

GOVT. OF INDIA- RNI NO. UPBIL/2014/56766  
UGC Approved Care Listed Journal

ISSN 2348-2397

EES

# शोध संचार

An International Multidisciplinary Quarterly  
Bilingual Peer Reviewed Refereed Research Journal

• Vol. 7

• Issue 28

• October to December 2020



Editor in Chief

**Dr. Vinay Kumar Sharma**

D. Litt. – Gold Medalist



**sanchar**  
Educational & Research Foundation

# CONTENTS

S. No.	Topic	Page No.
1.	A STUDY OF RURAL SPORTS FESTIVALS IN PUNJAB FROM THE VIEW POINT OF WOMEN EMPOWERMENT	Charnjit Kaur Dr. Rajwinderpal Singh 1
2.	IMPACT OF CAPITAL STRUCTURE ON PROFITABILITY IN INDIAN FMCG INDUSTRY : A PANEL DATA APPROACH	Dharm Pal Garg Dr. B.S. Bhatia 5
3.	THE FAMILY STROKE: WEIGHTY HUES	Dr. Honey Walia 11
4.	PROTEAN CAREER ORIENTATION AS A PREDICTOR OF JOB CRAFTING AND WORK ENGAGEMENT	Jasmine Kaur Dr. Sanjay Kaushik 15
5.	EFFECT OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON THE INVESTMENT OBJECTIVE OF WORKING WOMEN	Dr. K. K Sharma Dr. Nidhi Aggarwal 21
6.	MGNREGS : ITS IMPACT ON LABOUR SUPPLY AND WAGES IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR IN PUNJAB	Dr. Monica Sharda 28
7.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS – A STUDY OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS OF SAHARANPUR DISTRICT	Neha Singh Dr. Neeraj Kumar 34
8.	ARUNA ASAF ALI: A LEADER WHO LEADED WITHOUT ANY TITLE	Nitin Kumari 40
9.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AWARENESS AMONG LIBRARY PROFESSIONALS OF PUNJAB AND CHANDIGARH	Pankaj Kumar Dr. Baljinder Kaur 45
10.	BANGLADESH FOREIGN POLICY VIS-A-VIS INDIA: EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT POLITICAL REGIM	Priyanka Dubey 52
11.	NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY (NEP 2020) AND GENDER INCLUSION: FEW EXPOSITORY REFLECTIONS	Dr. Rajesh Kumar Chander 57
12.	TEMPORAL PATTERNS IN THE RURAL NON-FARM EMPLOYMENT: A STATE LEVEL ANALYSIS	Dr. Robina 62
13.	CORPORATE FINANCIAL REPORTING IN INDIA: A BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS	Sharandeep Kaur 68
14.	IMPACT OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXES ON GDP IN INDIA: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY	Dr. Tamal Basu 75
15.	THE COLLEGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF THE PRINCIPAL'S LEADERSHIP STYLE & ITS IMPACT ON THEIR EFFECTIVENESS	Ms. Vidhu Gupta Dr. Sandhya Mehta 81
16.	AGRARIAN CRISIS IN PUNJAB: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS	Dr. Vineet Kumar 87
17.	TAX REFORMS IN INDIA: CRITICAL EVALUATION OF GOOD AND SERVICE TAX	Dr. Isha Goyal 93
18.	EXPORT PERFORMANCE OF LEATHER INDUSTRY IN INDIA	Mamta Rani 100
19.	CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF ROLE OF STAKEHOLDERS IN CREATING AWARENESS FOR HEALTHY DIET AND HEALTHY LIVING AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN SCHOOLS	Dr. Priya Chadha 105

S. No.	Topic	Page No.
20.	PROBLEMATIC INTERNET USE AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS	Dr. Jagpreet Kaur Jahanjeet Singh 109
21.	SUPERVISION PRACTICES IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION: WHAT ARE THE CONCERNS AND HOW CAN WE IMPROVE?	Nancy Gogia Dr. Y. Vijaya Lakshmi 114
22.	A STUDY ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF SLUM DWELLERS IN SHIVAMOGGA CITY	Dr. Ravikumar S 120
23.	AN ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF GST ON INDIAN TELECOM SECTOR	Dr. Dimple Anshul Jain 125
24.	AN ANALYSIS OF B.A. ENGLISH QUESTION OF MANIPUR UNIVERSITY	Dr. W. Jyotirmoy Singh Dr. Ratnabali Sanasam 130
25.	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ADJUSTMENT AMONG URBAN AND RURAL STUDENTS	Dr. Renu Jalal Ms. Rati Rani Chaudhary 134
26.	IMPACT OF MACROECONOMIC INDICATORS ON BSE SENSEX AND NIFTY 50 PERFORMANCE	Dr. Pankaj Kumar Dr. Parveen Kumar 140
27.	AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON FACULTY PERCEPTIONS FOR EFFECTIVENESS OF ONLINE TEACHING	Dr. Ranpreet Kaur 146
28.	AN EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE OF UDAAN SCHEME IN JAMMU	Dr. Rouchi Chaudhary Dr. Sonam Sharma 151
29.	ECOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL ACUMEN: RISHIS AND THE SUFI SAINTS OF KASHMIR	Dr. Mumtaz Ahmad Numani 157
30.	AN EXPLORATIVE STUDY ON ACCELERATED GROWTH OF ONLINE BANKING IN CONSCIENCE WITH DEMONETIZATION - A STUDY IN CHIKKA MAGALORE DISTRICT	Rajith Kumar H. B Dr. K. V Suresha 161
31.	ONLINE TEACHING SKILL AS A SUBSET OF MICRO-TEACHING SKILL	Sourovi Thakur Dr. Usashi Kundu (De) 167
32.	A STUDY OF TEACHING COMPETENCY AMONG CTET-QUALIFIED AND NON-QUALIFIED TEACHERS	Shehla Parveen Dr. Nalini Srivastava 173
33.	SOCIAL STRATIFICATION, CONFLICT AND RELATED ISSUES: A MARXIST STUDY OF THE SELECTED NOVELS	Dr. Arun Dev Pareek 179
34.	EFFECT OF INNOVATED SPECIFIC TRAINING TO IMPROVE THE FLEXIBILITY FOR JUNIOR SWIMMERS	Mathews Abraham Dr. G. Vasanthi 184

## SUPERVISION PRACTICES IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION: WHAT ARE THE CONCERNS AND HOW CAN WE IMPROVE?

□ Nancy Gogia\*  
Dr. Y. Vijaya Lakshmi\*\*

### ABSTRACT

Pursuing doctoral degree is a prestigious achievement to a doctoral student and it encompasses contribution of new knowledge to the discipline. Research conducted at this level is the most sustained and the most demanding for both doctoral student and doctoral supervisor. The supervisory practices adopted by the doctoral supervisor and the relationship between the student and supervisor plays a pivotal role in enhancing the quality of the research work done at doctoral level. A common fact about doctoral supervision is that it is seen as a privatized space or a “black box”. With the growing volume of doctoral education all over the world, it is essential to break this black box and turn on lights in this private space. The present paper unveils about doctoral supervision, challenges and ways to address them. It also discusses about the areas which needs to be explored further in this direction.

**Keywords :** Doctoral Supervision, Doctoral Education, Doctoral students, Supervisory Practices and higher education.

Pursuing doctoral degree is a prestigious achievement to a doctoral student and it encompasses contribution of new knowledge to the discipline. Research conducted at doctoral level is the most sustained and the most demanding for both doctoral students and doctoral supervisors. Doctoral education encompasses many aspects other than production/publication of scholarly articles, research papers and theses. It helps the students to socialize in a research community and develops a sense of confidence for lifelong learning. With the growing volume of doctoral education, the programme is also undergoing many changes.

Doctoral supervisor has the primary responsibility for supervision and is most responsible for the progress of students (Epstein et al., 2011; Halse and Bansel, 2012 and Lee, 2008). The quality of supervision and access to appropriate supervisors are considered to be the most important factors in maintaining the quality of doctoral programme (Grevholm et. al., 2005).

Further, the philosophy of doctoral supervision is

also moving from a traditional hierarchical system to the one of master-apprentice model; from expertise as salient dimension to support and creative as salient dimension (Malfroy, 2005). Delany (2009) and Halse and Bansel(2012) described the four major paradigms of research supervision as 1) apprenticeship paradigm 2) person-centered paradigm 3) scientific-technical paradigm and 4) socio-cultural paradigm. According to Sinclair (2004), there are two main approaches of supervision i.e., “hands on” and “hands off” and the phase of doctoral work determines about which style of supervision dominates. Bhushanet al.(2020) claims that most dominant form of doctoral supervision is apprenticeship where the supervisors are responsible for instilling the qualities of integrity, ethical behavior and good research practices among students. Thus, doctoral supervision is considered a multi facet professional work (Taylor, 2006; Connell, 1985; Richards and Fletcher, 2020; Halse and Malfroy, 2010; Maxwell and Smyth, 2009; Löfström and Pyhältö, 2020) and such practice

\*Research Scholar, School of Education, Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar (India)

\*\*Assistant Professor, School of Education, Central University of Gujarat, Gandhinagar (India)

brings joy and pride to both the supervisors and the doctoral students, and build communities and academic networks that would live organically for a long time (Halse, 2011).

Also, the positive interpersonal relationship between the supervisors and the doctoral students is considered the most important factor for the success of doctoral thesis (Golde, 2005; Mainhard et al., 2009) and doctoral students usually prefer supervisors who are encouraging, supportive, optimistic, futuristic, reliable, knowledgeable, informative, and sharing. They also want their supervisors to be active listeners, to stimulate debate, to provide continuous feedback and support (Mainhard et al., 2009, Denicolo, 2004; Xiao and Taurigana, 1998).

### **Challenges in doctoral supervision**

A common fact about doctoral supervision is that it is still seen as a privatized space or a “black box” (Manathunga, 2005; Lee and Green, 1998; Lee and McKenzie, 2011) due to factors like paucity of research-based evidence on the supervisory practices, lack of clear guidelines on the role and responsibility of doctoral students and supervisors (Bhushan et al., 2020) etc.

Further, the majority of the supervisors in various higher education institutions have never received any formal training for supervision and they learn about their duties and responsibilities only either by reflecting on their experiences as a researcher or by indirectly observing senior supervisors (Halse, 2011, Epstein et al., 2011; Lee, 2008). This weakens them in terms of pedagogy of doctoral supervision and lack of guidelines regarding doctoral supervision further weakens the pedagogy.

Vilkinas and Cartan (2001); Lee (2008); Bhushan et al., (2020) emphasize that a doctoral supervisor plays a paradoxical role when he/she deals with both the professional and personal needs of students. To maintain a balance between these roles proves to be a challenge to the supervisor. Problems with the doctoral supervisors are cited as one of the main reasons for the delay or low completion rate of the doctoral thesis (Winchester-Seeto, et al., 2014). Thus, feedback and interpersonal communication between them play a very crucial role in

supporting doctoral students in their academic career and becoming an independent researcher (Wang and Li, 2011).

### **Addressing the challenges in doctoral supervision**

Grevholm et al. (2005) mentioned that many studies have documented that doctoral students are dissatisfied with the existing models of supervision and to address this problem, efforts should be made to introduce dynamic models of supervision rather than considering it as a black box. It is high time to break the black box of supervision and develop new learning alliance models (Halse and Bansel, 2012) to ensure that doctoral supervision takes place in form of research groups in which, apart from the doctoral students and supervisors, other members such as fresh doctoral students, other senior doctoral students, master's students, local supervisors, visiting subject experts and research students from nearby universities can also be part of the doctoral supervision. Such research groups help in improving both the quality of supervision and quality of doctoral thesis and helps in building a network of support system which will be very useful to a doctoral student. Such, interventions of forming research cluster groups can be taken up on experimental basis in one department and if successful can be extended to other departments as an ideal practice for doctoral supervision. Doctoral education can also be seen as a learning alliance where multiple agents involved in it become jointly responsible for ensuring the quality and timely completion of doctoral work and thus doctoral supervision can be considered as a collaborative responsibility rather than a privatized black space (Halse and Bansel, 2012; Baker and Lattuca, 2009).

Regarding pedagogy of doctoral supervision, given the changing scenario in higher education, it is time to introduce various pedagogical approaches and structural mechanisms that can help improve the quality of doctoral education in general, and doctoral supervision in particular. While initiatives such as mandatory publication of research has strengthened the writing and editorial skills of supervisors but there is a severe deterioration in their capabilities as doctoral supervisors and lack of suitable training has further fueled this

problem (Elmgren, et al., 2016). Hence, qualitative short-term training programmes should be initiated for the doctoral supervisors in order to make them more efficient and effective in their supervision. Trainings can also be organized specifically for the research supervisors where issues like: challenges faced in research supervision, most frequently committed methodological errors in research and other aspects of pedagogy of research supervision can be discussed thoroughly. A thought can also be extended towards the practice that is adopted in Finland where doctoral supervisory training is provided for faculty members irrespective of their length of service and number of students they already supervised (Löfström and Pyhältö, 2020). Further, it is not customary in many institutions to evaluate supervisory experience or discuss among staff how supervision is (or should be) provided (Mainhard, et al., 2009). To resolve this problem, collaborative knowledge sharing environments and collective models of supervision (Malfroy 2005) can be considered. Such models of exchange would help the new supervisors to learn from the experiences of others and their seniors. Universities can also develop list of competencies that supervisors can learn, strengthen, and measure (Hyatt and Williams, 2011).

In order to bridge the gap between the expectations of doctoral students and supervisors, universities can consider the development of supervision contracts. This contract can serve as a guideline in terms of time, communication, inputs and expected outcome. Such contracts can be very useful to both the doctoral supervisors and doctoral students as they act as source of reference when a conflict or dilemma arises with a supervisor, a student or both. A doctoral supervisor should accept that every doctoral student is unique and hence design individualized mentoring action plans. Developing such a mentoring action plan helps the supervisor to manage them both psychologically and academically and maintain a healthy relationship between the doctoral student and doctoral supervisor. A mentoring action plan should also advise doctoral students about what works well and what does not, and sensitize doctoral supervisor about “how much to interfere” in the choice and work of doctoral students and thus stay focused and

move closer to their goal of quality research. Establishing such a structured guidance environment and interim milestones can make the process more easier and less intimidating for everyone involved.

### **Further areas of Research on Doctoral Supervision**

Discussion on issues and concerns in doctoral education is a growing domain and much is not written about it especially in country like India (Grevholm et al., 2005; Jones, 2013) and hence efforts can be made to create new journals in this field.

This section presents about research areas which can be explored in this domain and wherever possible, different socio-demographic dimensions such as type of university, type of doctoral program (individual or team, etc.), discipline, type of research supervision, research supervision experience (naïve or experienced), the type of institution (university, research organization etc.), the locality of institutions, etc. can be considered while undertaking such research. India may also consider conducting doctoral education nationally, as has been done in countries such as Sweden (Doktorandspegl, 2003), Australia (ACER, 1999). Such studies will help us to understand the status quo, ongoing changes, and the required changes in doctoral education. Halse and Bansel (2012) expressed that it is very essential to carry out research to explore the practical and theoretical approaches about doctoral supervision that would work in this changing and diverse higher education environment.

Tremendous growth in enrolment and number of Ph.D. degrees awarded in doctoral education in India (UGC, 2019) have linked “obsession towards quantity” and “the issue of quality” as two major stigmas to doctoral education in our country (Rayan, 2018 and Priscilla, 2019). The Minimum Standards and Procedure for Award of M.Phil./Ph.D. Degrees regulations (2009, 2016, 2018) by UGC show concern towards improving doctoral education. However, the lack of qualified human resource for research guidance is the current state of affair in many universities (UGC, 2019). Hence, the guidelines can think about making doctoral supervision training mandatory.

Doctoral supervision is still considered to be a

black box that must be opened by exploring more about what works to ensure an optimum relation between the student and supervisor from supervisor and student perspective.

Studies can also be carried out to explore opinion of various stakeholders of doctoral education regarding doctoral supervision, doctoral assessment, and evaluation practices in terms of transparency, consistency, relevance of viva voce, external review etc. Comparative studies about the content, approaches, doctoral supervision practices adopted in doctoral programme in various universities in India and abroad will also be of great utility.

Exclusive studies to explore various aspects of doctoral supervision such as their styles of supervision, their views on good research supervision, pedagogy of doctoral supervision, challenges faced by the earlier career supervisors and experienced doctoral supervisors, team/collective supervision vs individual supervision, training of doctoral supervisors, perception of doctoral students, time management practices of doctoral supervisors, positive and negative experiences in doctoral supervision, pressure and challenges in doctoral supervision (balancing between research and academic work, publications etc.), and feedback practices can be undertaken. Studies on supervision ethics are also very essential.

Thus, there is a strong need to critically analyze the practices, issues, challenges, and shortcomings in doctoral supervision practices and explore what really constitutes the quality of good doctoral supervision.

#### References :

1. ACER. (1999). Evaluation and validation of the trial postgraduate research experience questionnaires. Camberwell: Australian Council for Educational Research.
2. Baker, V. L., & Lattuca, L. R. (2009). Developmental networks and learning: Toward an interdisciplinary perspective on identity development during doctoral study. *Studies in higher education*, 35(7), 807-827. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070903501887>
3. Bhushan, P., Anand, D., Anamika, C., Subhasree, N., & Rakesh, B. (2020). Guidance Document: Good Academic Research Practices. Retrieved from <https://philpapers.org/archive/BHUGDG.pdf>
4. Connell, R. W. (1985). How to supervise a Ph. D. *Vestes*, 28(2), 38-42. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ333265>
5. Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1998). *Supervising the Ph.D..A guide to success*, Open University Press, Buckingham. <https://196.189.45.87/handle/123456789/47225>
6. Delany, D. (2009). *A review of the literature on effective Ph. D. supervision*. Trinity College, Dublin: Centre for Academic Practice and Student Learning.
7. Denicolo, P. (2004). Doctoral supervision of colleagues: Peeling off the veneer of satisfaction and competence. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(6), 693-707. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507042000287203>
8. Doktorandspegeln. (2003). Report no 28. Hogskoleverketsrapportserie 2003:28, National Agency for higher education, Stockholm.
9. Elmgren, M., Forsberg, E., Lindberg-Sand, Å., & Sonesson, A. (2016). The formation of doctoral education. Retrieved from <https://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:916582/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
10. Epstein, D., Boden, R., & Kenway, J. (2011). *Postgraduate Research Supervision (I) Getting Going*. SAGE Research Methods. SAGE Publications Ltd, London.
11. Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669-700. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2005.11772304>
12. Green, B., & Lee, A. (1995). Theorising Postgraduate Pedagogy. *Australian Universities' Review*, 38(2), 40-45. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ523110>
13. Grevholm, B., Persson, L. E., & Wall, P. (2005). A dynamic model for education of doctoral students

- and guidance of supervisors in research groups. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 60(2), 173-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-005-4497-2>
14. Halse, C. (2011). 'Becoming a supervisor': the impact of doctoral supervision on supervisors' learning. *Studies in higher education*, 36(5), 557-570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.594593>
  15. Halse, C., & Bansel, P. (2012). The learning alliance: ethics in doctoral supervision. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(4), 377-392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.706219>
  16. Halse, C., & Malfroy, J. (2010). Retheorizing doctoral supervision as professional work. *Studies in Higher education*, 35(1), 79-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070902906798>
  17. Hyatt, L., & Williams, P. E. (2011). 21st century competencies for doctoral leadership faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 36(1), 53-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9157-5>
  18. Lee, A. (2008). How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 267-281.
  19. Lee, A., & Green, B. (Eds.). (1998). *Postgraduate studies: Postgraduate pedagogy*. University of Technology Sydney.
  20. Lee, A., & McKenzie, J. (2011). Evaluating doctoral supervision: Tensions in eliciting students' perspectives. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(1), 69-78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2010.543773>
  21. Löfström, E., & Pyhältö, K. (2020). What are ethics in doctoral supervision, and how do they matter? Doctoral students' perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 64(4), 535-550. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2019.1595711>
  22. Mainhard, T., Van Der Rijst, R., Van Tartwijk, J., & Wubbels, T. (2009). A model for the supervisor–doctoral student relationship. *Higher education*, 58(3), 359-373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9199-8>.
  23. Malfroy, J. (2005). Doctoral supervision, workplace research and changing pedagogic practices. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 24(2), 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500062961>
  24. Manathunga, C. (2005). The development of research supervision: “Turning the light on a private space”. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13601440500099977>
  25. Maxwell, T. W., & Smyth, R. (2009). Research supervision: The research management matrix. *Higher Education*, 59(4), 407-422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9256-3>
  26. Priscilla, J. (2019). UGC to review quality of PhD theses over 10 years. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/ugc-to-review-quality-of-phd-theses-over-10-years/article27277915.ece>
  27. Rayan, P. A. (2018). Are higher education institutions turning into PhD factories? Retrieved from <https://www.thehindu.com/education/an-obsession-with-quantity/article23341047.ece>
  28. Richards, K. A. R., & Fletcher, T. (2020). Learning to work together: Conceptualizing doctoral supervision as a critical friendship. *Sport, Education and Society*, 25(1), 98-110. Retrieved from <https://experts.illinois.edu/en/publications/learning-to-work-together-conceptualizing-doctoral-supervision-as>
  29. Sinclair, M. (2004). *The pedagogy of 'good' PhD supervision: A national cross-disciplinary investigation of PhD supervision*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
  30. Taylor, S. (2006). Thinking of research supervision as a form of teaching. *Lancaster University Supervision Online Journal*.
  31. UGC. (1984). UGC's policy and program for improvement of research in the universities. University Grants Commission. Retrieved from
  32. UGC. (2009). UGC Regulations on Minimum Standards and Procedure for the Award of



- M.Phil/Ph. D, Regulations 2009 University Grant Commission.
33. UGC. (2016). UGC Regulations on Minimum Standards and Procedure for the Award of M.Phil/Ph. D, Regulations 2009 University Grant Commission.
  34. UGC. (2018). UGC Regulations on Minimum Standards and Procedure for the Award of M.Phil/Ph. D, Regulations 2009 University Grant Commission.
  35. UGC.(2019a). UGC public notice on “Promoting and improving quality of research in Indian universities/colleges”.University Grants Commission. Retrieved from
  36. UGC.(2019b). UGC public notice on “Research and publication ethics”.University Grants Commission. Retrieved from [https:// www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/9836633\\_Research-and-Publication-Ethics.pdf](https://www.ugc.ac.in/pdfnews/9836633_Research-and-Publication-Ethics.pdf)
  37. Vilkinas, T., &Cartan, G. (2001). The behavioural control room for managers: the integrator role. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730110395079>
  38. Wang, T., & Li, L. Y. (2011). 'Tell me what to do' vs. 'guide me through it': Feedback experiences of international doctoral students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(2),101-112.<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469787411402438>
  39. Winchester-Seeto, T., Homewood, J., Thogersen, J., Jacenyik-Trawogger, C., Manathunga, C., Reid, A., & Holbrook, A. (2014). Doctoral supervision in a cross-cultural context: Issues affecting supervisors and candidates. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(3), 610-626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2013.841648>
  40. Xiao, Z., &Tauringana, V. (1998). Research students' training in accounting and finance: the case of “new universities”. *Managerial Auditing Journal*.<https://doi.org/10.1108/02686909810208065>
  41. Young, I. P. (2006).The doctoral student procurement and advisement process. Paper presented at the annual Conference of National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lexington, Kentucky.

