

CHAPTER 5

Visualization of Online Supervision in the Context of Social Work

ALŽBETA BROZMANOVÁ GREGOROVÁ

Visualization, frequently classified within the domain of qualitative analysis, is increasingly acknowledged as a powerful and versatile methodology that provides researchers with innovative ways to examine, interpret, and communicate complex social phenomena. (Jackson et al., 2007). By integrating visualization techniques into qualitative research, the limitations of traditional text-based analysis can be transcended. These techniques open alternative paths for exploring and capturing intangible phenomena, effectively conveying experiences and emotions that are often difficult to articulate, and fostering deeper reflection among participants. (Bhangu et al., 2023; Shannon-Baker & Edwards, 2018).

Visualization assumes particular importance within the context of online supervision – where interactions are mediated by technology. It offers a unique lens through which the dynamics, processes, and relationships unfolding within these virtual environments can be observed (D'Angelo et al., 2016).

In qualitative research, visual aids and visualization are often employed as projective or facilitative techniques to elicit richer data and insight (Comi et al., 2014). In addressing the research question: “*How do supervisors and supervisees visualize online supervision?*” visualization was employed specifically as a projective technique.

The qualitative data analysis focusing on the visualization of online supervision primarily aims to deepen understanding of how supervisors and supervisees perceive, conceptualize, and represent their experiences of online supervision through visual expressions.

As Anastas (1994) notes, visual representations can stimulate participants' imagination and verbal responses. Through the implicit intent and indirectness inherent in visual projection, respondents are often able to overcome inhibitions and reveal their underlying thoughts and emotions more openly (Steinman, 2009). Projective techniques also reduce the cognitive demands placed on respondents by drawing on the intuitive qualities

of visual language. This helps to overcome communication barriers while enhancing the cognitive stimulation that visual expression can offer.

In this study, a constructive projective technique was applied, and participants were invited to reflect on how they would depict online supervision through a drawing and to provide a description of the image they created. It was anticipated that this form of visualization would allow specific characteristics of online supervision – those perceived by supervisors and supervisees but not explicitly articulated in interviews – to be captured through a different medium.

To analyze the data, a combination of content analysis and an interpretive approach was employed, as both methods are recommended when working with outputs generated by projective techniques (Catterall & Ibbotson, 2000). Content analysis enabled the qualitative data to be systematically organized into themes, categories, and units of meaning (Krippendorff, 2018; Mayring, 2014; Mostyn, 1985). At the same time, the interpretive approach facilitated a deeper understanding of the subjective meanings, drawing upon hermeneutics, symbolic interaction, narrative analysis, and semiotics (Durgee, 1988; Levy, 1994).

As a result of this process, four main categories were identified in the visualizations of online supervision produced by supervisees and supervisors: *spatial representation, technical and visual aspects, emotional dimension, and interaction and dynamics*. These categories will be examined in greater detail in the subsequent section. The conclusion will then focus on the relationship between visualization and the different types and functions of supervision.

Spatial Representation of Online Supervision

The spatial representation category captures how participants, when visualizing online supervision, conceptualize space, distance, and the physical positioning of the supervision actors – namely, the supervisor and the supervisee. Their accounts include visual and symbolic elements that indicate where each person is situated, the degree of relational or physical separation, whether they are perceived as being “together” or “apart,” and how these spatial dynamic shapes their experiences of online supervision.

Through content analysis, three distinct dimensions within the category of spatial representation were identified: *physical distance, virtual connection, and barriers*.

Physical distance in online supervision was frequently represented by depictions of remote computers or physically separated individuals. Visualizations often portrayed online supervision as two people, or two screens or computers, situated at opposite ends of a space. This reflects the fact that participants in online supervision do not share a common physical environment. The following statements illustrate this well:

“Two people and a remote supervisor on the screen.” (P4)

“Two distant computers.” (P17)

“...one would be sitting at home and the other in the office. They would be in different places.” (S5)

Physical distance was perceived as a significant factor influencing both the course and the quality of online supervision. Participants frequently emphasized that online supervision takes place remotely, implying a geographical separation between the supervisor and the supervisee. This distance was experienced ambivalently: on the one hand, as an obstacle to building a deeper relationship, and on the other, as an advantage that allows for greater flexibility and accessibility for those who might otherwise be unable to participate.

Virtual connection refers to the effort to create a sense of connection between supervisor and supervisee in online supervision despite the absence of shared physical space. This was visualized by both supervisors and supervisees, for example:

“...two screens connected by cables – like a bond.” (P16)

“A circular diagram with connecting lines.” (S7)

“...connections leading to the screens.” (S9)

Participants used various symbols to express connection in online supervision, such as cables, digital links, linkage, connection via computers and screens. Technology was thus understood as a bridge between the supervisor and the supervisee. Although physical contact is absent, some participants interpreted this connection positively – through symbols such as *“cable bond,”* *“arrows,”* or *“hands joined together.”* This refers to a capacity for adaptability and for perceiving digital contact – under certain conditions – as meaningful and alive.

Visualizing the connection between participants in online supervision highlighted the desire to transcend physical distance and foster a sense of closeness and presence within the online setting. It also suggested an effort

to build trust and mutual understanding, which are essential for effective supervision.

Barriers in the visualizations of online supervision represent the obstacles or challenges perceived by supervisors and supervisees in the context of online supervision. These were often depicted as screens, walls, or lines that separated the supervisor from the supervisee.

“I drew a screen that separates us.” (P6)

“...I would draw it as two separate rooms.” (P12)

“There is a wall – a screen – between us.” (S3)

Such barriers may be interpreted as symbols of communication limitations, a lack of nonverbal interaction, technical difficulties, or feelings of isolation and detachment.

The absence of a shared physical space was often viewed as a barrier: *“...there is a barrier. They are not together in the same room.”* (P5) Screens and walls emerged as the central symbols of these barriers. The screen was often perceived as a window into another space rather than a component of a shared environment: *“...through the screen, but the supervisor is far away. In the distance.”* (P4).

Walls symbolized separation and division – both physical and emotional.

“Computers, people, a barrier (a wall) between them.” (P5)

“The supervisor, me, and a wall – a barrier to personal contact.” (P11)

Screens and walls thus became symbols of isolation and disrupted contact within online supervision. Participants recognized that the online setting introduces inherent constraints:

“Many bubbles in my head with crossed-out things I can’t use” (S1).

In the participants’ visualizations, online supervision was often portrayed as *spatially fragmented* – each participant “in their own world,” with contact occurring only through a digital channel. In some cases, this led to feelings of detachment, artificiality, or barriers; in others, it reflected innovative forms of connection (e.g., using symbols such as cables or open windows). This dimension demonstrates that “space” in online supervision is not solely physical but also symbolic and relational. Virtual connection, therefore, should not be seen merely as a substitute for physical contact but rather as a distinct type of relational space.

Supervisees tended to visualize space using specific physical metaphors (e.g., windows, walls), while supervisors were more likely to use symbolic

or abstract representations (e.g., beam of light, closed connection). Distance and barriers, in turn, appeared to reflect an inner tension between the need for connection and the simultaneous feeling of separation.

Technical and Visual Aspects of Online Supervision

This category describes how participants perceive technologies as an inseparable part of online supervision. The technical and visual elements are closely related to the category of spatial representation, as they often shape the space in which the interaction between the supervisor and the supervisee takes place in online supervision. They are also connected to barriers and virtual connectedness, depending on whether the technology used in online supervision functions reliably or not.

Within this category, the following subcategories were identified in content analysis: *basic technical elements*, *technical issues*, *symbolism of the digital world*.

The *basic technical elements* reflected in participants' visualizations were computer, screen, camera, microphone, circle, diagram, box, phone, and laptop. Participants referred to these elements neutrally or with a slightly positive connotation, as the standard equipment needed for contact in online supervision.

“Computer, camera, microphone, person, positive atmosphere.” (P1)

“Two windows: supervisor and employee.” (P10)

“Phone and laptop as a communication two-way channel.” (S12)

Technical elements such as the computer, camera, and screen represent not only objects but also symbols of mediated closeness and the digital environment. For example, the “two windows” symbolize both the division of space and the connection at the same time – similar to the frame of a painting. These technical elements visualize not only the tools but also the boundaries of communication. Technologies are perceived as an inseparable part of online supervision, influencing the relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee.

The second subcategory identified refers to *technical issues*. Technical issues and limitations – such as poor signal, interrupted connections, and audio/video dropouts – are perceived negatively, as obstacles that disrupt

the flow of information, the sense of safety in supervision, and the possibilities for communication.

"Poor signal, technical issues, lack of privacy." (P7)

Technical failures can trigger frustration, feelings of helplessness, or a loss of control. For instance, a signal outage may not be experienced merely as a technical issue but can evoke a sense that the relational connection itself has been disrupted.

Limitations of online communication are also closely tied to deficits in non-verbal communication:

"We miss out on a lot of material... we rarely see hands." (S7)

"There are no para-communications because the screen is right in front of me." (S9)

The restricted possibilities for non-verbal communication can lead to feelings of uncertainty and mistrust, while simultaneously highlighting the importance of verbal communication and the ability to adapt to new ways of building a supervisory relationship.

Visualizations rarely depict the whole person: when a person is present, typically only their head or face is shown.

"...talking heads in some pictures..." (S3)

"I would draw stick figures with big heads." (S5)

This reduction of human interaction to "talking heads" symbolizes the limited access to non-verbal cues and the broader context of communication. Physicality is seldom mentioned in the visualizations of supervisees; supervisors, on the other hand, associate it with the absence of visible bodies and thus the absence of non-verbal signals (*"We rarely see hands." (S7)*).

The last subcategory that emerged was the *symbolism of the digital world*. In addition to directly depicting technical devices, participants also used symbolic representations of the digital world, such as arrows, icons, rays, connections, signals, windows, bubbles, and networks. These elements are not merely decorative; they reflect how participants perceive the online space. They visualize interactivity, the direction of exchanges, and the structure of communication in the online format.

"Two arrows facing each other – two-way communication." (P8)

"Two boxes, each sending out some signals." (S8)

Technical elements in the visualization of online supervision appear as tools mediating contact, symbolic boundaries between worlds, as well as obstacles, limitations, and sources of tension. In participants' visual images and reflections, technology generally plays a neutral or positive role (as a mediator), but in moments of failure it becomes an "antagonist" that disrupts contact, interferes, or limits the possibilities for non-verbal communication. Thus, technology represents an ambivalent element in online supervision. On one hand, it enables remote connection and communication; on the other hand, it introduces challenges in the form of technical problems, limitations in non-verbal communication, and feelings of alienation.

Notable differences may be observed when comparing the visualizations of supervisees and supervisors. While supervisees tended to depict specific tools (e.g., camera, microphone), supervisors used richer metaphors in their visualizations (e.g., boxes, rays), which may represent deeper layers of perception.

The Emotional Aspect of Online Supervision

This category includes participants' statements and visualizations related to emotions, feelings, moods, and subjective experiences during online supervision. Emotions were expressed visually (e.g., smile, colors, symbols), verbally (describing the atmosphere), and indirectly (e.g., metaphors such as sun, wind, flowers, meadow, path).

Within the category of the emotional aspect of online supervision, authors identified three concepts: *positive emotions*, *negative emotions*, and *the feeling of relief and lightness*.

Positive emotions were symbolized by elements such as a smile, sun, flowers, Christian symbols, hearts, meadows, warm colors (red, yellow, orange), and pleasantness. These symbols express emotions associated with trust, relaxation, and human connection.

"Perhaps I would draw a smile on the face... pleasant atmosphere." (P1)

"Sun and heart and flowers... only good feelings." (P3)

"...la meadow full of flowers." (S9)

".....lots of colors." (S3)

*"...a cup of coffee in one hand, stick figures with big happy heads..."** (S5)

Positive symbols project safety and support in an environment where physical contact is missing. They express satisfaction. Symbols (such as the heart or cross) represent values like care, spirituality, and the uniqueness of the relationship.

Negative emotions were presented through elements such as distance, barriers, disruptive background, and lack of certainty. They are associated with loneliness, alienation, or frustration.

“...I was not sure whether the supervisor was there alone.” (P7)

“...the wall... for me it's the barrier.” (P11)

Online supervision is also associated with the pandemic period, which brings connotations of threat.

“...I would add Covid or some kind of threat...” (S4)

The feeling of relief and lightness was represented by symbols such as windows, doors, and fresh air: “Open doors... fresh wind... when one sails with the wind” (P12)

One supervisor described online supervision as a path:

“...gently winding at first, starting out as a narrow walkway, almost tentative, and then slowly opening up. As if stretching wider, branching into new directions, as if inviting you to wander further and explore” (S13)

Participants depict supervision as a narrative of transformation – from tension and uncertainty, through exchange, to relief and improved well-being. Interestingly, supervisees associate supervision mostly with positive emotions, while supervisors perceive online supervision more ambivalently.

Interaction and Dynamics of Supervision

This category focuses on the mutual relationship and communication between the supervisor and supervisee, or among multiple participants, and the building of the supervisory relationship in online supervision. The following meanings were identified within this category: *two-way communication, relational equality, distance, and incompleteness of the relationship*.

Symbols such as arrows, lines, conversations, and exchanges indicate efforts toward *bi-directional communication*, interaction, and equality in the relationship – even if mediated.

“Two arrows facing each other – two-way conversation.”* (P8)

"A lot of lines, force lines, dynamics..."(S3)

"...hands joined together..." (S4)

"...the rays going against each other." (S8)

"...a communication channel, two-way." (S12)

Online supervision is perceived as a relational process where an active "connection" exists, even though it is mediated technically.

Relational equality is expressed in visualizations that symbolize efforts to build a balanced relationship: participants in online supervision are attentive to each other and perceive each other as equals in communication: ("We would be equal, just each on the other side." (P6)) Visualizations show that even through a screen, participants in supervision can maintain a respectful and balanced relationship, which is important for trust and cooperation.

Distance and Incompleteness of the Relationship

Distance and incompleteness of the relationship were also apparent in the visualizations, reflecting that the interaction is incomplete or impoverished because the shared physical space is missing.

"The supervisor was also distant from me; it was via a screen." (P4)

"Two computers distant from each other." (P7)

"Two boxes, each sending signals in slightly different directions; the intersection of what's shared is smaller. As if the center... In real contact, they would overlap, but not so much online..." (S8)

Technically, the contact is possible, but psychologically it can be disrupted – the connection is not fully "embodied" or anchored in a shared space.

Arrows, windows, and faces on screens are signs of attempts at interaction – both visually and communicatively. Despite the technology, these symbols represent the intention of "being together." Many statements depict online supervision as a story of two sides trying to find a way to understanding. Dialog motifs emphasize the importance of reciprocity.

The analysis of online supervision visualizations provided rich qualitative material that demonstrates the complex perceptions of this particular form of supervision. Each visualization represents a different – albeit simplified – narrative about how a particular supervisor or supervisee interprets the experience of online supervision. This analysis shows that visualizations of online supervision express more than just the technical process

– they reveal lived experiences, relational dynamics, emotional tensions, and the need for connection. Respondents described online supervision as:

- *An ambivalent space*: Technology mediates contact but simultaneously creates boundaries.
- *A symbolic process*: Images like walls, windows, or cables carry meanings related to distance, safety, or change.
- *An emotional journey*: Feelings of relief, frustration, isolation, or closeness are reflected in visual elements.
- *A dynamic relationship*: The effort for two-way communication, equality, and overcoming barriers is visible in the visualizations.

The findings suggest that online supervision is not merely a substitute for face-to-face contact but has its own unique dynamics and challenges. Supervisors and supervisees visualize online supervision in different ways, often perceiving it as a combination of challenges and opportunities. Some visualize it as a bridge across distances, where technology enables connection and support regardless of geographical constraints. Others see it as an impoverished form of interaction, lacking non-verbal communication and the spontaneity of in-person meetings. Similar findings were reported by Vrtová & Vaska (2022), who observed that the experience of online supervision changed in such a way that supervisors "do not feel the other side" and sometimes do not perceive the context (of the topics being addressed), or experience emotional coldness.

The analysis of online supervision visualizations in the discussion is supplemented with two additional dimensions. The first dimension concerns the type of supervision, and the second concerns the functions of supervision.

Administrative and Clinical Supervision in Visualisations of Online Supervision

In social work, there is a distinction between administrative and clinical supervision. As Kadushin & Harkness (2014) state, administrative supervision primarily focuses on managing practice within an organizational setting. This model emphasizes compliance with internal guidelines, staff accountability, and performance evaluation. Administrative supervisors ensure that social workers adhere to ethical and procedural standards, protect clients' interests, and maintain organizational integrity. By contrast, clinical super-

vision focuses on developing professional (clinical) skills and providing support for therapeutic work. As Holloway (1995) highlights, it is a process that enables social workers to reflect on their practice, receive constructive feedback, and develop effective client intervention techniques.

In the visualizations of online supervision, *administrative supervision was virtually absent*. There were no references to power structures, performance criteria, evaluative mechanisms, or organizational direction. Participants did not perceive this type of supervision as a dominant or significant aspect of online interaction. *Clinical supervision appeared indirectly*, primarily through the emphasis on reflection, exchange of experiences, and symbolic expressions of learning. Elements such as "force lines," "path," "connections between people," or "rays" pointed to internal movement, processing of themes, and skill development.

"A lot of force lines, a lot going beneath the surface..." (S3)

"A path that broadens..." (S13)

In this sense, we can conclude that clinical (reflective) supervision is implicitly present, even if it is not explicitly named.

Administrative supervision is absent, likely because the online environment is not perceived as controlling but rather as supportive. This may be influenced by the fact that participants associated their experiences of online supervision primarily with the pandemic period, when the focus was mainly on providing support in a crisis (Vrťová & Vaska, 2022). Online supervision is perceived primarily as a space for personal and professional development, not as a tool of management or control. The visualizations reflect the human and professional dimensions, which mirrors the setup of the online supervisory process and is also connected to the analysis of the functions of supervision represented in the visualizations.

Functions of Supervision in Visualizations of Online Supervision

According to Kadushin's classification (1976, in: Hawkins & Shohet, 2016), further developed by Havrdová (2008), Proctor (2008), and Wonnacott (2012), we can distinguish four basic functions of supervision: supportive (restorative), educational (formative), managerial (normative), and mediating (transactional). Each of these functions can be activated at different stages of the supervisory process with varying intensity (Vaska et al., 2020). When interpreting the visual representations of online supervision

by supervisees and supervisors, it becomes clear that while the functions of supervision cannot be strictly separated, *the supportive and educational functions* dominate in participants' symbolic expressions.

The most prominent function in both participant groups is the supportive function. Participants perceive online supervision as a space for safety, relief, emotional ventilation, and stabilization. Specific manifestations in the visualizations symbolizing this function include: the image of a circle (symbolizing a safe space), symbols such as meadow, flowers, smile, hands, fresh wind, sun, and statements about feelings of relief, pleasant atmosphere, and satisfaction. Visualizations of online supervision reflect that the dominant role of supervision is to provide psychological support and inner release. In the context of social work, where emotional demands are high, this function is particularly important.

The educational (formative) function is present in the visualizations mainly at the level of reflection. It appears visually most often as interaction, exchange of opinions, and flows of communication, or as a path, process, or structure. It is most frequently present among supervisors, referring to the development of participants. Visual elements symbolizing the educational function include question marks (representing the search for answers or new perspectives), arrows, rays, diagrams, and connections.

The mediating or transactional function is present in the visualizations only marginally. Only a few statements (mostly from supervisors) suggest the mediating role of supervision – problem-solving, transferring information between individuals and the system. Hints of this function may be symbolized by cables and connections.

The managerial or normative function was completely absent in the visualizations. The administrative and controlling dimension of supervision is not part of participants' mental image of online supervision.

Visual representations of online supervision clearly highlight the supportive function supervision is perceived as a space for support, sharing, and release. It focuses on self-development, personal growth, and the importance of supportive supervisory relationships that foster learning and reflection. This emphasis on empathy and encouragement aligns with the principles of clinical (reflective) supervision, which focuses on creating a safe space where employees can discuss challenges and discover new approaches (Adamowich et al., 2014). *The educational function* is present in the form of exchange, reflection, and mental movement. In the context of supervision, this framework highlights the value of reflective practices and their connection to real-world practice, enabling social workers to develop skills

directly related to their work. *The managerial* and *mediating* functions are only minimally present (or totally absent) – which may reflect the specific setup of the supervisory process in the studied context (non-hierarchical, process-oriented, participatory). The visual representation of supervision primarily reflects its supportive (emotional) and educational (reflective) functions. Supervision is perceived as a safe space for sharing and learning, rather than a control or mediation tool.

In summary, participants describe online supervision through visual metaphors – screens, windows, connected individuals, rays, arrows, flowers, or paths. These images carry symbolic meanings about relationships, space, communication, and emotions. The visualizations of online supervision offer deep insight into how participants perceive its essence in the digital space. Although physical contact is missing, respondents express an effort for connection, exchange, and support. The images of communication, dynamics, and emotional connection demonstrate that even the online format can fulfill the core goals of supervision – support, reflection, and professional growth. However, online supervision is also deprived of some sensory and physical dimensions, which is reflected in symbols of distance, limited connection, or reduced space for group dynamics. Overall, the visualizations predominantly reflect the supportive and educational functions of supervision, emphasizing the human and relational dimension over managerial or controlling aspects.

List of References

- Adamowich, T., Kumsa, M. K., Rego, C., Stoddart, J., & Vito, R. (2014). Playing Hide-and-Seek: Searching for the Use of Self in Reflective Social Work Practice. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 15(2), 131–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.883312>
- Anastas, M. (1994). Visuals Stimulate Richer Response in Focus Groups and Individual Interviews. *Quirk's Marketing Research Review*. Retrieved 01.07.2025, from <https://www.quirks.com/articles/a1994/19941206.aspx>
- Bhangu, S., Provost, F., & Caduff, C. (2023). Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods – Part I. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 14(1), 39–42. https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.picr_253_22
- Catterall, M., & Ibbotson, P. (2000). Using Projective Techniques in Education Research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(2), 245–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920050000971>
- Comi, A., Bischof, N., & Eppler, M. J. (2014). Beyond Projection: Using Collaborative Visualization to Conduct Qualitative Interviews. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 9(2), 110–133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-05-2012-1074>

- D'Angelo, A., Ryan, L., & Tubaro, P. (2016). Visualization in Mixed-Methods Research on Social Networks. *Sociological Research Online*, 21(2), 148–151. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.3996>
- Durgee, J. F. (1988). Projective Techniques for Product Positioning Explorations. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 5(3), 19–29.
- Havrdová, Z. (2008). Mnoho tváří, jeden cíl. In: Z. Havrdová, M. Hajný et al. (eds.), *Praktická supervize: Průvodce supervizí pro začínající supervizory, manažery a příjemce supervize* (s. 47–61). Praha: Galén.
- Hawkins, P., & Shohet, R. (2016). *Supervize v pomáhajících profesích*. Praha: Portál.
- Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical Supervision: A Systems Approach*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Jackson, R. L., Drummond, D. K., & Camara, S. K. (2007). What is Qualitative Research? *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 8(1), 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17459430701617879>
- Kadushin, A., & Harkness, D. (2014). *Supervision in Social Work*. Columbia University Press.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Levy, S. J. (1994). Interpreting Consumer Mythology: A Structural Approach to Consumer Behavior. *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 1, 67–72.
- Mayring, P. (2015). Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical Background and Procedures. In: A. Bikner-Ahsbals, C. Knipping, & N. Presmeg (eds.), *Approaches to Qualitative Research in Mathematics Education. Advances in Mathematics Education* (pp. 365–380). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9181-6_13
- Mostyn, B. (1985). The Content Analysis of Qualitative Research Data: A Dynamic Approach. In: M. Brenner, J. Brown & D. Canter (eds.), *The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches* (pp. 115–145). London: Academic Press.
- Proctor, B. (2008). *Group Supervision: A Guide to Creative Practice*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Shannon-Baker, P., & Edwards, C. (2018). The Affordances and Challenges to Incorporating Visual Methods in Mixed Methods Research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(7), 935–955. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218772671>
- Steinman, R. B. (2009). Projective Techniques in Consumer Research. *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 5(1), 37–45.
- Vaska, L., Brozmanová Gregorová, A., & Vrtová, J. (2020). *Modely supervízie organizácie – výskumné reflexie*. Banská Bystrica: BELIANUM.
- Vrtová, J., & Vaska, L. (2022). Digitalizácia supervízie v sociálnej práci v čase pandémie. *Sociální práce/Sociálna práca*, 22(5), 60–77.
- Wonnacott, J. (2012). *Mastering Social Work Supervision*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.