Expectation of Candidates and their Advisory Team

Read each pair of statements below and then estimate your position on each. For example with statement 1 if you believe very strongly that it is the advisory team's responsibility to select a good topic you would put a ring around "1". If you think that both the advisory team and candidate should equally be involved you put a ring around "3" and if you think it is definitely the candidate's responsibility to select a topic, put a ring around "5".

1	It is the advisory team's responsibility to select a topic.	1	2	3	4	5	The candidate is responsible for selecting her/his own topic
2	It is the advisory team who decides which theoretical framework or methodology is most appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	Candidates should decide which theoretical framework or methodology they wish to use
3	The advisory team should develop an appropriate program and timetable of research for the candidate	1	2	3	4	5	The advisory team should leave the development of the program of research to the candidate
4	The advisory team is responsible for ensuring that the candidate is introduced to the appropriate services and facilities to the College and University	1	2	3	4	5	It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that she/he has located and accessed all relevant services and facilities for research
5	Advisory teams should accept candidates only when they have specific knowledge of the candidate's chosen topic	1	2	3	4	5	Advisory teams should feel free to accept candidates, even if they do not have specific knowledge of the candidate's topic
6	A warm, supportive relationship between advisory team and candidate is important for successful candidature	1	2	3	4	5	A personal, supportive relationship between advisory team and candidate is inadvisable because it may obstruct objectivity for both candidate and advisory team during candidature
7	The advisory team should insist on regular meetings with the candidate	1	2	3	4	5	The candidate should decide when she/he wants to meet with the advisory team
8	The advisory team should check regularly that the candidate is working consistently and on task	1	2	3	4	5	The candidate should work independently and not have to account for how and where time is spent
9	The advisory team is responsible for emotional support and encouragement to the candidate	1	2	3	4	5	Personal counselling and support are not the responsibility of the advisory team – candidates should look elsewhere for such assistance
10	The advisory team should insist on seeing all drafts of work to ensure that the candidate is on the right track	1	2	3	4	5	Candidates should submit drafts of work only when they want constructive criticism from the advisory team

11	The advisory team should assist in the writing of the thesis if necessary	1	2	3	4	5	The writing of the thesis should only ever be the candidate's own
12	The advisory team is responsible for decisions regarding the standard of the thesis	1	2	3	4	5	The candidate is responsible for the standard of the thesis

Kiley, M. & Cadman, K. (1997) Supervision Expectations adapted from work by Brown, G. & Atkins, M. (1988). *Effective teaching in higher education.* Methuen, London. 146-147.

Margaret.kiley@anu.edu.au

Using the "Expectations in Advisory team Questionnaire"

The Role of Expectations:
Relevant expectations in the context of intercultural research advisory team can relate to
- Understandings of what research is,
- Appropriate roles of candidates and advisors
- What is polite behaviour
- How respect is expressed
- The likely consequences of asking for help or acknowledging problems
- And many other issues.

Mismatches of expectations are constant theme in the literature on supervision, especially cross-cultural supervision. For a cogent description of possible expectations of Chinese candidate which diverge markedly from common Australia perspectives, see Ouyang (2004)

To help bring some of these differences in expectations into the open for discussion, a possible strategy is the Expectations of Advisory Team Questionnaire. This tool has been designed as a discussion starter for use by advisory teams and candidates. The current version was adapted by Margaret Kiley & Kate Cadman, of the then Centre for University of Education (now CLPD) from work by Ingrid Moses, Centre for Learning & Teaching, University of Technology, Sydney.

Our Experience suggests that the tool is especially effective when candidates recognise that

- There are no "right" answers to the items on the questionnaire
- Responses are likely to be different at different stages of candidature, and
- The purposes of using it are
    - To structure a fruitful discussion about the reasons why different responses may have been selected, and
    - To decide on appropriate ongoing actions for the current participants and candidature stage.