman
University of Haifa, Israel

Zvi Eisikovits
University of Haifa, Israel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maier, Ron; Guttman, Edna; and Eisikovits, Zvi (1984) "Measuring Ecology in Social Work Supervision: The Relationship Between Work and Treatment Environments and the Quality of Supervision in Israeli Public Welfare Agencies," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 11 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol11/iss2/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



MEASURING ECOLOGY IN SOCIAL WORK
SUPERVISION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
WORK AND TREATMENT ENVIRONMENTS AND THE
QUALITY OF SUPERVISION IN ISRAELI PUBLIC
WELFARE AGENCIES

DR. RON MAIER
Lecturer, School of Social Work,
University of Haifa, Israel.

Received Ph.D. from Washington University,
1978. Current interests are citizen part-
icipation, generic social work practice and
the social ecology of social work agencies.

MS. EDNA GUTTMANN
Research Associate, School of Social Work,
University of Haifa, Israel.

Graduate Student, current interests are in
practice model building and child and youth
care work.

DR. ZVI EISIKOVITS
Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work,
University of Haifa, Israel

Received Ph.D. from the University of
Minnesota, 1977. Current interests are
epistemology of practice, professional
socialization, residential child and youth
care.

ABSTRACT

This study measures the interaction
between work and treatment environments in

public welfare agencies and social work supervision. One hundred and twenty-four social work students enrolled in B.S.W. studies at two Israeli universities, who were doing field work in these agencies, were randomly sampled. The work and treatment environments were measured utilizing an adapted version of a scale developed by Rudolf H. Moos. The student's evaluation of supervision was measured using a revised version of Carlton Munson's questionnaire. Supervisory variables such as administrative capability, effective use of time, and relationships were positively correlated with work environment variables such as order and organization, clarity, cohesiveness and support, and with treatment environment variables such as innovation, spontaneity, anger and aggression. Conflicts in the supervisory relationship were correlated with a controlling and unsupportive work environment. The use of technology was perceived as limiting the clients' autonomy. While some logical influences were drawn concerning the direction of these correlations and the possible paths these create, further research is needed in order to address the direction of these correlations. Some practice implications of the findings were discussed briefly.

Social work interest in the study of human environments and especially in the person-environment interface has increased dramatically over the last decade (Maluccio, 1979). Germain (1981) contends that concern for the person-in-environment "...is the distinguishing and unifying characteristic of social work."

From its inception, social work considered the agency setting as central to the work and to the therapeutic process (Perlman, 1957; Hollis, 1972; Turner, 1978). This view was at the heart of several theoretical models, but little effort was made to test them empirically. Examples of these models are the application of the general systems theory to social work (Gordon, 1969), the Psychosocial formulation to social treatment (Turner, 1978) and the linking of social work with the concept of social networks (Collins & Pancoast, 1976). The integration of these models led to the development of the ecological approach in social work (Gitterman & Germain, 1976; Germain, 1979; Germain, 1981)

This approach focuses on improving transactions between people and environments in order to strengthen adaptive capacities and improve environments (Germain, 1979; Coulton, 1979a). Ecological social work practice is based on "the natural life processes of adaptation, stress, coping, and the environmental nutrients required for release of adaptive capacities" (Germain, 1981). The objective is to strengthen the individual's autonomy, competence, relatedness and identity through a change effort focused on the individual, the environment or the person-in-environment (Middleman & Goldberg, 1974; Coulton, 1979a; Germain, 1979).

While ecological measurement is at the basis of a wide variety of studies in the social and behavioral sciences which assess environments in industry and business organizations (Pane & Pheysey, 1971; Drexler, 1977; Schneider, 1980), treatment settings (Proshansky & Rivlin, 1970; Willems, 1976; Lemke & Moos, 1981; Rhodes,

1981), other total institutions (Moos, 1974), educational settings (Stern, 1970) and informal group and family contexts (Moos, 1974), it has rarely been applied to primary social work settings. There are several examples of ecologically based research in social work. Seabury (1971) described and compared the physical settings of six social work agencies. Coulton (1979) measured the person-environment fit among users of hospital social services. Maluccio (1979, 1979a) found that clients perceived the social and physical environments of the agency as more critical to the course and outcome of service, than did the social workers. One study was found which measured public welfare agencies from a holistic ecological perspective. It examined the impact of the organizational structure of these agencies on the work and treatment environments (Maier, 1983). These studies clarify the interdependence of the social environments in the treatment organization and the quality of service provided to clients. Hence, the work and treatment environments need to be studied in their interaction in the context of the agency's everyday functioning.

More specifically, the agency's physical surroundings, relationships among workers and the opportunities each worker has for growing and developing, the relationships among clients and workers, their input in the management of care are all interacting and their quality is essential in operationalizing an ecological perspective to social work practice. Measuring these components and their inter-relatedness is one purpose of the present study.

Another essential aspect of social work activities within the environment is the quality of supervision provided. Together

with the work and treatment environments, supervision is believed to impact significantly on the quality of service. The relationship between the work and treatments environments and the quality of supervision is our second and major interest in this study. No empirical studies, or conceptually oriented work, directly aimed at assessing the relationship between the quality of supervision and the quality of work treatment environments, are known.

Social work has always held an implicit assumption concerning the quality of supervision and the agency in which it occurs. This relationship has always been taken for granted rather than empirically measured. The supervisory process is known to include an education, a self-growth and an administrative component (Berl, 1960; Kadushin, 1976; Munson, 1979). Within the administrative component supervision was related to the agency's organizational needs: to keep the quality of the agency's services up to the standards and aspire to improve them (Brackett, 1903; Arndt, 1955; Wax, 1963; Munson, 1979a); to facilitate the internal functioning of the agency (Stiles, 1963; Watson, 1973; Eldridge, 1982); and to socialize workers to their work place (Wax, 1963). Even though it is known that "organizational structure and processes are so powerful that supervisory practice must focus its major attention on them" (Epstein, 1973; p. 6), few studies tried to identify the relation of these processes to supervision. When this was done, primary concern was with bureaucratic elements such as the impact that the worker's social position in the hierarchical structure has on his satisfaction with supervision (Wasserman, 1971; Kadushin, 1974) and the way the organizational structure of the agency influences attitudes toward supervision

(Scott, 1965).

While these studies reveal a variety of important problems which arise from doing professional work in a bureaucratic organization (Barber, 1963; Green, 1966; Finch, 1976) none tried to identify the unique connection between the work and treatment environments of social work agencies and social work supervision. This connection can be found implicitly only in conceptualizations and empirical studies of the relationship between supervision and a) working relationships among professional staff, b) growth opportunities that workers have, and c) work management.

a) Working relationships among Professional Staff

Group supervision enhances mutual social support among workers, and develops their sense of cohesion (Abels, 1970) and hence is the supervisory method used to strengthen the relationship component of the work environment.

b) Growth opportunities

Workers' growth was primarily thought to be the kind and extent of supervision (Scherz, 1958) and extent of autonomy given to workers (Moos; 1974; Munson, 1976). Only more recently Cherniss & Eguatios (1978) presented a typology of supervision, namely didactic consultative, laissez-faire, authoritative, insight oriented and feelings oriented. Satisfaction with supervision was found to vary with the style of supervision used. One can only infer that if professional growth is influence by the supervisory style, and if the style used impacts upon satisfaction from supervision, then more satisfaction may lead to enhanced professional growth.

Autonomy, or independence, is considered an appropriate measure of the opportunities for professional development (Moos, 1974). Findings that workers had little autonomy because of supervisory arrangements (Scott, 1965), raised one of the major dilemmas in social work supervision today: how can social workers do autonomous practice while being supervised? (Epstein, 1973; Munson, 1976). Then, if autonomy is an integral part of self-growth in the work environment, are we saying that supervision in social work works against professional self development? By seeking to understand the relationship between supervision and the work environments of public welfare agencies this study may shed additional light on this question.

c) Work management

Work management variables include work pressure, and the clarity and systematic enforcement of the agency's rules. Supervisors who lack competence were found to emphasize their power and to control the social worker's activities (Wasserman, 1970, 1971). The social workers, in return viewed this power and control as the causes for their dissatisfaction with supervision (Kadushin, 1974; Munson, 1980, 1981). While factors in the work environment are directly related to supervision, as shown above, various aspects of the treatment environment such as worker-client relationships, clients' growth and the management of intervention are shown to impact on supervision only to the extent that they influence the work environment.

It is assumed that through the contribution of supervision to workers' cohesiveness, to their self-growth and to their work orientation, improvements in the

treatment environment will occur (Stiles, 1963; Watson, 1973; Kadushin, 1976; Munson, 1980). This assumption can be understood in the light of the manifest purpose of supervision -- to improve social work services through a better professional functioning of the workers.

From the supervisory literature an imaginary path connecting supervision and the quality of work and treatment environments can be inferred. We understand at this point that each component on this path co-constitutes the other but have little knowledge of how and to what extent. It becomes essential then to conceptualize the interrelatedness of these parameters and measure them.

The purpose of this study is to conceptualize and measure ecology in social work supervision. More specifically, it aims to further our understanding and measurement of ecology in social work, and to begin the movement from partial descriptions of the relation between agency variables and supervisory ones, to a holistic conceptualization and measurement of the way that supervision, work and treatment environments in social work agencies interact.

METHOD

In the present study two measuring instruments were developed: the first which assessed the work and treatment environments of social work field agencies and the second which focused on the evaluation of the supervisory process of social work students and staff. The resulting questionnaire was administered to a sample of social work students who were completing a year's field placement in a

social work agency and who were receiving regular supervision. We wanted to measure the relationship between work and treatment environments and the supervisory experience.

Study Sample

One hundred and twenty-four social work students enrolled in B.S.W. studies at the University of Haifa and University of Tel Aviv Schools of Social Work were sampled randomly. Undergraduate social work training in Israel consists of a three-year program of full-time studies (40 hours per week) and it is the professional degree in social work. In both the second and third year, students are engaged in a year-long 24 hour/week supervised placement in a field agency. The present sample included 68 (55.3%) students who were completing their second year of study and 52 (42.3%) completing their year. Students were placed either in public welfare offices (51.7%) or in counseling centers (48.3%). In most cases (86.8%) students met with their field supervisor once a week or more for two hours. In the remaining instances the frequency of supervision sessions was once every two weeks or less.

Measures

The assessment of the work and treatment environments of public welfare offices and learning centers was based on the work of Rudolf H. Moos who developed instruments for measuring the psychosocial environment of psychiatric hospitals (Moos, 1974), community based psychiatric treatment settings (moos & Otto, 1972), correctional institutions (Moos, 1975) and sheltered care settings (Lemke & Moos, 1981).

Treatment environment dimensions, sub-scales and items were adapted from Moos' Ward Atmosphere Scale (Moos, 1974) while work environment items were based on his Work Environment Scale (Moos & Insel, 1974). Specific questions were revised to account for cultural and systemic differences between the American organizational settings, in which Moos' scales were developed, and the Israeli social work agencies in which they were applied in the present study.

Moos suggest that all work and treatment environments encompass three basic dimensions: interpersonal relationship (the kind of interaction between worker and client or worker and worker reinforced by the agency); personal development (the growth and development opportunities offered by the setting to workers and/or clients); and system maintenance and change (the ecology of organizational administration). In the present research the work environment scale was composed of the following subscales: an interpersonal relationship dimension including involvement, cohesion and staff support; a personal development dimension which included independence and task orientation; and a system maintenance and change dimension encompassing work pressure, staff clarity, control and comfort.

The treatment environment scale was composed of sub-scales as follows: an interpersonal relationship dimension measuring support and spontaneity; a personal development dimension including autonomy, practical orientation, personal problem orientation, anger and aggression; and a system maintenance and change dimension including order and organization, clarity in innovation. The work and treatment environment scales, sub-scales and sample

items are described in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

Table 1
Social Work Agency Work Environment Scale
Description of Subscales

Relationship Dimension	Extent to which workers are involved and tend to support and help each other.
1. Involvement	Measures the extent to which staff are actively involved in the functioning of the agency. <u>Workers put quit a lot of effort into what they do.</u> <u>Few people ever volunteer in this agency.</u>
2. Cohesion	Measures the extent to which staff have close personal relationships with one another. <u>Workers rarely do things together after work</u> <u>Workers take a personal interest in each other.</u>
3. Staff Support	Measures the extent to which staff are encouraged and supported by supervisors and other workers. <u>Supervisors usually comp-</u>

liment a worker who does something well.

Workers discuss their personal problems with their supervisor.

Personal Development Dimension

Opportunities afforded by the environment for worker growth and development.

4. Independence

Measures the extent to which workers are encouraged to be independent in making decisions regarding their work.

Agency supervisors encourage workers to rely on themselves when a problem arises.

Few Workers in this agency have any real responsibility.

5. Task Orientation

Measures the extent to which staff emphasize getting jogs done quickly and effectively.

Work rarely gets "put off till tomorrow."

People seem to be quite inefficient.

System Maintenance and Change Dimension

Extent to which the environment is well organized, clearly understood

and open to change.

6. Work Pressure Measures the extent to which the agency expects more from the staff than time would reasonably allow.

There is constant pressure in this agency to keep working.

It is very difficult for workers in this agency to keep up with their work load.

7. Staff Clarity Measures the extent to which staff clearly understand the way the agency operates and what is expected of workers.

Policies and procedures in this agency are unclear.

Generally when a job is assigned the worker is given a detailed explanation.

8. Control Measures the extent to which the worker's activities are regulated by agency rules and strict supervision.

Workers in this agency are expected to follow set rules in doing their work.

Supervisors in this agency are always check-

ing up on the workers and supervise them very closely.

9. Comfort

Measures the extent to which the agency's physical surroundings are attractive and comfortable.

The lighting in agency offices is very good.

Work space is awfully crowded.

Table 2
Social Work Agency Treatment
Environment Scale:
Description of Subscales

Relationship
Dimension

Extent to which clients are involved and are supported by other clients and agency staff.

1. Support

Measures the extent to which clients are encouraged and supported by staff and other clients.

Staff go out of their way to help clients.

The workers do not expect much from the clients.

2. Spontaneity

Measures the extent to

which the agency encourages clients to express themselves openly.

Clients are careful about what they say when staff are around.

People here say what they are thinking.

Personal Development Dimension

Opportunities afforded by the environment for client growth and development in accordance with the treatment program.

3. Autonomy

Measures how self-sufficient and independent clients are encouraged to be in making decisions.

The workers discourage criticism.

Staff encourage clients to suggest changes and give ideas.

4. Practical Orientation

Measures how well the program orients an individual towards training for a new job, looking to the future and setting and working toward concrete goals.

Clients are expected to make detailed specific plans for the future.

There is very little emphasis on what clients

will be doing after they stop coming to the agency.

5. Personal Problem Orientation

Measures the extent to which the program encourages clients to be concerned with their feelings and personal problems.

Clients rarely speak with one another about their personal problems.

Staff are mainly interested in learning about clients feelings.

6. Anger and Aggression

Measures the extent to which the agency encourages clients and workers to express anger and frustration.

Staff and clients often criticize each other.

Sometimes clients here threaten to hit someone.

System Maintenance and Change Dimension

Extent to which the environment is well organized, clearly understood and open to change.

7. Order and Organization

Measures how well organized the environment is and to what extent the

program is planned.

This is a very well organized agency.

Client services are carefully planned.

8. Clarity

Measures the clarity of goal expectations and agency rules and procedures.

Clients know what kind of services are offered here.

There are rarely changes in the rules here.

9. Innovation

Measures the environments openness to new ideas and changes in treatment approaches.

New and different ideas are always being tried out.

Things in this agency don't change.

The 57 item, 9 sub-scale revised form of the original 90 item Work Environment Scale and 45 item, 9 sub-scale revised form of the original 90 item Ward Atmosphere Scale were derived by using the following criteria:

1. Items in which more than 80% of the respondents answered in one direction were deleted to avoid items

characteristic of extreme settings.

2. Each sub-scale should have acceptable internal consistency. Internal consistency coefficients were calculated using Cronbach's alpha and average within program item variances. Table 3 Summarizes these findings and confirms that all 18 sub-scales showed high internal consistency.
3. On each sub-scale the number of items scored true should be approximately the same as scored false to control for acquiescence response set.

Table 3
Internal Consistencies for
Social Work Agency Work and
Treatment Environment Subscales

Subscale	Cronbach's Alpha
----------	------------------

Work Environment:

Involvement	.742
Cohesion	.768
Staff Support	.759
Independence	.755
Task Orientation	.738
Work Pressure	.789
Staff Clarity	.771
Control	.801
Comfort	.799

Treatment Environment:

Support	.764
Spontaneity	.771
Autonomy	.781
Practical Orientation	.787
Personal Problem Orientation	.774
Anger and Aggression	.775
Order and Organization	.772
Clarity	.783
Innovation	.769

The measuring instrument on the process of worker supervision was adapted from the 60 item instrument on field instruction developed by Carlton Munson (1979). In this questionnaire, Munson attempted to develop items which tapped the three major dimensions suggested by Kadushin (1976) of administration, education and self-growth. Certain items were dropped in the present research based on either their inapplicability to the supervisory process of the agency settings studied or to the overall supervisory culture in Israel.

In order to determine the major factors underlying the revised 43 item supervisory scale a factor analytic approach was applied. Rotation to an oblique solution resulted in five factors whose eigenvalues were greater than 1.00. These five factors, their associated eigenvalues and individual scale items whose factor pattern coefficients were greater than .35 are presented in Table 4. Based on interpretation of the factor pattern matrix, these five factors have been characterized as follows: Factor 1 -- supervisor-worker relationship; Factor 2 -- technology and accountability; Factor 3 -- administrative skills; Factor 4 -- appropriate use of time; Factor 5 -- conflict.

Table 4
Scale Items from the Five Supervision
Factors and their Associated Factor
Pattern Coefficients*

Factors and Scale Items	Eigenvalue	Factor Pattern Coefficient
Factor 1 Supervisor-Worker Relationship	14.614	
My supervisor en- courages me to speak freely with him		.470
My supervisor assumes that I know less than I do		.752
If I am able to, I avoid meeting with my supervisor		.501
My supervisor has a tendency not to accept new ideas		.512
My supervisor's approach is "sit and listen to me"		.389
My supervisor enables me to work according to my best personal and prof- essional judgment		-.776
The evaluations given by my supervisor orally or in writing are in accord-		

ance with my own evaluation
of my work .551

My supervisor tries to treat
rather than supervise me .716

I think my supervisor is
fair in the demands he
makes of me .452

My supervisor respects me
as a professional and acts
accordingly .543

My supervisor can be easily
approached .482

Factor 2
Technology and
Accountability 2.294

My supervisor uses tapes
of my work in supervisory
sessions .682

My supervisor participates
in some of my sessions
with clients in order to
help me develop profess-
ional skills .431

My supervisor demands that
I tape treatment sessions
for our use in supervisory
meetings .756

Factor 3
Administrative Skills 2.113

My supervisor possesses
extensive knowledge of
the procedures and oper-
ating regulations of the

agency .850

My supervisor really
knows how to get about
in administrative matters .756

My supervisor is a good
administrator .558

Factor 4
Appropriate Use of Time 1.424

My supervisor tells me
about his personal
problems instead of
giving me supervision .801

My supervisor knows how
to set priorities in
supervision .378

During supervisory sessions
my supervisor speaks about
everyday matters that don't
relate to work .398

My supervisor organizes his
work well .361

Factor 5
Conflict 1.326

My supervisor usually invents
things to argue about -3.88

There is no sense in getting
into conflicts with my
supervisor -.417

My supervisor is a good
administrator .403

* Only scale items whose factor pattern coefficients are .350 or greater are included.

Factor score coefficients were calculated for the five main dimensions of supervision from which five factors scored were figured for each respondent. Simple Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated among the work and treatment scales and five main supervision factors in order to analyze the pattern of association between perceptions of social welfare agency work and treatment environments and the nature of the field supervision experience.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of correlation coefficients between the five supervisory scale factors and work and treatment environment subscales are presented in descending order according to the amount of variation in the supervisory process scale accounted for by each factor. The simple Pearson correlation coefficients between supervision factors and environment scales appear in tables 5 through 9 respectively. The degree of association between each factor and work environment sub-scale is presented first followed by its correlation with treatment environment subscales. Finally correlations between each supervision factor and work and treatment environment subscales are examined together with the intercorrelations evident among the agency environment subscales themselves.

The Supervisory Relationship and the Agency Environment

The quality of the relationship between

the supervisor and field work student was highly correlated with the extent to which student perceived the agency environment as supportive and encouraging for the staff ($r = .415$). In addition, a supervisor-supervisee relationship characterized by openness, mutual respect, challenge and freedom of expression was positively linked to the perception of high cohesion among agency workers ($r = .247$). It is interesting to note that the Physical environment of the agency, i.e., comfort, was negatively correlated with the supervisory relationship factor ($r = -.225$). This suggests that substandard physical conditions in the agency are associated with stronger supervisory relationships than is the case in improved physical surroundings.

The supervisor-supervisee relationship was also positively correlated with several aspects of the treatment environment in the agency. Most notably, constructive and trusting supervisor-supervisee relationships were related significantly with the agency's encouragement of free expression, i.e., spontaneity, on the part of its clientele ($r = .364$). Similarly, but to a lesser degree, the relationship factor correlated with an agency climate which allowed the client and worker to express anger ($r = .225$). Also, where the field students felt the supervisor treated them as professionals, was easy to approach, encouraged them to act independently and was demanding, but fair, they viewed the agency as open to and encouraging of new ideas and innovation in serving its clients ($r = .296$).

When the supervisory relationship, work environment and treatment environment are taken together, it becomes clear that the positive association between the supervision factor and staff support in the work

environment and spontaneity and innovation in the treatment environment is felt both directly and indirectly. The direct effect has already been described. The potential indirect effect is evident in the high associations between staff support and both spontaneity ($r = .541$) and innovation ($r = .440$) and in the correlation between these latter two treatment subscales ($r = .473$). It seems most plausible that the supervisor-student relationship in supervision works to strengthen the agency's support for its staff which in turn reinforces the openness of the organization to client spontaneity and service innovation.

Table 5
Pearson Correlation Coefficients between
Supervision Factor 1 (Supervisor-Worker
Relationship) and Work and Treatment
Environment Subscales*

	l	Co	St	Cm	Sp	An	In
Factor 1	1.000						
Cohesion	.247	1.000					
Staff Support	.415	.460	1.000				
Comfort	-.225	-.114	-.005	1.000			
Spontaneity	.364	.281	.541	-.103	1.000		
Anger and Aggression	.225	.240	.268	.093	.415	1.000	

Innovation

.296 .275 .440 .011 .473 .226 1.000

* Only environment subscales which correlated with factor 1 at $r \geq .220$ were included.

Technology and Accountability in Supervision and the Agency Environment

The extent to which the supervisor observed the student in meetings with clients and required the supervisee to record client sessions in writing, on tape, or on video was significantly associated with only the autonomy subscale and this association was negative ($r = -.242$). This relationship should be seen as two-directional. On the one hand, where the supervisor stresses observation and accountability regarding worker-client sessions, the independence of the client is limited. On the other, in an agency environment which limits the client's independence of action, the supervisory experience is marked by a great extent of accountability demanded from the workers. It may well be that various technical recording devices were by students as means of control rather than serving any other purpose.

Table 6
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between
Supervision Factor 2 (Technology and
Accountability) and Treatment Environment
Subscales*

	2	Au
Factor 2	1.000	
Autonomy	-.242	1.000

* Only environmental subscales which correlated with factor 2 at $\geq .220$ were included.

The Supervisor's Administrative Skill and the Agency Environment

The students perceived their supervisors as competent in administrative skills in agencies with high degrees of task orientation ($r = .263$). Or to put it differently, when agency supervisors are competent in administrative matters the agency climate presses on the staff to complete tasks quickly and effectively.

In a similar manner, the greater the administrative skills of the supervisor the more the agency encourages organized and planned services ($r = .237$). Also, supervisor's administrative skills were associated with the organization's encouragement of free expression on the part of the client ($r = .238$) and openness to efforts of the staff to be innovative in developing and providing agency services and programs ($r = .243$).

Like in the case of the supervisory relationship factor previously discussed, the link between administrative skill in supervision and the total agency environment is both direct and indirect in nature. The direct positive correlation between the administrative skills in the supervisory experience and task orientation, order and

organization, spontaneity and innovation in the agency environment should be noted. The high positive correlations between task orientation in the work environment and order and organization ($r = .514$) and innovation ($r = .538$) in the treatment environment suggests that the indirect effect could be quite strong. It appears then that strong administrative skills in supervision reinforce and are reinforced by task orientation in the work setting which in turn is associated with emphasis on both planning and organization and change and innovation in client services.

Table 7
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between
Supervision Factor 3 (Administrative
Skills) and Work and Treatment
Environment Subscales*

	3	Ta	Or	Sp	In
Factor 3	1.000				
Task Orientation	.263	1.000			
Order and Organization	.237	.514	1.000		
Spontaneity	.238	.365	.165	1.000	
Innovation	.243	.538	.308	.473	1.000

* Only environment subscales which correlated with factor 3 at $r \geq .220$ were

included

The Appropriate Use of Time in Supervision and the Agency Environment

The student's perception of effective and goal oriented use of time in the supervisory session was positively correlated with clarity concerning procedures, policies, rights and responsibilities of workers in the working environment ($r = .348$). Also, the supervisor's ability to successfully budget time was positively related to the student worker's sense of support and encouragement in the agency's working environment ($r = .244$). Appropriate use of time in supervision was also positively correlated with two factors in the treatment environment, namely, spontaneity ($r = .264$) and anger ($r = .221$). In other words, agencies which emphasize appropriate time budgeting also intend to encourage clients or staff to verbalize their anger and frustration.

The high intercorrelations between staff support in the work environment and spontaneity in the treatment environment ($r = .541$) is a good indicator of possible indirect association between the time factor and features of the organizational environment. It may be that effective utilization of time in supervision is conducive to the staff perceiving the work setting as supportive. The sense of collegiality, togetherness and organizational support contributes in turn to a climate in which client spontaneity and expressions of anger are allowed for.

Table 8
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between

Supervision Factor 4 (Appropriate Use of
Time) and Work and Treatment Environment
Subscales*

	4	St	Cl	Sp	An
Factor 4	1.000				
Staff Support	.244	1.000			
Staff Clarity	.348	.363	1.000		
Spontaneity	.264	.541	.192	1.000	
Anger and Aggression	.221	.268	.252	.415	1.000

* Only environment subscales which correlated with factor 4 at $r \geq .220$ were included

Conflict in Supervision and the Agency Environment

The way in which conflicts between supervisor and students doing field work are handled was associated with the agency's work environment. Only agencies in which the supervisor encourages conflicts with the supervisee tend to be those where cohesion among staff is low ($r = -.225$). In addition, conflict in supervision is positively correlated with a work environment high in control over workers ($r = .223$). It may be said then that supervisor-supervisee relationships marked by conflict are associated with a

high degree of control in the work environment and with a tendency of low cohesion among the staff.

Table 9
Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between
Supervision Factor 5 (Conflict) and
Work Environment Subscales*

	5	Co	Cn
Factor 5	1.000		
Cohesion	-.225	1.000	
Control	.223	-.106	1.000

* Only environment subscales which correlated with factor 5 at $r \geq .220$ were included

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In concluding let us go back to the imaginary path developed by inference from the literature between supervision, work environment and treatment environment. In this study we attempted to operationalize each one of the three points on the path and develop a puzzle from the correlations between the various components of supervision, work environment and treatment environment. It is also important to note which aspects of work and treatment environments were unrelated to supervision particularly since we hear too often the unwritten expectation that supervision is the cure to all evils in social work.

It seems as if a positive evaluation of supervision in term of administration, role relationship and appropriate use of time correlates with a positive perception of a working environment as a task oriented, well organized, supportive and cohesive place. These in turn are correlated with clients' sense of innovation, spontaneity and free expression of animosity.

It is possible to logically infer that good administrative supervision creates good working environment which in turn is conducive to high quality treatment relations. However, establishing these relationships as an empirical fact requires further inquiry. While from the supervisory literature these logical inferences could be drawn, we attempted to operationalize these three dimensions and show the correlations among them, without attempting to address the direction of the correlations.

No significant correlations have been found between the quality of supervision and the workers' perception of the extent of their involvement in the agency. In the treatment environment variables such as client autonomy, sense of support or practical problem orientation were also unrelated to the quality of supervision.

These correlations as well as their absence have the potential of many practical implications. For example, if we accept that the direction of the above correlations is that the quality of supervision influences the quality of the work environment which in turn impacts on the treatment environment then one can expect to enhance mutual support, cohesion and task orientation by providing highly skilled supervisors in the administrative area who can make effective use of their

time. Such work environment can then account for innovation and spontaneity from the client's part. On the other hand, one should not expect to achieve worker involvement or independence or practical orientation in client-worker relationships through manipulating the content or form of supervision.

It is also helpful to know that conflicts between supervisor and supervisee do not carry over to worker-client relationships, at least as it emerges from our findings.

But in order to actualize the practical implications inherent in these findings and in order to point out the direction of these correlations, further research needs to be done.

REFERENCES

- Abels, P.
1970 "On the Nature of Supervision: The Medium is the Group", Child Welfare, 49, 304-311.
- Arndt, H.C.M.
1955 "Principles of Supervision in Public Assistance Agencies", Social Casework, 36, 307-313.
- Barber, B.
1963 "Some Problems in the Sociology of Professions", Daedalus, 92, 669-688.
- Berl, F.
1960 "An Attempt to Construct a Conceptual Framework for Supervision", Social Casework, 41,

339-346.

- Brackett, J. R.
1903 Supervision and Education in Charity, New York: MacMillian Co.
- Cherniss, C. & Egnatios, E.
1978 "Clinical Supervision in Community Mental Health", Social Work, 23, 219-223.
- Colins, A. & Pancoast, D.
1976 Natural Helping Networks: A Strategy for Prevention, New York: National Association of Social Workers.
- Coulton, C.
1979a "Developing an Instrument to Measure Person-Environment Fit", Journal of Social Service Research, 3, 159-174.
- Drexler, J.
1977 "Organizational Climate: Its Homogeneity within Organization", Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 38-42.
- Eldridge, W. D.
1982 "Coping with Accountability: Guidelines for Supervisors", Social Casework, 63, 489-496.
- Epstein, L.
1973 "Is Autonomous Practice Possible?", Social Work, 18, 5-12.
- Finch, W. A.
1976 "Social Workers Versus Bureaucracy", Social Work, 21, 370-375.
- Germain, C.

- 1979 "Ecology and Social Work", in, Germain C. (ed.) Social Work Practice: People and Environments, New York: Columbia University Press, 1-22.
- Gitterman, A. & Germain, C.
1976 "Social Work Practice: A Life Model", Social Service Review, 50, 601-610.
- Gordon, W.
1969 "Basic Constructs for an Integrative and Generative Conception of Social Work", in Hearn, G. (ed.), The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward A Holistic Conception of Social Work, New York: Council on Social Work Education, 5-11.
- Green, A. D.
1966 "The Professional Worker in a Bureaucracy", Social Service Review, 40, 71-83.
- Hollis, F.
1972 Casework--A Psychosocial Therapy
New York: Random House.
- Ittelson, W., Proshansky, H. & Rivlin, L.
1970 "The Environmental Psychology of the Psychiatric Ward", in Ittelson, W., et. al. (eds.) Environmental Psychology--Man and His Physical Setting, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 419-439.
- Kadushin, A.
1974 "Supervisor-Supervisee: A Survey", Social Work, 19, 228-297.
- Kadushin, A.
1976 Supervision in Social Work, New

York: Columbia University Press

Lemke, S. & Moos, R.

1981 "The Supra-Personal Environment of Sheltered Care Settings", Journal of Gerontology, 36, 233-243.

Maluccio, A.

1979 Learning from Clients, New York: The Free Press.

Maluccio, A.

1979a "Perspectives of Social Workers and Clients on Treatment Outcomes", Social Casework, 60, 394-401.

Maier, R.

"The Impact of the Structural Organization of Public Welfare Offices on the Psychosocial Work and Treatment Environments", Journal of Social Service Research, in print.

Middleman, R. & Goldberg, G.

1974 Social Service Delivery: A Structural Approach to Social Work Practice, New York: Columbia University Press.

Moos, R. H.

1974 Evaluating Treatment Environments--A Social Ecological Approach, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Moos, R. H.

1975 Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Moos, R. H. & Insel, P.

1974 Work Environment Scale Prelim-

inary Manual, Palo Alto, Ca.:
Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Moos, R. H. & Otto, J.
1972 "The Community Oriented Programs Environmental Scale: A Methodology for the Facilitation and Evaluation of Social Change", Community Mental Health Journal, 8, 28-37.
- Munson, C. E.
1976 "Professional Autonomy and Social Work Supervision", Journal of Education for Social Work, 12, 95-102.
- Munson, C. E.
1979 Social Work Supervision, New York: The Free Press.
- Munson, C. E.
1979a "Authority and Social Work Supervision: An Emerging Model" in Munson, C. E., Social Work Supervision, New York: The Free Press, 336-346.
- Munson, C. E.
1980 "Differential Impact of Structure and Authority in Supervision", Arête, 6, 3-15.
- Munson, C. E.
1981 "Style and Structure in Supervision", Journal of Education for Social Work, 17, 65-72.
- Pane, R. & Physey, D.
1971 "G. G. Stern's Organizational Climate Index: A Reconceptualization and Application to Business Organizations", Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 6, 77-98.

- Perlman, H.
1957 Social Casework -- A Problem-Solving Process, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rhodes, L.
1981 "Social Climate Perception and Depression of Patients and Staff in a Chronic Hemodialysis Unit", The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 169, 165-175.
- Scherz, F.
1958 "A Concept of Supervision Based on Definitions of Job Responsibility", Social Casework, 39, 435-443.
- Schneider, B.
"The Service Organization: Climate is Crucial", Organizational Dynamics, 8, 180, 52-65.
- Scott, W.
1965 "Reactions to Supervision in a Heteronomous Organization", Administrative Science Quarterly 10, 65-81.
- Seabury, B.
1971 "Arrangement of Physical Space in Social Work Settings", Social Work, 16, 43-49.
- Stern, G.
1970 People in Context: Measuring Personal Environment Congruence in Education and Industry, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Stiles, E.
1963 "Supervision in Perspective", Social Casework, 44, 19-25.

- Turner, F.
1978 Psychosocial Therapy, New York:
Free Press.
- Wasserman, H.
1970 "Early Careers of Professional
Social Workers in a Public
Welfare Agency", Social Work,
15, 93-101.
- Watson, K. W.
1973 "Differential Supervision",
Social Work, 18, 80-88.
- Wax, J.
1963 "Time Limited Supervision",
Social Work, 8, 37-43.
- Willems, E.
1976 "Behavioral Ecology, Health
Status, and Health Care: Appli-
cations to the Rehabilitation
Setting", in Altman, I. &
Wohlwill, J. (eds.) Human Behav-
ior and Environment: Advances
in Theory and Research, New
York: Plenum Press, 211-263.