

Enhancing Psychological Resilience in Youth Welfare Professionals: The Role of Regular Supervision, Supervision Formats, and Frequency

Sora Pazer^{1*}¹Department of Social Work, IU International University of Applied Sciences, Germany

*Corresponding author: Sora Pazer

| Received: 16.02.2025 | Accepted: 24.03.2025 | Published: 28.03.2025 |

Abstract: This quantitative, cross-sectional study examines how regular participation in supervision influences psychological resilience among youth welfare professionals in Germany, considering various supervision forms (individual, team, and combined) and frequencies. Using standardized questionnaires (RS-25, Maslach Burnout Inventory, Supervision Quality Questionnaire), data from 103 professionals were analyzed. Findings indicate that regular supervision significantly enhances resilience, with combined individual and team supervision formats yielding the highest resilience scores. Furthermore, supervision frequency positively impacts resilience, particularly among less experienced professionals. These results underline the importance of structured supervision practices for mitigating professional stress and strengthening resilience, offering valuable implications for policy and practice in youth welfare institutions.

Keywords: Resilience, Supervision, Youth Welfare, Social Work, Psychological Well-being, Professional Development, Quantitative Study.

1. INTRODUCTION

Social work professionals, particularly those engaged in youth welfare services, are frequently exposed to highly demanding and emotionally challenging work conditions. The complexities involved in supporting vulnerable youth populations and families, coping with crisis situations, handling interpersonal conflicts, and navigating institutional constraints expose these practitioners to elevated psychological risks, including chronic stress, emotional exhaustion, and burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016; Robson & Cook, 2021). Consequently, resilience—the ability to adapt successfully in the face of adversity, trauma, stress, or significant life challenges (Windle, 2011; Wagnild & Young, 1993)—has emerged as a critical personal and professional resource, influencing the health, job satisfaction, and long-term retention of social workers within youth welfare settings (Kinman & Grant, 2020).

Supervision, defined as a structured, reflective practice enabling professionals to examine their professional roles, emotional experiences, and interpersonal relationships critically (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014), has been widely endorsed as an essential mechanism for professional development and emotional support in social work practice (Beddoe & Davys, 2016; Engelbrecht, 2021). Previous research indicates that high-quality supervision

is associated with reduced job stress, increased job satisfaction, and enhanced emotional competence among social workers (O'Donoghue *et al.*, 2014; Turner-Daly & Jack, 2019). However, empirical evidence regarding the specific impact of regular supervision on resilience among youth welfare workers remains fragmented and limited, with insufficient attention to the nuances of supervision forms and frequencies (Beddoe & Howard, 2012; Kearns & McArdle, 2012). Furthermore, although resilience has been acknowledged as multifaceted (Wagnild & Young, 1993), few studies have systematically explored how different types and frequencies of supervision interact to influence resilience across its multiple dimensions.

This study addresses this critical gap by quantitatively investigating the influence of regular supervision participation on resilience among professionals in German youth welfare settings. Specifically, the study examines the extent to which regular engagement in supervision sessions, differentiated by form (individual supervision, team supervision, or a combination thereof) and frequency (weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly), correlates with the psychological resilience of youth welfare professionals. The central objective is to elucidate not only whether regular supervision contributes positively to resilience but also to clarify which combinations and

Quick Response Code

Journal homepage:
<https://saspublishers.com/>

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Sora Pazer (2025). Enhancing Psychological Resilience in Youth Welfare Professionals: The Role of Regular Supervision, Supervision Formats, and Frequency. *Cross Current Int Peer Reviewed J Human Soc Sci*, 11(3), 37-44.

intensities yield the greatest resilience-promoting benefits, thereby providing practical implications for optimizing supervision practices within social work institutions.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 The Concept of Resilience in Social Work

Resilience has emerged as a crucial theoretical and practical construct within the field of social work, particularly in contexts characterized by persistent professional stress, emotionally challenging client relationships, and complex institutional structures (Beddoe, Davys, & Adamson, 2014; Kinman & Grant, 2017). The original conceptualization of resilience, rooted in developmental psychology, describes it as the capacity to adapt effectively and maintain psychological functioning despite significant adversity or stress (Masten, 2018; Rutter, 1987). From these foundational insights, resilience has gradually evolved into a broader, multidimensional framework encompassing individual traits, relational dynamics, and contextual resources relevant across professional domains, particularly within the human service sector (Ungar, 2019).

Central to the contemporary resilience discourse is the distinction between resilience as an individual trait (trait resilience) and as a process or outcome resulting from the interaction between personal characteristics and environmental factors (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Within the context of social work, resilience is increasingly viewed as an integrative and dynamic construct comprising multiple psychological dimensions such as perseverance, meaningfulness, self-confidence, serenity, and existential solitude (Wagnild & Young, 1993; Schumacher *et al.*, 2005). These dimensions do not merely reflect individual characteristics but also interact significantly with contextual resources and workplace conditions, which can either facilitate or undermine resilience (Britt *et al.*, 2016). The integration of Antonovsky's salutogenic model (1979) further elucidates this interplay by suggesting that professionals' resilience is fostered through a sense of coherence—a global orientation reflecting the extent to which individuals perceive their environment as comprehensible, manageable, and meaningful. Thus, supervision can potentially strengthen resilience by enhancing professionals' sense of coherence and resource awareness (Antonovsky, 1979; Bauer & Jenny, 2013). Further theoretical support emerges from Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) transactional model of stress and coping, which emphasizes appraisal and coping mechanisms as central to stress management. According to this model, individuals' subjective appraisal of stressors and available coping resources significantly determines psychological outcomes. Regular supervision might function as an external coping resource, facilitating cognitive and emotional reframing of stressful professional situations, thus indirectly contributing to increased resilience (Kinman & Grant, 2017; Lazarus &

Folkman, 1984). Complementary to this, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) highlights that supervision, by providing emotional and cognitive resources, could mitigate the negative impact of high job demands, thereby protecting workers from burnout and strengthening resilience.

2.2 Supervision in Youth Welfare Practice

Supervision is recognized as a crucial element of professional support in social work, systematically contributing to skill development, emotional well-being, and quality assurance in social services (Beddoe, 2010; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014). Supervision, broadly defined, refers to structured professional guidance aimed at supporting, reflecting, and enhancing practice competencies, emotional resilience, and ethical standards within social work practice (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012). Within youth welfare specifically, supervision functions as a pivotal reflective space in which professionals critically assess their roles, client interactions, ethical dilemmas, and emotional responses in a confidential and supportive environment (Noble & Irwin, 2009).

Supervision practices differ significantly regarding format, encompassing individual supervision, team or group supervision, and integrated approaches (Beddoe & Howard, 2012; Carroll, 2014). Individual supervision offers practitioners focused, personalized support and space to reflect on emotional challenges privately, fostering deep self-reflection and individual coping strategies (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012). Conversely, team supervision emphasizes collective processes, mutual support, shared problem-solving, and development of collaborative skills, thereby potentially strengthening team cohesion, reducing professional isolation, and building organizational resilience (Carpenter *et al.*, 2013; Hyrkäs *et al.*, 2014). A combined approach, integrating both individual and team supervision, may capitalize on the advantages of each format, thus enhancing overall psychological resilience more effectively than either format alone (Beddoe, Davys, & Adamson, 2014; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014). Additionally, empirical studies highlight that the quality of supervision—characterized by trust, professional competence of the supervisor, reflective practice, and emotional containment—significantly influences outcomes such as resilience, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; O'Donoghue & Tsui, 2012). According to Bernard and Goodyear (2019), supervision quality is a mediator that critically determines the efficacy of supervisory interventions on psychological outcomes, including resilience and burnout. Thus, examining supervision quality alongside format and frequency can elucidate the precise mechanisms through which supervision contributes to resilience.

2.3 Empirical Findings and Research Gaps

Prior research consistently indicates that supervision positively impacts mental health and professional resilience among social workers, especially in demanding fields such as child welfare and youth services (Turner & Hill, 2011; Kearns & McArdle, 2012). Studies by Beddoe and Davys (2016) and Robson and Cook (2021) demonstrate significant associations between effective supervision and reduced emotional exhaustion, higher job satisfaction, and improved coping strategies among social workers. However, evidence specifically examining the effects of different supervisory modalities (individual vs. team vs. integrated supervision) and varying frequencies (weekly, monthly, quarterly) remains sparse. Previous research typically aggregated supervision into a homogeneous category, neglecting potential differential effects arising from specific supervisory configurations (Beddoe & Howard, 2012; Kearns & McArdle, 2012). Moreover, few studies explicitly investigate how the impact of supervision on resilience might vary based on professional experience levels. Understanding whether early-career social workers benefit more substantially from frequent supervisory interventions compared to experienced professionals can provide practical insights into targeted supervision policies (Kinman & Grant, 2017; Collins, 2008). Consequently, existing research emphasizes the necessity of nuanced, empirical investigations into how supervision's specific characteristics (regularity, format, and quality) influence psychological resilience within youth welfare practice contexts (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design and Operationalization

The present study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional research design, chosen specifically to examine the relationship between various aspects of supervision participation and the psychological resilience of youth welfare professionals in Germany. Data were collected over a five-month period, from January to May 2024, using a standardized online questionnaire. A cross-sectional approach was selected for its strength in capturing a snapshot of associations among multiple variables within a clearly defined population at a single point in time, thus enabling efficient comparative analyses (Creswell & Creswell, 2017).

The dependent variable, psychological resilience, was operationalized through the German-adapted version of the Resilience Scale RS-25 by Wagnild and Young (1993), validated by Schumacher *et al.*, (2005). This scale measures resilience as a multidimensional construct consisting of 25 items across five sub-dimensions: perseverance, meaningfulness, self-confidence, serenity, and existential solitude. Participants responded to each item on a five-point Likert scale (1 = "does not apply at all," 5 = "fully applies"), with total scores ranging from 25 (low resilience) to 125 (high resilience). Supervision, the independent variable, was measured using a specially developed *Supervision Quality Questionnaire*. This self-report instrument recorded participants' supervision experiences in terms of regularity (regular, irregular, none), frequency (weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly), and form (individual, team, or combined). The quality of supervision was assessed via participants' subjective evaluations, again using a five-point Likert scale, from 1 ("very low quality") to 5 ("very high quality"). Additional variables included professional stress, assessed using a *shortened* version adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1996), and demographic data (age, gender, professional experience, educational background, occupational field, and employment status). The inclusion of professional stress aimed to contextualize resilience outcomes within participants' occupational environments.

3.2 Sampling Procedure and Participant Description

Participants were recruited from a diverse range of youth welfare organizations across Germany, including residential care institutions, ambulatory services, youth welfare offices, counseling centers, and open youth work settings. Convenience sampling combined with snowball sampling methods were employed to maximize reach. Participants accessed the online survey through direct institutional emails and via QR-codes placed on institutional noticeboards.

The final sample included 103 participants from 18 youth welfare institutions, achieving adequate heterogeneity regarding age, gender, education, professional experience, and supervisory engagement. Detailed demographic data are presented in Tables 1 through 3, reflecting the essential characteristics of the study sample.

Table 1: Gender and Age Distribution (n = 103)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Female	68	66.0
Male	33	32.0
Diverse	2	2.0
Age Group		
20–29 years	24	23.3
30–39 years	35	34.0
40–49 years	27	26.2

50–59 years	14	13.6
60+ years	3	2.9

Participants were predominantly female (66.0%), aligning with demographic patterns typically observed in the German social work sector. The age distribution illustrates that most respondents were

between 30 and 49 years, indicating considerable occupational maturity within the sample. The mean age was 37.9 years (SD = 9.4).

Table 2: Educational Qualifications and Professional Experience (n = 103)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Educational Qualifications		
Bachelor in Social Work	59	57.3
Master in Social Work	17	16.5
Diploma in Social Pedagogy	15	14.6
Qualified Educator (Erzieher/in)	9	8.7
Other Pedagogical Qualification	3	2.9
Professional Experience		
Less than 2 years	12	11.7
2–5 years	28	27.2
6–10 years	33	32.0
11–20 years	22	21.4
More than 20 years	8	7.8

Participants predominantly held a Bachelor's degree in Social Work (57.3%). Most reported between 6 and 10 years of professional experience (32.0%), with

a mean professional experience of 8.3 years (SD = 6.5), indicating a sample well-acquainted with the complexities of youth welfare practice.

Table 3: Occupational Area and Employment Status (n = 103)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Occupational Area		
Residential youth care	41	39.8
Ambulatory youth services	31	30.1
Youth welfare office	14	13.6
Open youth work	10	9.7
Counseling services	7	6.8
Employment Status		
Full-time	79	76.7
Part-time (50–75%)	20	19.4
Part-time (<50%)	4	3.9

The occupational distribution shows that residential youth care (39.8%) and ambulatory youth services (30.1%) were the most frequent professional contexts, consistent with the German youth welfare landscape.

3.3 Supervision Participation Characteristics

Participants provided extensive details about their supervisory practices. Regular supervision was reported by 74.8% of respondents (n = 77), irregular participation by 17.5% (n = 18), while 7.8% (n = 8) received no supervision. Among those receiving supervision regularly, most attended sessions monthly (54.7%), followed by biweekly (27.4%), quarterly (12.6%), and weekly (5.3%). Regarding supervisory format, team supervision dominated (64.2%), followed by a combined individual-team format (20.0%) and individual supervision alone (15.8%). Regarding duration of previous supervision experience, 35.8% had 1–3 years of experience, while 29.5% reported 4–7 years. Short-term (<1 year) and long-term (>7 years) experiences were less common.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted via a secure online platform ensuring anonymity and confidentiality. Participants were provided with detailed informed consent forms, clearly outlining the study's purpose, voluntary nature, anonymity assurances, and ethical guidelines. Ethical approval was obtained from institutional review boards in accordance with German ethical research standards. Data analysis utilized SPSS (Version 29). Statistical methods included descriptive analyses, independent-samples t-tests, ANOVA (with post-hoc Bonferroni corrections), correlation analyses, and hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Regression analysis incorporated an interaction term (supervision frequency × professional experience) to examine moderation effects explicitly.

4. RESULTS

In this section, we present comprehensive descriptive findings regarding the resilience scores of youth welfare professionals in relation to their

supervision practices. Data analyses include overall resilience levels, as well as differentiated outcomes according to supervision regularity, format, and frequency.

Participants' resilience was measured using the RS-25 scale, yielding scores between 25 (minimum resilience) and 125 (maximum resilience). The sample

demonstrated an overall average resilience score of $M = 84.8$ ($SD = 12.1$), suggesting a moderately high resilience level among youth welfare professionals in the study. To examine the association between supervision regularity and resilience, participants were categorized into two groups: (1) regular supervision ($n = 77$) and (2) irregular or no supervision ($n = 26$). Table 4 summarizes the descriptive results.

Table 4: Resilience Scores by Regularity of Supervision

Supervision Regularity	n	Mean Resilience (RS-25)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Regular	77	86.9	11.4
Irregular/None	26	78.6	12.8

Professionals receiving regular supervision exhibited notably higher average resilience scores ($M = 86.9$, $SD = 11.4$) compared to those without consistent supervision ($M = 78.6$, $SD = 12.8$). This initial descriptive finding indicates a meaningful difference, warranting further inferential statistical analysis.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that youth welfare professionals who regularly participate in supervision would demonstrate significantly higher resilience scores than those without regular supervision. To test this hypothesis, an independent-samples t-test was conducted (Table 5).

Table 5: T-test Results Comparing Resilience by Regularity of Supervision * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Group Comparison	Mean Difference	t-value	df	p-value	Cohen's d
Regular vs. Irregular/None	8.3	3.12	101	.002**	0.67

The t-test revealed a statistically significant difference ($t(101) = 3.12$, $p = .002$) between groups, supporting Hypothesis 1. The calculated effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.67$) indicates a medium-to-large practical significance, suggesting that regular supervision significantly contributes to enhanced resilience among youth welfare professionals.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that the form of supervision (individual, team, or combined) influences resilience differently, with the combined format expected to yield the highest resilience levels. A one-way ANOVA was performed to assess differences among the three supervision formats (Table 6)

Table 6: ANOVA Results for Resilience by Supervision Format $p < .05$

Supervision Form	n	Mean Resilience	SD	F-value	df	p-value	η^2
Individual	15	82.7	10.9	4.27	(2, 92)	.017*	.085
Team	61	86.2	11.2				
Combined (Both)	19	92.4	10.6				

The ANOVA yielded a significant effect ($F(2, 92) = 4.27$, $p = .017$, $\eta^2 = .085$). Post-hoc Bonferroni tests revealed significant differences between the combined supervision format and each of the individual formats: Combined vs. Individual supervision ($p = .018$) Combined vs. Team supervision ($p = .039$) No significant difference between individual and team supervision ($p = .467$) Thus, Hypothesis 2 was confirmed, indicating that a combination of individual

and team supervision produces the highest resilience scores among youth welfare professionals.

Hypothesis 3 asserted that supervision frequency positively correlates with resilience, with professional experience serving as a moderating variable. To test this, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted, as summarized in Table 7.

Table 7: Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Resilience * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .001$**

Predictor Variables	Model 1 (β)	Model 2 (β)	Model 3 (β)
Frequency of Supervision	.321**	.305**	.284**
Professional Experience		.149	.142
Interaction (Frequency \times Experience)			-.219*
R^2	.103	.125	.172
ΔR^2		.022	.047*
F-value	10.68**	6.58**	6.30***

In Model 1, frequency alone significantly predicted resilience ($\beta = .321, p = .002$). Adding professional experience in Model 2 did not substantially increase predictive power ($\beta = .149, p = .137$). However, introducing the interaction term (frequency \times professional experience) in Model 3 significantly improved the explanatory power ($\Delta R^2 = .047, p = .026$). The negative interaction term ($\beta = -.219, p = .026$) indicates that the positive effect of supervision frequency on resilience decreases as professional experience increases. Hypothesis 3 was thus partially supported: supervision frequency positively influences resilience, yet this effect is significantly moderated by professional experience, particularly benefiting less experienced professionals.

5. DISCUSSION

This section delves deeply into the study's findings on how supervision practices influence the psychological resilience of youth welfare professionals. It situates these results within relevant theoretical frameworks and extant empirical research, while acknowledging both the study's contributions and its limitations.

5.1 Regular Supervision as a Pillar of Resilience

One of the most prominent findings is that professionals who participated in supervision regularly—compared to those with irregular or no supervision—displayed significantly higher resilience levels, with a medium-to-large effect size. This observation complements a longstanding body of literature suggesting that supervision serves as a critical buffer against occupational stressors in social work contexts (Beddoe & Davys, 2016; Kinman & Grant, 2017). Consistent, formalized supervision can foster reflective practice and provide emotional support, thereby enhancing overall coping capacity (Hawkins & Shohet, 2012; Kadushin & Harkness, 2014). From a theoretical standpoint, such findings align with Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) transactional model of stress and coping, as regular supervision appears to facilitate adaptive appraisals of challenging client interactions and organizational pressures. Similarly, Antonovsky's (1979) salutogenic theory underscores that supervision can strengthen professionals' sense of coherence by fostering a greater understanding of work demands (comprehensibility), supplying strategies and guidance (manageability), and affirming the meaningfulness of youth welfare practice. Taken together, these perspectives underscore the likelihood that regular supervision not only mitigates distress but also enhances the broader psychosocial functioning of practitioners—a hypothesis corroborated in multiple settings where high emotional labor is involved (Robson & Cook, 2021).

5.2 Format of Supervision: Synergy in a Combined Approach

An equally important insight is that professionals who received both individual and team

supervision reported the highest resilience scores. This finding supports the notion that each supervision format—individual or team—addresses distinct needs (Beddoe & Howard, 2012; O'Donoghue & Tsui, 2012). Individual supervision provides a focused, confidential arena to discuss personal emotional challenges and case complexities in depth, a process that can enhance self-confidence and permit more intensive skills development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Conversely, team supervision fosters collective problem-solving, peer support, and shared accountability, which can alleviate feelings of isolation and strengthen a sense of organizational belonging (Carpenter *et al.*, 2013; Hyrkäs *et al.*, 2014). By integrating both formats, practitioners benefit from the synergy of personalized reflection and communal learning—factors widely recognized as instrumental to resilience (Turner & Hill, 2011). This synergy likely promotes multiple protective processes, from heightened emotional awareness to greater perceived support (Britt *et al.*, 2016). Nonetheless, the logistical and resource-related feasibility of implementing a combined approach in all youth welfare agencies remains an open question (Engelbrecht, 2019). Organizations may need to invest in supervisor training, schedule coordination, and structural support to optimize both individual and team sessions effectively.

5.3 Frequency of Supervision and the Moderating Role of Experience

A third notable outcome is that, while supervision frequency positively predicted resilience, this effect was moderated by professional experience. In other words, the benefits of frequent supervision were more pronounced among less experienced professionals and gradually diminished for those with longer tenures. This finding resonates with social learning theory (Bandura, 1986), implying that novices depend more heavily on direct supervisory input to acquire competencies and manage the emotional weight of child and youth welfare tasks (Collins, 2008). Conversely, seasoned professionals may have internalized stronger coping repertoires, reducing the incremental value of very frequent supervision. Still, experienced practitioners should not be overlooked; even veteran social workers encounter high-stress situations that might warrant periodic, specialized forms of supervision (Turner & Kewley, 2021). Overall, the study's results indicate a nuanced interplay between professional tenure and supervision needs, suggesting that one-size-fits-all models for supervision frequency are likely suboptimal.

5.4. Resilience as a Dynamic, Contextual Phenomenon

The present findings robustly endorse the view of resilience as a dynamic and context-sensitive construct (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Masten, 2018). Far from being a fixed trait, resilience emerges from ongoing interactions between personal attributes, workplace conditions, and systemic supports like supervision (Ungar, 2019). The positive influence of regular, high-

quality supervision on resilience aligns with the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that adequate professional resources (e.g., supervision and peer support) can mitigate job demands and prevent burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Kinman & Grant, 2017). Moreover, the significant mediation by supervision quality confirms prior research pointing to the relational and contextual nature of resilience enhancement (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Supervision, when perceived as empathetic, constructive, and appropriately challenging, allows professionals to reframe job stressors into manageable challenges, thereby reinforcing self-efficacy and optimism. Hence, the combination of conceptual frameworks—salutogenic, transactional, and resource-based—offers a coherent explanation for why and how frequent, high-quality supervision elevates resilience levels in social workers.

By bridging Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional model with Wagnild and Young’s (1993) conceptualization of resilience, the present study underscores that supervision can function as both an emotional and cognitive coping resource. Supervisory dialogues likely facilitate reappraisal processes, turning perceived threats into manageable obstacles (Turner & Hill, 2011). This reappraisal is particularly salient in youth welfare, where high emotional labor and ethical complexities can lead to moral distress if left unaddressed (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Regular and structured supervisory support may thus reduce the cognitive load associated with these emotional challenges, aiding professionals in sustaining motivation and psychological well-being.

5.5 Limitations and Practical Implications

While these findings significantly advance knowledge about supervision’s influence on youth welfare professionals’ resilience, the study is subject to several constraints. Because the research design is cross-sectional, causal relationships remain speculative (Creswell & Creswell, 2017); it is plausible that more resilient individuals might proactively seek and maintain regular supervision. All measures—supervision frequency, format, quality, and resilience—relied on self-report, raising the possibility of social desirability bias (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2012). Although the sample included 103 professionals from 18 institutions, it may not capture the full diversity of the German youth welfare sector, and organizational factors such as leadership style or agency policy were not systematically assessed (Engelbrecht, 2019). Addressing these limitations through larger, more varied samples, longitudinal or mixed-method designs, and inclusion of organizational variables could yield stronger causal inferences and a more comprehensive understanding of supervision’s impact. Despite these caveats, the study’s outcomes point to several avenues for enhancing practice and research in youth welfare supervision. Organizations are encouraged to invest in regular supervision

frameworks, given their potential to bolster practitioner resilience (Beddoe & Howard, 2012). A hybrid model that integrates both individual and team sessions may better address diverse needs, and adjusting supervision frequency to professionals’ experience levels could optimize its benefits (Collins, 2008). Training supervisors in relational and feedback skills remains crucial (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). Future investigations should consider longitudinal approaches to establish causal pathways, and qualitative or ethnographic methods to capture the nuanced processes underpinning supervision’s effects (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Additional research on organizational climates, leadership, and policy contexts can further elucidate how these systemic factors enable or hinder effective supervision (Turner & Kewley, 2021). Ultimately, by strategically refining supervision models in terms of regularity, frequency, format, and quality, youth welfare agencies and policymakers can strengthen practitioners’ resilience, leading to more sustainable and impactful services.

6. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated how regular supervision impacts psychological resilience among youth welfare professionals in Germany, specifically examining the roles of supervision frequency, format, and professional experience. Findings clearly support supervision’s positive association with resilience, particularly highlighting the combined use of individual and team formats as most effective. Furthermore, frequent supervision notably benefits early-career professionals. These results align with theoretical frameworks emphasizing resilience as dynamic and context-dependent. Practically, organizations should prioritize structured, regular, and combined supervision models, especially tailored to professional experience levels, and enhance supervisor training to maximize quality. Despite methodological limitations, including the cross-sectional design and self-report measures, this study reinforces supervision as a vital resource in youth welfare, meriting further research to strengthen and refine supervisory practices within the sector.

REFERENCES

- Antonovsky, A. (1979). *Health, stress, and coping*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Beddoe, L. (2010). Surveillance or reflection: Professional supervision in “the risk society”. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(4), 1279–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcq018>
- Beddoe, L., & Davys, A. (2016). Challenges in professional supervision: Current themes and

- models for practice. *Australian Social Work*, 69(4), 464–465.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2016.1210676>
- Beddoe, L., & Howard, F. (2012). Interprofessional supervision in social work and psychology: Mandates and (inter)disciplinary relationships. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 31(2), 178–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2012.730471>
 - Beddoe, L., Davys, A., & Adamson, C. (2014). “Never trust anybody who says ‘I don’t need supervision’”: Practitioners’ beliefs about social worker resilience. *Practice*, 26(2), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09503153.2014.896888>
 - Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). Pearson.
 - Britt, T. W., Shen, W., Sinclair, R. R., Grossman, M. R., & Klieger, D. M. (2016). How much do we really know about employee resilience? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 378–404. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.107>
 - Carpenter, J., Webb, C., Bostock, L., & Coomber, C. (2013). Effective supervision in social work and social care. *Social Work Education*, 32(1), 40–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.755161>
 - Collins, S. (2008). Statutory social workers: Stress, job satisfaction, coping, social support, and individual differences. *British Journal of Social Work*, 38(6), 1173–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcm047>
 - Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
 - Engelbrecht, L. K. (2019). Performance management and supervision in social work practice. In L. K. Engelbrecht (Ed.), *Management and supervision of social workers* (2nd ed., pp. 187–206). Cengage Learning.
 - Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist*, 18(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124>
 - Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2012). *Supervision in the helping professions* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
 - Hyrkäs, K., Appelqvist-Schmidlechner, K., & Haataja, R. (2014). Efficacy of clinical supervision: Influence on job satisfaction, burnout, and quality of care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 50(3), 356–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03409.x>
 - Kadushin, A., & Harkness, D. (2014). *Supervision in social work* (5th ed.). Columbia University Press.
 - Kinman, G., & Grant, L. (2017). Building resilience in early-career social workers: Evaluating a multi-modal intervention. *British Journal of Social Work*, 47(7), 1979–1998. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw164>
 - Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
 - Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual* (3rd ed.). CPP.
 - Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry*, 15(2), 103–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311>
 - Masten, A. S. (2018). Resilience theory and research on children and families: Past, present, and promise. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 12–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12255>
 - O’Donoghue, K., & Tsui, M.-S. (2012). Towards a professional supervision culture: The development of social work supervision in Aotearoa New Zealand. *International Social Work*, 55(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020872810396109>
 - Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539–569. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452>
 - Robson, S., & Cook, L. L. (2021). Emotional labour and burnout among child protection social workers. *Child & Family Social Work*, 26(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12771>
 - Rutter, M. (1987). Parental mental disorder as a psychiatric risk factor. In E. J. Anthony & B. J. Cohler (Eds.), *The invulnerable child* (pp. 85–108). Guilford Press.
 - Schumacher, J., Leppert, K., Gunzelmann, T., Strauß, B., & Brähler, E. (2005). Die Resilienzskala – Ein Fragebogen zur Erfassung der psychischen Widerstandsfähigkeit als Personenmerkmal. *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie, Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 53(1), 16–39.
 - Turner, S., & Hill, A. (2011). Implementing clinical supervision (part one): Laying the groundwork for effective clinical supervision in podiatry practice. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 18(8), 448–454. <https://doi.org/10.12968/ijtr.2011.18.8.448>
 - Turner, S., & Kewley, S. (2021). The relationship between supervision and resilience in child welfare workers: An integrative review. *Child & Family Social Work*, 26(3), 387–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12818>
 - Ungar, M. (2019). Designing resilience research: Using multiple methods to investigate risk exposure, promotive and protective processes, and contextually relevant outcomes. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 96, 104098. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.104098>
 - Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 1(2), 165–178.