Supervisors watching supervisors

The deconstructive possibilities and tensions of team supervision

Catherine Manathunga

Victoria University, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand

Many universities have introduced team supervision as a means of intervening in the intensity of the traditional supervisor-student dyad. This policy is intended to provide students with a great support during their candidature and to share the burden of sole supervision. It is also a pedagogy that seeks to support students' engagement with new knowledges that cross institutional and epistemic boundaries. However, few researchers have studied the effects of team supervision on doctoral pedagogical practices and on the already complicated fields of power circulating in supervision. This paper focuses on one particular aspect of the operations of power within team supervision – the issue of how power circulates between supervisors. Drawing on Foucault's notions of governmentality, technologies of self and surveillance, I seek to track supervisors' self-regulation and peer-regulation when they co-supervise doctoral students with one or more colleagues. I conclude by arguing that the need for more post structural research into supervision pedagogy remains just as urgent as it was when Green and Lee first made their call for theorising postgraduate pedagogy in 1995.

Introduction

In their seminal special issue on postgraduate pedagogy, Green and Lee (1995), building upon early assertions by Connell (1985) that supervision was a form of teaching, made a passionate plea for supervision to be regarded as a form of pedagogy involving complex power relations circulating between the supervisor, the student and knowledge. The special issue contained a number of ground-breaking, critical explorations of supervision pedagogy. However, team supervision had not yet come to prominence and, as a result, the special issue focused only upon uncovering the complexities and possibilities inherent in sole supervision.

If we fast forward to contemporary times, team supervision, or the supervision of one doctoral student by two or more supervisors, has come to be regarded as effective supervision pedagogy and has become standard policy in most universities across the Western world. It is this form of team supervision (i.e. one student working with two or more supervisors) that is the focus of this article rather than group supervision (where several students work together with one or several supervisors). North America has a longer tradition of panel supervision. For the countries that adopted the English model of doctoral education, team supervision is a more recent development. Patterns of supervision also vary across disciplines, with much longer traditions of team supervision common in the Sciences and far less common in the Humanities and some of the Social Sciences.

It is believed that team supervision will provide students with a broader range of intellectual and social support during their candidature. In particular, team supervision seeks to address concerns that the sole supervisor model, in which supervision was regarded as a private space (Manathunga, 2005b), could be a problematic

method of inducting research students into academic disciplines. This apprenticeship/protégé model of supervision involved the development of an intense relationship between one supervisor (master) and a research student (apprentice/protégé). Grant (2008) has also characterised this relationship as master/slave, drawing upon Hegel's construct to highlight the complex and contradictory mutual relations of domination and subordination inherent in these types of relationships.

In this model of supervision, the student learnt to become an independent researcher by observing their supervisor. This acculturation into the discipline and into the role of scholar was believed to occur by osmosis. In some cases, this model of supervision worked for research students or they at least survived it. As Lee and William's (1999, p 20) research has suggested, it was more a case of survival; a kind of brutal, 'bizarre and barbaric initiation'; a 'trial by fire'. This model of supervision was often characterised by exploitation or abuse at worst or neglect at best. It worked best if the supervisor and student were able to develop good rapport. It also worked if the student came from a similar social class and ethnic background to the supervisor or was able to imitate these attitudes, modes of dress, forms of speech and behaviour. Very often the supervisor guarded their student as if they personally owned them, becoming hostile to the notion of their student talking to other colleagues. In this intense private space, students sometimes became cheap quasi research assistants. Even in the Sciences where there is a longer tradition of team-based research, students were often consigned to the role of cheap laboratory assistant.

Not only did this model expose students to potential exploitation or abuse, but it also ensured that the burden of the student's success rested heavily on the shoulders of the lone supervisor. So it is now assumed that team supervision shares the significant and often demanding pedagogical responsibility of working with doctoral candidates among several supervisors and may enable junior supervisors to gain supervision mentoring from more experienced colleagues. Increasingly, as students engage with new knowledges that cross institutional and epistemic boundaries, team supervision also provides students with broader interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary support.

However, few researchers have actually studied the effects of team supervision on doctoral pedagogical practices. Even fewer researchers have taken up Lee and Green's (1995, p. 2) challenge to subject team supervision to alternative lines of inquiry that might critique the 'rational Science model of … supervision' that has indeed come to dominate, as Lee and Green warned it would. This paper seeks to rise to this challenge by discussing a post structuralist study of team supervision in the Humanities and Social Sciences. In particular, I focus on exploring the operations of power circulating between supervisors in team supervision. After exploring the existing studies of team supervision, which can be located in a liberal theoretical paradigm, this paper outlines the role of power, desire and governmentality in supervision pedagogy. I then highlight the additional complexities team supervision brings to what Grant (2003, p. 189) has already characterised as a 'chaotic pedagogy'. This sets the scene for the contextual details of my study. Adopting a poststructuralist discourse analysis methodology, I outline how team supervision produces self-regulation and peer-regulation between supervisors and how intersections of gender and power emerge in my data. Finally, I explore how the operations of power between supervisors can be both generative and problematic and call for more post structuralist investigations of team supervision that might continue the work that Green and Lee (1995, p. 44) described as 'needing urgent and rigorous attention'.

Team supervision as a universal good

Although there is now a substantial literature on supervision pedagogy, much of it remains silent about how team supervision alters the character of supervisory practice. Even those that mention team supervision usually do so to recommend it as a highly effective form of supervision pedagogy rather than to investigate it. For example, Conrad's (2003) pilot study of research students at one Australian university only contains a few comments about team supervision and concentrates instead on group supervision where one supervisor meets with a group of students. Grigg *et al.*'s (2003) report on cross-disciplinary research indicates that some students experience difficulties in interdisciplinary team supervision but made no further recommendations on this issue. Sutcliffe (1999) reports that the dynamics of team supervision and the need to establish effective team working practice have been highlighted in his supervisor academic development sessions and Andresen (1999, p. 34) also recommends team supervision as an approach that could 'balance the inherently fragile and vulnerable dyadic supervisor-student relationship'.

The most detailed exploration of team supervision has been conducted by Pang (1999), writing from the perspective of a recent PhD graduate. He recommends five key principles for developing effective team supervision:

1. A good start: establishing explicit expectations in the group and allowing the student to be honest about

their fear of being confused by so many supervisors
2. Trust and respect: especially when diverse views and perspectives come up. It is usually the student who must work out a compromise or take a stand supporting one perspective or the other.
3. Avoid the politics: supervisors should try to keep students insulated from departmental politics
4. Distinguish between supervisors and friends: try to keep work and social times in the team separate
5. Be sensible, reasonable and supportive: supervisors need to recognise the extra pressures team supervision puts on students and be particularly sensible and supportive (Pang, 1999).

One of the few articles that draws upon some empirical evidence (300 interviews of students and supervisors in the Social and natural Sciences in the UK) to discuss joint supervision argues that joint supervision can be successful but it can also be plagued with difficulties, ambiguities and tensions (Pole, 1998). Pole warns about the dangers of regarding team supervision as a panacea for all supervision ills. Rather than regarding it as a 'safety net', he suggests that team supervision 'if used cautiously may be an effective way of cushioning a fall' (Pole, 1998, p. 270).

...team supervision represents both an increase in the intensity of surveillance and disciplining of students by several supervisors and a diffusion of this intensity as supervisors are engaged in watching (and at times disciplining) each other.

However, none of this small body of research on team supervision has sought to investigate the highly complicated fields of power circulating in team supervision. Watts (2010) emphasises this continuing dearth of critical investigation of team supervision. Summarising Delamont and others' (2004) list of concerns about team supervision, Watts (2010) argues that communication can become problematic within team supervision and that there is a risk that no one supervisor will take responsibility for the oversight of the whole PhD project. However, she outlines her personal experience that disagreement between supervisors can provide students with opportunities for more critical insights into research issues and that it can provide students with continuity in the face of an unexpected departure of one supervisor.

Indeed, most of the existing studies of team supervision come from a liberal paradigm, which suggests that postgraduate supervision is based on rationality, logic, and the intellect. The current dominant liberal discourse circulating about postgraduate supervision constructs effective supervision as mentoring research students (Manathunga, 2007). According to this understanding of supervisory pedagogy, supervisors guide and facilitate their students' gradual development into independent researchers. This mentoring discourse represents supervisor/s-student interactions unproblematically as dialogues between 'collegial equals' (Wisker, 2003 quoted in Grant, 2008). Discourses about the 'dirty' concepts of 'power, desire and difference' (Grant, 2001, p. 13) within the supervisory relationship remain absent from this acceptable view of supervision pedagogy. So, within this framing of supervision, it is assumed that team supervision simply gives students access to additional mentors and provides supervisors with more collegial support.

There is one recent study by Guerin and others (2011), however, that provides an exception to this. Guerin and her colleagues interviewed research students about team supervision and challenged the positioning of students as 'passive novices' (Guerin *et al.*, 2011, p.10). Instead, they argued that students engaged proactively in managing team supervisory relationships, conflict, feedback and communication. Using the metaphor of polygamous marriage, they suggested that students, like the husband of many wives, actively 'skilfully and sensitively manage multiple relationships with very different partners' (Guerin *et al.*, 2011, p. 3).

Power, desire and governmentality in supervision

There are, however, an increasing number of studies that deploy critical and poststructuralist paradigms to investigate supervision pedagogy, particularly following Lee and Green's 1995 call for action. These scholars have sought to unearth the complexities, operations of power, and hidden constructions inherent in supervision relationships (Grant, 2001; 2003; Green & Lee, 1995; Lee & Williams, 1999). Grant's (2003; 2008) work in particular demonstrates just how complex the operations of power within supervision pedagogy are.

Grant (2003) maps out four complex, interwoven layers of relations that operate within supervision. The first layer constructs supervision between a supervisor and a student as an 'institutionally prescribed relationship with stable [supervisor and student] positions' (Grant, 2003, p. 178). This is the layer acknowledged in policy documents and in studies of supervision drawing on a liberal paradigm.

Grant (2003) argues that the second layer of supervision is the pedagogical power relations that circulate between the supervisor, the student and the thesis or knowledge along the lines proposed by Lusted (1986). The third layer of relations includes the 'diverse social positions' adopted by the supervisor and student, producing complicated and changeable interactions (Grant, 2003, p. 182). Finally, the fourth layer is the inexplicable yet powerful operation of supervisors' and students' 'conscious and unconscious knowing and desires' (Grant, 2003, p. 185). Grant (2003; 2008) demonstrates how much potential there is in supervision for supervisors and students to misunderstand each other or talk past each other. Communication in supervision where there is only one supervisor and one student is a complicated personal and pedagogical space as Grant's (2003) work has shown. Adding one or more additional supervisors into the mix has the effect of multiplying these complexities exponentially. As far as I am aware, most of these poststructuralist studies are yet to explore power and desire in team supervision pedagogy.

Supervision pedagogy is also a site of governmentality, as I argued in my article investigating notions of mentoring in supervision (Manathunga, 2007). This article drew upon Devos' (2004) characterisation of general mentoring programmes for women as sites of governmentality, which require the production of two contradictory subject positions for those being mentored. These subject positions include being simultaneously an active subject and a subject that desires to be acted upon (Devos, 2004). Devos (2004, p. 77) thereby demonstrated how mentoring includes both 'a form of paternalism and … 'supported self-direction". I argued that these contradictions within supervision, where the student desires both 'autonomy and regulation' (Manathunga, 2007, pp. 211-212), were even more pronounced because supervisors (unlike mentors in most formal programmes) have 'additional surveillance mechanisms [e.g. annual progress reports or milestone reports], which demonstrate the institutional power and responsibility invested in them' and because they are helping students to 'achieve particular identifiable outcomes (the thesis) within a fairly prescribed form and timeline'.

Supervisors are also seeking to socialise students into a disciplinary way of being, thinking and acting or, to draw on the work of Foucault (1988), to develop particular technologies of self. As I argued previously,

> supervisors encourage students to shape their minds (and bodies) through a range of self-disciplining techniques, such as reflective practice, engaging in thinking and writing tasks within disciplinary paradigms, drafting ideas and gaining expert feedback, so that they will become credentialed as wise scholars (Manathunga, 2007, p. 211).

Supervisors achieve this through a complex mix of support, guidance and facilitation; modelling their own research practices; and surveillance and disciplining (Manathunga, 2007).

However, in team supervision, both (or many) supervisors are not only encouraging students to develop certain technologies of self and watching and disciplining students. They are also watching each other and causing each other to display particular supervisory technologies of self. So, team supervision represents both an increase in the intensity of surveillance and disciplining of students by several supervisors and a diffusion of this intensity as supervisors are engaged in watching (and at times disciplining) each other. Supervisors become simultaneously more powerful and less powerful when subjected to the scrutiny of their colleagues as well as that of their students. So too, students also become both less and more powerful in these team interactions. All of this ensures that communication and pedagogical patterns in supervision become even more complex and it can be difficult to determine who is actually addressing who in team supervision interactions. Each member of the team is managing their relations with and through each other as well as through the thesis (Grant, 2003). As a result, studies that seek to trace the operations of power, desire and governmentality in team supervision are a vital addition to existing understandings of supervision pedagogy.

Context and methodologies

I collected data from four supervision teams at an Australian research-intensive university; two in the Humanities and two in the Social Sciences. The team supervision meetings for each team were recorded for four consecutive team meetings, except in the case of one team in the Humanities where two meetings were recorded. After each meeting, supervisors and students were emailed some short reflection questions, which they responded to separately on email. These reflections provide valuable indications of each participant's thoughts, feelings and experiences of each meeting. Attempts were made to collect reflections from all of the participants but, in some cases, not all of the participants responded after each meeting. This approach was similar to that adopted by Grant (2003) in her study of Masters supervision, although she interviewed each participant separately after each meeting.

Table 1: Research participants

Teams	*Student*	*Supervisors*	*General research topic*
1	*Natalie* – domestic student; confirmed; Anglo-Australian	Principal S (PS): *Diana* Assoc. S (AS) 1: *Paul* AS 2: *Tim* All Anglo-Australian	Vietnamese film studies
2	*Melanie* – domestic student; confirmed; Anglo-Australian	PS: *Bill* AS: *Eva* Both Anglo-Australian	Education and technology
3	*Maria* – international; new candidate; South American (+ 1 *Fred* – domestic student; new candidate; Anglo-Australian participates in 1 meeting)	PS: *Christina* AS: *Peter* Both Anglo-Australian	Philosophy
4	*Margaret* – domestic student; confirmed; Anglo-Australian	PS: *Alice* AS: *Sue* Both Anglo-Australian	Social work

Table 1 provides a summary of the details of each team, using pseudonyms and slightly modified research topics to protect participants' identities and supervisory relationships.

The four students in this study were all women, with one of them being international and one of them mature aged. Three of the students were from Anglo-Australian backgrounds and one student was from South America. Three of the students were in the mid-candidature stage, while one was in the early stages of candidature. As it happened, another male student was included in two meetings of one team in the Humanities because he was studying a similar PhD topic.

A total of nine supervisors participated in this study, including 5 women and 4 men. All of these supervisors were from Anglo-Australian backgrounds. In one team in the Humanities, there was joint Principal Supervision provided by the female and male supervisors, although the team acknowledged the greater role and seniority of the female supervisor. In the three other teams, there was one Principal Supervisor (2 females and 1 male) and up to two Associate Supervisors. As also indicated in Pole's (1998) study of joint supervision in the Social Sciences, these teams had been formed according to the individual expertise of each supervisor, with one team adding an additional Associate Supervisor during the study because they recognised a gap in the expertise of the existing supervision team. Although team supervision is often used in the Humanities and Social Sciences to provide mentoring for new supervisors (Pole, 1998), in this study 7 of the supervisors were experienced and one female Principal Supervisor and one male joint Principal Supervisor were less experienced but not entirely new to supervision. I have deliberately changed the topic areas they are researching a little in order to preserve their harmonious supervisory relationships and to offer them some anonymity. In this paper, I will particularly draw on data from Teams 1 and 2.

The interview transcripts and notes produced by supervisors and students were analysed using poststructuralist discourse analysis (Threadgold, 2000). This form of discourse analysis was selected because it foregrounds the 'context of culture'. Broader disciplinary cultural norms and practices are particularly important in studying supervision pedagogy because they shape supervisor-student interactions in many significant explicit and implicit ways. In particular, these contextual factors play out in the unconscious knowings and desires that complicate and enrich supervision relationships, both between supervisors and students and between co-supervisors. Poststructuralist discourse analysis also enables the researcher to engage in a form of textual analysis intimately located within poststructuralist theory (Poynton & Lee, 2000). Indeed, as Threadgold (2000, p. 40) argues, 'the binary separation of metalanguage (or theory) and data … is already an impossible separation'. Foucault's political notion of discourse as a body of knowledge and practices was adopted in order to uncover the political aspects of team supervision.

In particular, the following linguistic devices were tracked in transcripts of team supervision meetings in order to identify some of the displays of power and unconscious knowings and desires of supervisors and students:

- dominance in the conversation
- turn taking and length of turns
- repairs and hesitations in the dialogue
- strength or tentativeness of the language
- laughter and other audible non-verbal communication
- unexplained ambivalences and contradictions.

I also sought to track moments when both the supervisors seem to act as one against the student or when one supervisor seems to help the student respond to some of the comments of the other supervisor or when the student seemed to align themselves with either of the supervisors. I paid particular attention to the strength of the student's voice and how frequently they entered

the conversation and the length and nature of their turns. Identifying these discourses and some of their linguistic markers enabled me to investigate how supervisory teams wrestle with the inherent tension in supervision that comes from the desire for intellectual, collegial dialogue within a pedagogical practice invested with governmentality and power (Grant, 2003; Manathunga, 2007). For the purposes of this paper I have selected one example of self-regulation from Team 1, one of peer-regulation as represented in Teams 1 and 2 and I have then included a longer analysis of the gender and power dynamics playing out in Team 1. Interestingly, these gender dynamics do not appear to be present in Teams 2 and 3.

Self-regulation

There were a number of instances of careful self-regulation by supervisors in these data. I have included the example that provides the most striking evidence of the ways in which supervisors censor themselves and chose their words more carefully in team supervision situations. It is also indicative of the pressure some Principal Supervisors can experience in team supervision. This example comes from Team 1. The female principal supervisor in this Humanities team whom we will call Diana[1], commented in her email reflections that, 'as principal advisor and person most responsible for the supervision … I felt a bit 'under scrutiny' myself and, hence, slightly nervous' (Principal Supervisor (PS), Team 1, email 13/12/06). Although she seeks to modify the extent of her nervousness (a bit … slightly), the team interactions clearly indicate that she feels under surveillance. She comments after the first meeting that she was also 'nervous at first about structuring the meeting effectively and presenting comments coherently' (PS, Team 1, email 31/5/06)

This is played out in a number of ways. As she herself suggests, 'I wasn't sure how much I was talking to the student about her writing and how much I was talking to the other advisors about her writing' (Principal Supervisor (PS), Team 1, email 13/12/06). As a result, in both meetings, she spends a lot of time giving her feedback and it seems to be the Associate Supervisor who is attending to the student's feelings and seeking to draw her opinions out by asking facilitative, prompting questions (lines 289-306, Team 1, Meeting 1, 31/5/06). In other words, these feelings of being under surveillance result in the Principal Supervisor focusing a lot more on herself and how she is managing the meeting, rather than on how the student is responding to the feedback or gaining opportunities to contribute to the conversation.

This also played out in a tendency of the Principal Supervisor to answer the Associate Supervisor's questions that were clearly directed at the student. This is illustrated in the following excerpt:

> Paul (AS1): Because I remember you were talking about you know, ideas about 'Vietnamese'[2] women or even if wasn't in films. And there is a whole, really that underpins your methodology, you know. Actually how you go about it, and how you should be doing it. Those issues will be relevant here as well.
>
> Diana (PS): You mean who [unclear word] is it? To analyse Vietnamese women as a non-Vietnamese woman?
>
> Paul: Not specifically. In your honours thesis you talked about the appropriateness of various approaches or same works? (Team 1, Meeting, 1, 31/5/06)

The 'you' Paul is referring to here is clearly the student, but it is the Principal Supervisor who responds seeking clarification. What is interesting is that Principal Supervisor becomes aware of this tendency in her post-meeting reflections – 'in fact I have a problem of having to make myself stop answering on the student's behalf when Paul raises an issue' (PS, Team 1, email 31/5/06).

The First Associate Supervisor (Paul) seems to make a conscious effort to support the feedback given by the Principal Supervisor, which she found 'reassuring … [this] gives me confidence that my judgement/critical skills are ok' (PS, Team 1 email 31/5/06). However, he does not comment explicitly on any of this and assumes that his comments were 'well received by student and co-advisors alike' (AS1, Team 1, email 13/12/06). The second male Associate Supervisor, whom we will call Tim, seems to pick up on Diana's nervousness:

> being the principal advisor, [Diana] might have been worried that I was too critical, and that my comments were indirect criticisms of her advising, which of course they weren't. I saw [Paul] later, though, and he seemed to think my comments were fine' (AS2, Team 1, email 14/12/06).

Tim is sufficiently worried about this that he seeks out feedback from the other Associate Supervisor, who has been in the team longer than he has. Therefore, there are clear instances in these two meetings of careful self-regulation mainly by the Principal Supervisor but also, to a lesser extent, by one of the Associate Supervisors.

Peer-regulation

There were also a number of instances of peer-regulation evident in the data. I will focus on two examples from Teams 2 and 1 where one of the Associate Supervisors intervenes to try and soften the comments of the Principal

Supervisor or to give the student a hint about how they might respond to the other supervisor's line of questioning. Bill, the Principal Supervisor from the Social Sciences (Team 2) is asking the student to explain how she has approached data collection. The student's (Eva) responses and nervous laughter suggest a defensiveness that is not characteristic of her usual contributions in the other team meetings recorded in this study. Eventually the Associate Supervisor (Melanie) inserts a hint about how to respond (see italicised line) and Eva regains her momentum and composure:

Bill (PS): But yeah, I just wanted you to help me recall where that's coming from? What's that all about? Because it's very very obvious when you're looking at those diagrams and you need to talk about it and you need to make a case about why it's set up and done that way.

Eva (St): Well, really I think some people find it really annoying but I was doing it to somehow flesh out sometimes by saying what you don't like about something is giving you more information about what, I mean if you don't like something or what belief isn't so useful is giving you more information about what you believe …[3]

Bill: Have you got anything in the literature that you've read? That backs that?

Eva: No …

Melanie (AS): *People could choose what they want to [write?], and they didn't use it?*

Eva: Some didn't use it. The only thing that people were compelled to use was the central, overarching concept. The blue one.

Melanie: Just teaching and learning.

Eva: So here's John[4] saying, checking all the [unclear word] and learning and teaching. That was the only one they were compelled to use. And in some cases for example Elizabeth, her map on [teaching[5]], that's the only concept she uses …

In the second example, this time from Team 1, the Principal Supervisor (Diana) and Associate Supervisor 2 (Tim) engage in sustained and quite critical feedback about the student's draft chapter. Associate Supervisor 1 (Paul) asks some clarifying questions of Diana in this excerpt and the student's (Natalie) responses are limited to soft 'yeahs'. Diana even refers to Natalie in the third person as if she is not there. Eventually, Paul intervenes suggesting that it would be hard to rewrite this section along the lines that the other two supervisors are suggesting (see first italics). This prompts Diana to suggest some more sign-posting instead (second italics) and then she and Tim seem to back away from their suggestions, agreeing finally that any of these changes should be made after the next three chapters are written:

Diana PS: goes to that the idea of, you know, in, in Vietnamese, um, film studies, and and feminist, women studies, there is this debate about how can you use the western theories to look at Vietnamese contexts, and, I don't see whether you have to accept totally Vietnamese definition of female consciousness in order to examine female consciousness as displayed in Vietnamese films, cause what you're looking at does not necessarily have to be the same as what Vietnamese critics [looking at] …

Diana: ...a bit more defensive against um, um, examiner //

Paul: //yer

Diana: particular (of) cultural contexts or something, and reading most of your chapters and thinking, well, ((not clear)), is there, and then finding out throughout your chapters your are in fact doing that ( ) and probably stated them//

Paul: *[I'd keep an eye on that … it could be hard to write*

Tim: [a lot of work] ((very weak sound))

Diana: It will cause, it would require a substantial rewriting of the chapter

Tim AS2: …the Vietnamese …keep that down, and then what you are going to say, um, well, (actually, ….) ((weak voice))

Paul: I guess, [I guess, um]

Tim: [seems a bit clumsy, that's all]

Paul: it could be, it could be, it//

Diana: *//what if (through some) sign [posting (more)*

Tim: What's the sign posting an [(alternative)]?

Diana: something like [that]

Tim: yer]

Diana: I am aware of these arguments, and this is coming later on, something to show//

Tim: //yer

Diana: to show, and//

Tim: //yer, you can do that with sign posting that paragraph, it just means (you'll take) more work to start with the Vietnamese perspective …

What is intriguing about this is that, after this intervention, Tim's comments become far more positive and less critical for the remainder of the meeting. As we saw in the example of self-regulation above, Tim did seem to realise that he had been too critical at first. Although Paul doesn't explicitly comment about this in his post-meeting reflections or admit to Tim that he did regard his critique as too strong, his actions in the meeting clearly seek to regulate

the behaviour of the other supervisors in the team.

Gender and power in team supervision

Although Teams 1, 2 and 3 have a mixture of male and female supervisors and the Principal Supervisors of Teams 1 and 3 are women, the intersections of gender and power that are already evident in these examples of self- and peer-regulation appear most strongly in Team 1. There are possibly a number of reasons for this. Whereas in Team 3, the First Principal Supervisor (in this case she and her colleague are Joint Principal Supervisors) is senior to the Second Principal Supervisor and has more supervisory experience, in Team 1, although the Principal Supervisor has a more senior rank than the Associate Supervisors, she has less supervisory experience than they do. Undoubtedly, personality factors probably come into it too, as the Principal Supervisor (Diana) in Team 1 is a quiet, gentle and self-deprecating person (some might argue an 'acceptable' subjectivity for women academics!).

I am particularly intrigued by the Second Associate Supervisor's (Tim) comment that he thought that '[Diana], being the principal advisor, might have been worried that I was too critical and that my comments were indirect criticisms of her advising, which of course they weren't' (AS2, Team 1, email 14/12/06). Tim is trying to account for his behaviour in the supervision meeting. The way in which he states this may signal that he may have intended some criticism of Diana' supervision even unconsciously. What is clear, though, in this whole interaction and the post-meeting reflections of each of the supervisors, is that Diana felt particularly defensive about her supervision and critical judgement in front of the other supervisors, although she constructs herself as more confident after interacting with the First Associate Supervisor (Paul) in the first meeting.

It is also intriguing that both Diana and Tim seek to construct themselves as reflective supervisors in their post-meeting email comments perhaps to account for their performances in the supervision meetings. In addition to the reflections quoted above, Diana resolves after meeting 2 that 'next time we should perhaps circulate each other's comments to the whole group so that more productive group interaction and discussion can take place' (PS, Team 1, email 13/12/06). In Tim's case, his concern centres on being too critical and he checks this out with the First Associate Supervisor (Paul). He seems quite reassured by Paul's response, though, as if that puts the matter to rest. Intriguingly, Paul does not seem interested in constructing himself as a reflective supervisor indicating that he thought his comments were 'well received by student and co-advisors alike' (AS1, Team 1, email 15/12/06). Instead he seems to use his responses within supervision team meetings to regulate the comments of his peers. There is not the space in this article to tease out any further the complicated strands of gender, rank and experience operating within this team, but that could be a subject for future analysis.

Implications for supervision pedagogy

This study of supervisors watching supervisors in team supervision highlights the complexities introduced to the already 'chaotic' pedagogy (Grant, 2003, p. 189) of supervision. In particular, its findings have significant implications for understandings of supervisor subjectivities and pedagogies as team supervision increasingly becomes the norm across most disciplines. As Foucault reminds us, power operates both generatively and oppressively and, therefore, the acts of surveillance and regulation supervisors perform on each other in team supervision have both positive and problematic consequences. So there is a need to recognise both the positive and negative operations of self- and peer-regulation that operate in team supervision. Firstly, as this study demonstrates, team supervision causes an increase in supervisory self-regulation as supervisors monitor their own words and actions more carefully in team supervision meetings than they might do in private meetings with their student.

Team supervision also provides opportunities for direct peer-regulation during meetings. In both of the instances reported in this paper, one of the supervisors is able to intervene in the conversation in order to offer the student a hint about how they might respond to the critique of their other supervisor or to gently challenge the other supervisors' requests that the student complete a major rewrite of a chapter. This peer-regulation has the effect of reducing the student's defensiveness or confusion in each of the cases respectively and allows them to regain their composure or their understanding of the feedback being given. Therefore, through the self and peer regulation made possible by team supervision, the intensity and operations of power evident in sole supervision, where students are subjected to all of the surveillance and disciplining, is reduced.

However, team supervision also produces some complex and challenging tensions. In particular, it becomes difficult for supervisors and students to understand who is addressing who. Not only are the relations of the supervisor and student being managed through the thesis as in sole supervision (Grant, 2003), but the relations of each of the supervisors and the student are being man-

aged through each other as well as the thesis. Guerin and others' (2011) work also emphasises this point. This increases the possibilities for misunderstanding and miscommunication exponentially.

So too, gender and power can intersect in difficult ways in team supervision. This is particularly evident in this study in the meetings and reflections of Team 1. A lack of experience and confidence on the part of the female Principal Supervisor causes her to focus more on defending her supervision in team meetings than on attending to the student's feelings or allowing more space for the student to respond to each of the supervisors' comments. While this has the effect of making her very self-conscious, in the end she is able to draw comfort from the affirmation of her approach offered by the First Associate Supervisor in the first meeting and she constructs herself as a reflective supervisor seeking to continuously enhance her supervisory practice.

Therefore, Foucault's notions of governmentality and technologies of self allow us to open up new ways of understanding and theorising team supervision subjectivities and pedagogies. In this way, I have sought to apply Lee and Green's 1995 call for more critical, alternative explorations of supervision pedagogy to team supervision. One of the most important effects of this kind of post structuralist scrutiny of supervision is that it foregrounds both the generative possibilities created through team supervision and the problematic tensions it produces for students and for supervisors. In this way, I hope to challenge dominant rational, Science accounts of team supervision as a universal good and demonstrate the ongoing need for post structuralist investigations of the productive and oppressive operations of power in team supervision. Sixteen years after Green and Lee's (1995) seminal special issue on postgraduate pedagogy, the need for more critical, alternative research on new forms of supervision remains just as urgent.

Dr Catherine Manathunga is an Associate Professor in Education, Victoria University Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Endnotes

1. All names have been changed.
2. Country changed to protect anonymity of participants.
3. … indicates text deleted in the interests of word length – conversations continue in the same vein; // indicates overlapping voices; [ ] indicates softer text or an aside; (( )) indicates transcriber's explanation about soft or unclear text.
4. All names changed to protect anonymity of participants.
5. Word changed to protect anonymity of participants.

References

Andresen, L (1999). Supervision revisited: thoughts on scholarship, pedagogy and postgraduate research. In Wisker, G. & Sutcliffe, N. (eds) *Good practice in postgraduate supervision.* Birmingham: SEDA, pp. 25-38.

Connell, R. (1985). How to supervise a PhD. *Vestes, 28*(2), 38-42.

Conrad, L. (2003). *Five ways of enhancing the postgraduate community: student perceptions of effective supervision and support.* Paper presented at the Learning for an unknown future: 26th Annual HERDSA Conference, Christchurch, New Zealand, 6-9 July 2003.

Devos, A. (2004). The project of self, the project of others: mentoring, women and the fashioning of the academic subject. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*:1, 67-80.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of self. In L. Martin; H. Gutman & P. Hutton. (eds) *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality.* Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 87-104.

Grant, B. (2001). Dirty work: 'a code for supervision' read against the grain. In A. Bartlett & G. Mercer (eds), *Postgraduate Research Supervision: transforming (R)Elations.* New York: Peter Lang, pp. 13-24.

Grant, B. (2003). Mapping the pleasures and risks of supervision. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education 24*(2): 175-190.

Grant, B. (2008). Agonistic struggles: master-slave dialogues in humanities supervision. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 7*:1, 9-27.

Green, B., & Lee, A. (1995). Theorising postgraduate pedagogy. *Australian Universities' Review, 38*:2, 40-45.

Grigg, L.; Johnston, R. & Milson, N. (2003). *Emerging issues for cross-disiciplinary research: conceptual and empirical dimensions.* Canberra: DEST.

Guerin, C., Green, I. & Bastalich, W. (2011). Big love: Managing a team of research supervisors. In Mallan, V. & Lee, A. (eds) *Doctoral education in international context.* Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia, pp. 138-153.

Lee, A. & Green, B. (1995). Introduction: postgraduate studies/postgraduate pedagogy? *Australian Universities' Review, 38*:2, 2-4.

Lee, A., & Williams, C. (1999). 'Forged in fire'. Narratives of trauma in PhD supervision pedagogy. *Southern Review, 32*(1), 6-26.

Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen*, 27:5, 2-14.

Manathunga, C. (2005). The development of research supervision: 'turning the light on a private space'. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *10*:1, 17-30.

Manathunga, C. (2007). Supervision as mentoring: the role of power and boundary crossing. *Studies in Continuing Education, 29*:2, 207-221.

Pang, N. Sun-Keung (1999). The plain truth is out there. In A. Holbrook & S. Johnson (eds). *Supervision of postgraduate research in education* (pp. 157-161). Coldstream, Victoria: AARE.

Pole, C. (1998). Joint supervision and the PhD: safety net or panacea? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 23*:3, 259-271.

Poynton, C. & Lee, A. (2000) (eds) *Culture and Text: discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Sutcliffe, N. (1999). Preparing supervisors: a model of research awards supervision training. In Wisker, G. & Sutcliffe, N. (eds) *Good practice in pg supervision.* Birmingham: SEDA, pp. 139-147.

Threadgold, T. (2000). Poststructuralism and discourse analysis. In Poynton, C. & Lee, A. (2000) (eds) *Culture and Text: discourse and methodology in social research and cultural studies.* London: Allen & Unwin, pp. 40-58.

Watts, J. (2010). Team supervision of the doctorate: managing roles, responsibilities and contradictions. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*:3, 335-339.