Good-quality (personal) supervision in doctoral programmes

Jenna Vekkaila, Lecturer in university pedagogy, Centre for University Teaching and Learning, HYPE, UH

Solveig Cornér, Doctoral student, Doctoral Programme in Psychology, Learning and Communication, UH

LEARNING ADVENTURE 2017

Content

1. Viewpoints and research on doctoral supervision

2. Good-quality supervision: Possibilities and challenges

- o Individual work
- o Small group work
- o General discussion

3. Conclusion

From PhD. Student to Academic Expert – Research Group
https://researchondoctoraleducation.wordpress.com/

- Various aspects of doctoral education and researcher careers:
  - Early career researchers
    - Particularly doctoral students' learning and well-being
    - Supervision and researcher communities
- Launched in 2006
- Multimethod systemic research designs
- Currently, the group is involved in conducting cross-cultural multimethod comparative research on doctoral students and post- doctoral researchers in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, UK, Spain and Switzerland, in collaboration with international partners.

Research group & collaboration

- Research director Prof. Kirsi Pyhältö (University of Oulu, University of Helsinki)
- Dr. Jenna Vekkaila, Dos. Viivi Virtanen, Dos. Auli Toom, Dos. Erika Löfström, Dr. Jouni Peltonen, Dr. Yusuke Sakurai, PhD student Solveig Corner
- National collaboration: Prof. Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Prof. Kai Hakkarainen, Prof. Kirsti Lonka
- International collaboration: Prof. Emerita Lynn McAlpine, (University of Oxford, McGill University), Prof. Montserrat Castelló (Universitat Ramon Llull in Barcelona), Dr. Juha Nieminen (Karolinska Institutet), Dr. Søren S.E. Bengtsen (Aarhus University, Denmark)

Personal supervision

- Takes place in the dynamic interaction between a doctoral student and his/her supervisor(s)/supervisory team

- Forms the central environment for doctoral students' learning and development.

(Murphy et al., 2007; Lee, 2007; Nummenmaa & Soini, 2009; Pyhältö & Soini, 2006, 2008)

Why supervision matters?

- The quality and the quantity of supervision have shown to have a significant impact on
  - Degree completion, graduation time, the risk of interrupt doctoral studies
  - Competencies developed while studying
  - Satisfaction, engagement, motivation
  - The risk of burnout and experience stress
  - Productivity
  - Employment
  - Success of a possible post doc -phase

(See, for instance, Aitchison, 2009; Castelló, 2016: Golde, 2005; Heath, 2002; Ives & Rowley, 2005; Kamler, 2008; Lahenius & Ikavalko, 2014; Lovitts, 2001; McAlpine et al., 2012; Meyer, Shanahan, & Laugksch, 2005; Murphy et al., 2007; Paré et al. 2011, 2013; Pyhältö et al., 2012, 2015, 2016; Scaffidi & Berman, 2011; Thune, 2010)

Good supervision according to doctoral students…

- More than one supervisor
- Regular supervision (once a month is so called cutting point)
- Sufficiently shared understanding of the aims and practices
- The prerequirements of supervision are fullfilled when supervisor
    - Is available, shows interest, is prepared for the meeting, is focused on the student's matters, and replies to doctoral students' initiatives in reasonable time
- Doctoral students participate and experience belonging to the (closest) researcher community.

(See, for instance, Pyhältö et al. 2009, 2011, 2012, 2015, 2016)

What kind of support is provided in good supervision?

- Doctoral students receive
  - *Informational support:* informative advice, expertise, guidance, feedback
  - **Socio-emotional support:** encouragement, showing interest and trust, and a sense of belonging
  - *Instrumental support:* time, work space, equipment, materials, writing recommendations, funding, networks
  - *Co-constructional support*: having others with whom to collaborate and share ideas

  From supervisor(s) and reseacher communities.

(Vekkaila, Virtanen, Taina, & Pyhältö, 2016)

Think for a little while…
(individual work)

- What kinds of good and efficient supervisory practices already exist?

- What are the current challenges in supervision? How should doctoral supervision be further develop?

- Write your answers on a paper/computer…

A couple of minutes.

Discussion in small groups:

- Discuss:
  - What kinds of good and efficient supervisory practices already exist?
  - What are the current challenges in supervision? How should doctoral supervision be further developed?

- Write down 2 main good supervisory practices and 2 ideas on challenges/how to develop doctoral supervision
  - Send the ideas to Flinga
    - https://edu.flinga.fi/s/QUYDVP
  - Send 1 idea in one message.

about 10-15 min.

Flinga

- **Session name**

Good-quality (personal) supervision in doctoral programmes 7.3.17

- **Access code**

QUYDVP

- **Join link**

https://edu.flinga.fi/s/QUYDVP

General discussion:

- Good supervisory practices?

- Challenges and development ideas?

Take-home (doctoral programmes) message from this session:

- Good supervisory practices
- Challenges and development ideas related to supervision
  - How the challenges are going be solved?
  - Who is responsible for solving them/developing the practices further?
    - Steering group members?
    - Follow-up group members?
    - Supervisors?
    - Doctoral students?
    - Someone else, who?

Thank you for your participation!

Contact information:

jenna.vekkaila@helsinki.fi

solveig.corner@helsinki.fi

More information about our research:

https://researchondoctoraleducation.wordpress.com/