Building Productive Working Relationships

A guide for facilitators of workshops for supervisors and research students

Aims of the workshop

- To provide a shared base of experience on which supervisors and their students can build to develop a productive working relationship
- To open up the issue of power and authority in one-to-one communication and raise awareness of how it is expressed and perceived, including cross-cultural variation
- To offer new research students a range of strategies for negotiating their supervision.
- To encourage the use of an Expectations Questionnaire to support the establishment of effective working relationships

The Integrated Bridging Program (IBP) at Adelaide University is an innovative, language-based academic induction program which is an integral part of the first semester for all international postgraduate research students (Cargill 1996; Cadman 2000; Cargill et. al., in press). It is designed to assist these students in addressing their special needs in transition to, and progress in, their new learning environment, in particular in developing an understanding of postgraduate university culture, and a command of the academic English language specific to their area and level of study and research. Highlights of the program are the collaboration of IBP lecturers with staff in the students' faculties and the involvement of students and staff in decision-making on curriculum specifications and assessment procedures. Insights gained from the IBP also contribute significantly to professional development for academic staff in the area of cross-cultural supervision.

Acknowledgement

Introduction

This workshop has been developed for use with postgraduate research students and their supervisors.

It is especially useful when offered in the early stages of candidature.

The workshop uses pyramid discussions to help students and supervisors begin discussions about key supervision issues. After the pyramid discussion, the group is debriefed about both the content of their discussions and the process of reaching agreement on issues. These debriefings are intended to raise awareness of effective communication strategies and factors which work against effective communication (workshop instructions).

An optional activity (activity on transcript extracts) for use with groups concerned with communication between people from different cultural and language backgrounds is offered.

Finally, an Expectations Questionnaire is offered for future use by individual students and their supervisors.

Conducting a pyramid discussion – general instructions for facilitators

During a pyramid discussion, members of a group first form their own opinions about a set questions by prioritising from a list of options (see Jordan, 1994; Cadman and Grey, 1997). Then they identify someone else who shares at least some of their priorities, and they discuss their choices until they reach a consensus. The two then find two more people who share at least part of their opinion and the four negotiate. In this workshop the aim is to build the groups until there are eight people who have reached a consensus.

Preparation

You will need:
- a room large enough for all members of the group to move around freely
- moveable chairs (desirable)
- an overhead projector
- enough whiteboard surfaces to allow the activity to proceed without congestion (this will become clear as you read on)
- plenty of whiteboard markers and erasers
- a co-facilitator or two (depends on group size)
- name labels for participants

Provide enough copies of Instructions to Participants to ensure there is one for each participant.

Make an overhead transparency of the Instructions to Participants (optional).

Provide enough task sheets to ensure there is one for each participant, and label them in one corner

with a letter of the alphabet. If more than 26 are needed, you can double the letters, e.g., AA, BB.

Make an overhead transparency of the task sheet for the final discussion phase.

Across the whiteboard/s, write all the letter combinations you have used to label the task sheets, well separated and with enough space underneath for the participants to record three numbers.

Procedure

Once you have explained the function of the pyramid discussion in your activity, distribute the Instructions to Participants or display the instructions on an overhead.

Distribute the copies of the task sheet, labeled as in the Preparation instructions.

Take participants through the Instructions to Participants up to step 9, and set them to work. You may find it helpful to demonstrate the steps using facilitating staff. Participants may need some individual guidance on the process as they work through the steps.

As pairs of participants begin to reach step 9, stop the action for a moment and explain the rest of the process. Once you restart the action, be available as before to assist people who are not clear about their next move.

Bring the process to a close, allowing sufficient time to complete the debriefing steps you have planned to meet your own teaching objectives. For example:

- For a focus on the content of the pyramid discussion, ask each group to report on the items they agreed on (or why they could not agree, if this was the case) and record these on an overhead transparency of the task sheet.

- For a focus on the process of the pyramid discussion, ask groups to report on selected aspects to the whole group (e.g., how hard was it to reach consensus? Did anyone find it difficult to join the discussion at any point?) and/or have the facilitators report on what they observed as they visited working groups (e.g., did they observe individuals dominating groups? Did they see someone using a good strategy to get everyone involved in the discussion?)

- For a focus on the differences between student and supervisor participation, select a significant facilitator observation to open up discussion.

Pyramid discussions: Instructions for participants

1.   You will receive a task sheet. It is labeled with a letter or letters of the alphabet.
2.   Copy the letter/s onto your name label (Let's say you are 'A').
3.   Read the task sheet carefully; ask for explanation if anything is unclear.
4.   Choose three items (as instructed on the task sheet). Circle the numbers next to your choices.
5.   On the whiteboard, find the letter/s that match your name label and write the numbers of your three chosen items underneath. (Under 'A' perhaps you will write '3', '8', and '15'.)
6.   Next, find another person who shares at least one item with you. Identify their letter from the whiteboard and then walk around checking labels until you find the right person (Participant 'G' also listed item '3' so you go looking for 'G').
7.   Sit down together and discuss the items until you can agree on three items. Try to persuade your partner to agree with your choices, and listen as they try to persuade you to change your mind (You decide you agree with G's arguments about one item and you give up '8' and accept '7'. G decides to give up one original item and accept your arguments in favour of 15).
8.   When you agree on three items, choose one of your letter labels to represent your group. Change one name label so you both show this letter (You cross out 'A' and become 'G').
9.   Go to the whiteboard and rub out the letter label you don't need. Under your group label, write the three numbers you have agreed on (Rub out 'A' and check that 'G' lists the three items you agreed on – 3, 7 and 15).
10.   Next, find another group that shares at least one item with you. Sit down with them and discuss as before until all four of you can agree on three items (Your group 'G' joins group 'W' and after discussion you agree on items 3, 7 and 16).
11.   Repeat the process of changing one group name, rubbing out the letter label you don't need, listing the items under your new group label, and finding another group that shares at least one item with your group (You kept the label 'G', rubbed out 'W', listed 3, 7 and 16 under 'G', and the four of you went looking for group 'E').
12.   Try to agree on three items in your group of eight. Be ready to report on your discussion to the whole group at the end - both the outcome and how the process worked.

Building Productive Working Relationships: Sample Task 1

The Student/Supervisor Relationship

Select the three items you believe are the most important in a good working relationship with your supervisor.

1. The student is capable of handling theories and concepts at an advanced level.
2. The supervisor selects a research topic for the student.
3. The student is able to work independently.
4. The student is willing to acquire new research techniques and skills.
5. The supervisor is always available when the student needs help with his/her research.
6. The student selects her/his own research topic.
7. The supervisor leaves the student alone to get on with his/her (the student's) work.
8. The student and supervisor like each other.
9. The student and supervisor negotiate on how often to meet to discuss the student's research.
10. The supervisor understands the particular difficulties involved in being an international student.
11. The supervisor and student jointly decide on the student's research topic.
12. The supervisor tells the student exactly what to do and when to do it.
13. The supervisor is a critic of the student's work.
14. The supervisor helps the student to write the student's thesis.
15. The student and supervisor interact with respect and formality.
16. The student and supervisor have a teacher/pupil relationship.
17. The student and supervisor interact as colleagues.
18. The supervisor takes an interest in the student's personal welfare.
19. The student does what the supervisor says, even if he/she disagrees with the supervisor.
20. The student initiates discussion with the supervisor when he/she disagrees with the supervisor.

Building Productive Working Relationships: Sample Task 2

What makes a successful researcher?

Below is a selection of attributes of successful researchers. Select the three you consider to be most important.

1. high level of intelligence
2. open-mindedness
3. creativity
4. courage
5. clear-thinking
6. independent decision making
7. patience
8. even temperament
9. risk-taking
10. pleasure in experimenting
11. originality
12. lateral thinking
13. diligence
14. awareness of different levels of consciousness
15. love of wide reading
16. clear writing skills
17. physical fitness
18. humility
19. strong educational background
20. drive
21. good organisation skills
22. perseverance
23. curiosity about natural phenomena
24. imagination
25. meticulous attention to detail
26. integrity
27. practical aptitude
28. ability to be critical of own work as well as that of others

Acknowledgement

Building Productive Working Relationships: Sample Task 3

Outcomes of international postgraduate education

What do you think are the three most important outcomes of international postgraduate education? Circle your choices from the list below.

1.   opportunities for cultural exchange
2.   opportunities for future joint enterprises
3.   trade between developed and developing countries
4.   making personal and professional friendships
5.   international travel opportunities for professionals
6.   internationalisation of 'Western' universities
7.   potential loss of well-educated people from developing countries
8.   transfer of advanced level professional skills from developed to developing countries
9.   profitable commercial opportunities for 'Western' universities
10.   improved career prospects for students
11.   development of student's ability to communicate about their research in English
12.   promotion of intercultural tolerance through sharing human values
13.   potential loss of cultural identities through 'colonisation' by English language and worldview
14.   development of specialists as resources for governments
15.   increased understanding by industrialised nations of global development issues
16.   overall English language development for students
17.   personal satisfaction through intercultural academic activity and research
18.   enhanced status for students on their return home
19.   positive anti-racism influence on future generations

Building Productive Working Relationships

<u>**Workshop plan**</u>

Who, when and why?

It is valuable for both students and supervisors to participate, preferably at the beginning of the students' candidatures.

Ideally, at least eight students and eight supervisors would be involved, with two facilitators. Larger numbers can be accommodated but we do not recommend exceeding 25 in either category of participant, and would recommend additional facilitators in the case of large groups.

These activities will work with a group with members from a variety of disciplines, or the workshop could be offered to a group from a single school/department or faculty if there are enough students and supervisors. If you have a variety of disciplines, discussion of the task items may well turn up discipline differences. For instance, in the humanities it would be very rare for a supervisor to give a student a topic, but in many lab sciences this is quite common. Generally, these differences in perspective are illuminating because discipline-based people may assume that the way they do things is the way everyone operates, and they are encouraged to question the *status quo*.

In this activity what is important is *getting people talking about what they think about supervision issues*. You are trying to open channels of communication and encourage continuing discussion. You are also trying to alert both students and supervisors to some of the things that may impede open and frank communication.

Building Productive Working Relationships

Workshop outline

Suggested timetable

The times estimated below, totaling just under 3-1/2 hours, including a coffee break, are the absolute minimum that should be allowed.

It is possible to run the program in a half day with a short coffee break, but we would suggest two sessions with a short meal break in between, during which supervisors and students can socialise. You would allow 1 3/4 - 2 hours for the pre-meal session and 2 hours for the post-meal session. (If you decide to include a meal break, try to keep the group together. It is sometimes hard to get people to reconvene on time, or at all, if they leave the venue.)

First pyramid discussion

The two groups, students and supervisors, do the first task separately (45 min). They are debriefed on process separately (15 min). They compare their responses to the task in a combined session when they have finished the process debriefing (15 min). Coffee break (10-20 minutes depending on size of group and location)

Second pyramid discussion

The two groups do the second task together (50 min). They are debriefed on content quickly (10 min). Facilitators concentrate on the process debriefing of this task (15 min). Transcript extracts to **highlight cross-cultural communication issues (optional)** (15 min). Facilitators read aloud a transcript of a portion of an overseas student's meeting with supervisor. Facilitators seek opinions about what members of the group believe was being communicated in specific segments of this meeting. Facilitators suggest some interpretations and point out key elements in the transcript/s. **Introduce Expectations Questionnaire** (5 min)

Building Productive Working Relationships

Detailed advice for facilitators

Refer to the general instructions for conducting a pyramid discussion.

First pyramid discussion – choice of topic

Ultimately the topic you choose for the first discussion will be determined by the context in which you are working. If the session is open to all students and supervisors in a university, you will need a topic of general interest. Our Sample Task 2 "What Makes a Successful Researcher?" could be appropriate. You will need to consider the choice items to see if any seem 'out of place' in your context. Only you know the vocabulary and issues that are current in your setting. Remember when introducing any list of items for a pyramid discussion to provide a way to clarify vocabulary for non-English speaking students – particularly with regard to culturally loaded expressions.

If you are working in a school or faculty where there are differences of opinions about research methods, you might want to change this task to "What Is Good Research?" and prepare a list of possible items that includes some of the disputed points. (On the other hand, if the school/faculty is deeply divided, this is not a good idea!)

If you are running the session for a mixed discipline group in an institution where there is discussion of international student postgraduate enrolments, Sample Task 3 "Outcomes of International Postgraduate Education" might be of interest.

Since the supervisors and students do this first task separately, a task on which their opinions may be quite different should lead to an interesting content debriefing and may encourage them to talk with each other about some of the differences over coffee or their meal.

First pyramid discussion – giving instructions

It is important that participants understand what your goals are for this activity. For us there are essentially two elements.

The first is related to the content of the task, and is about comparing and contrasting the thoughts of supervisors and students in a final combined debrief. Whether their choices of the three items are similar or different, we hope the participants will be encouraged to continue to talk about issues or expectations after the workshop just because they have begun the conversation already.

The second is about beginning to raise issues about how people reach consensus. We suggest doing this in separate groups of supervisors and students first, to eliminate the complications of authority figures negotiating with people who may doubt they have enough experience to reach valid conclusions on these topics.

So tell the group at the beginning of the session that you have these two goals related to content and communication.

If participants have not engaged in pyramid discussion before, they may find the process somewhat daunting or confusing. Take them through the instructions slowly, demonstrate the steps, and assure them that there will be someone to help if they get confused.

First pyramid discussion – debriefing on process in separate groups

Our suggestion is to keep the groups separate for the first discussion of communication, negotiation, persuasion, etc.

You could encourage people to talk firstly in an impersonal way, asking questions such as:

- How did the group work? Did any one speaker dominate? Did you notice anyone creating opportunities for others to contribute? Did you notice any demonstrations of leadership? Did you notice any issues related to gender or age?

Then you could move on to encourage more personal reflection about how people felt and why, with questions such as:

- How did you feel during the discussion? Did your confidence to contribute grow as the discussion proceeded? Or did your confidence decrease? Did you feel frustrated at any stage of the process? Did you feel comfortable in the discussion? What other feelings did you experience? Can you remember what triggered these feelings?

The facilitator should observe the activity and make notes of the effective and/or counter-productive strategies participants use. These can include the actual words used, instances of assertiveness or capitulation, groups where not all members participated equally, domination by females or males, or problems identified by groups with the task as set.

The facilitator can describe these to the whole group without identifying individuals, but this needs to be done delicately. You can say, "Most of us get so involved in a discussion that we forget to listen carefully to the other person while we are planning what we want to say next." Or "I noticed in several groups that…"

We have observed that open questions presented with humour often produce positive reflexive feedback on both own and peer performance. For example, if the facilitator asks whether anyone in a group said nothing at all, it may be the silent member who responds, or it may be someone else who reports on the silent one. If a question is asked about whether anyone spoke too much during the discussion, the same thing is likely to occur – in one group we ran a Deputy Vice-Chancellor responded "Yes, I did."

The facilitator of the supervisors' group may want to remind them that when they are doing the second pyramid discussion with the students, they could use strategies to make sure everyone gets a turn to speak and to minimise any discomfort students may feel when they have ideas different to those of their supervisors.

First pyramid discussion – debriefing on content in combined group

This discussion is less demanding to lead, unless some supervisors have come along to support their students but are not fully committed to the enterprise in hand. Usually all you need to do is invite each group of eight to report the three items they settled on. Discussion of differences of opinion between groups will occur quite naturally. You might also want to ask which items were discarded along the way and why. When collating responses on the overhead, it is useful to encourage discussion about what are the dominant ideas and what may be the reasons for the differences that are appearing. One of the most valuable aspects of this segment is discussion that relates to clarifying the parameters of meaning of the phrases selected: which items can be seen to encompass which others, which overlap with which, and which appear mutually exclusive?

You will probably find that there are many differences in the choices groups make and lots of room for extended discussion. The facilitator will probably have to cut this discussion short. The point of the exercise is to open conversations, not to reach conclusions. There are no right or wrong answers. However, there may be an opportunity to introduce information from published literature or personal experience, which may help students and supervisors avoid common pitfalls. For instance, some students may be holding up their own progress by being overly perfectionistic. When discussing "What makes a successful researcher?" they could over-emphasise items like "high level of intelligence" and "originality".

Break for coffee, lunch or dinner

Second pyramid discussion – choice of topic

Since the two groups will be combined, this seems to us to be a good time to use a topic like our Sample Task 1 "The Student/Supervisor Relationship".

Second pyramid discussion – giving instructions

The facilitator should mention that, when the debriefing occurs, more emphasis will be put on process issues than on the content and so ask participants to observe behaviours in their groups and their own feelings. Where an opportunity arises in helping participants find an appropriate person or group for the next stage in the pyramid, the facilitator may like to manipulate group formation to encourage as much as possible a mixture of students and supervisors in groups.

Second pyramid discussion – debriefing on content

Groups will want to know what others thought, so collect the responses but limit the discussion to an absolute minimum time. Stress that the important thing is for individual students and supervisors to talk about expectations and needs frequently and openly throughout the whole candidature.

Second pyramid discussion – debriefing on process

Debrief on the process as for the first pyramid discussion, but keep the groups together this time. Try to emphasise issues of power, and the difficulties students may have in raising problems, admitting that they need help, etc. You can ask students what they think a supervisor could do to help them. And you can ask supervisors to describe what students do that makes it harder for them to supervise effectively.

Issues that often arise include the balance between being cooperative and assertive, some likely outcomes of extreme positions, and what kind of language might be used to effectively express polite assertiveness in Australian postgraduate culture.

A strategy we have found useful is for the facilitator to highlight an expression heard during the process and ask participants whether it was said by a supervisor or a student. Examples from our experience include:

'Now this is what we're going to do next.' (fairly obviously a supervisor)

'Would you like to explain that again, please?' (either)

'Well, you know better than I would.' (student)

Transcript extracts to highlight cross-cultural communication issues (optional)

Where a workshop is being run with a particular focus on cross-cultural supervision situations, it may be useful to discuss with participants extracts of transcripts from supervision meetings where difficulties have occurred in communication. The two extracts presented in these materials are from meetings between English native-speaker supervisors and non-English speaking background postgraduate research students. Table 1 shows the transcription conventions used, which are important because they help demonstrate the role of intonation and pausing in the creation of meaning. To maintain anonymity, the names of the students are rendered as X and Y. Wherever particular terms may identify participants, a category has been substituted for the name and placed in parentheses, e.g., 'Briefly we misunderstood each other on the point of the (disease organism) populations tested'.

You should provide a copy of the transcript/s for each participant and a copy of Table 1.

Two of the facilitators should read the student and supervisor parts in the transcript with pauses, emphases, overlaps, etc. as shown in the transcript. You will need to rehearse this.

Ask the group members to comment on the communication issues and their interpretation of the interaction. You may find it helpful to re-read a few lines at a time. Some questions you might ask:

1.   Why do you think the student may have responded like this (pointing to OHT)?
2.   Can you think of any other reasons?
3.   What do you think the supervisor may have been thinking when s/he said that?
4.   Can you think of any other way the supervisor could have worded that question?

Here is our summary of the communication issues that arose in each extract. For a more detailed discussion see Cargill (1998) and Cargill (2000).

Extract 1: Problem with inferred meaning (male non-native speaker student, female native speaker supervisor)

Background: Extract 1 follows a discussion of the possible effects of the student's having had to replant one type of seed because of poor germination, resulting in the two types being compared not reaching maturity at the same time.

Features: In line 7 the supervisor explicitly asks for comment after a three second pause that has not been taken up. The student's response in lines 9 to 13 is characterised by nervous laughter, rephrasing, fillers and pauses. In line 20 it is clear that the supervisor has interpreted this response to mean that the student is not really satisfied with the outcome of their discussion on this point. She then seeks suggestions of other ways the situation could be tackled. This extract leads into a long discussion (data not shown) in which the student does not suggest an alternative but instead talks about the final result he hopes to obtain for the experiment. This chain of events suggests reluctance on the student's part to respond to the supervisor's invitation to talk about alternatives. Three possible reasons for such reluctance could be that: he did have reservations but they did not involve having ideas about alternative solutions; he did not have reservations, or; he did not know the meaning of the word 'reservations' in this context. Does this then mean that the supervisor misinterpreted his intended message in the hesitant utterances? Laughter and disfluencies have been reported as helping portray speakers as modest persons, and this may have been the intention of these lines. What can be stated is that the student did not move to query the supervisor's statement about reservations.

However, the student would have needed to break into the conversational flow in a fairly abrupt manner to question or correct the supervisor's interpretation, because she presents it as a given -'you obviously have reservations about it' (line 27) - and follows this up with a question. A response which sought to correct the supervisor's interpretation would go against the common practice in which the preferred response to a question is an answer. The student attempts to provide the expected 'answer' response, but with little success in the longer term, as discussed above.

If the supervisor had used an open query about whether the student had reservations, rather than acting on her assumption that she had fully comprehended his meaning, he may have found it easier to comment on the accuracy of the interpretation itself, as well as to seek clarification of the rather particular meaning of the word 'reservations' in this context. It should also be noted here that this student shows far fewer surface errors in his spoken English than the student in Extract 2, and thus his foreign-ness is less likely to be at the forefront of the supervisor's attention. It may therefore be less likely that his contributions to conversation will be interpreted as being

influenced by cultural values and norms other than those commonly operating in Australian academic circles.

Extract 2: Supervisor pauses not used as opportunity to introduce new topic (male non-native speaker student, male native speaker supervisor)

The student seems reluctant to take up turns at talk. There is a 6 second pause after an 'OK' by the student in line 5, and pauses of 2 and 1.5 seconds in the supervisor's turn in line 17. All of these are longer than the 1 second pause which is the expected norm in Australian English. Combined with the 'and so' in line 1 and the 'yeah so' in line 6, these suggest that the supervisor had come to the end of a topic and was offering the student the opportunity to initiate a new one. Yet it is not until the supervisor asks explicitly in line 18 that the student comes in with his new topic. It seems possible that a supervisor could interpret such non-take up of turns at long pauses as demonstrating that the student has nothing to say, particularly if the behaviour occurred regularly. This can be discussed in terms of presenting self or interpreting others as showing initiative.

Extract 1 (M NNS student, F NS supervisor) (Cargill 1998)

Extract 2 (M NNS student, M NS supervisor) (Cargill 2000)

1	Su	... ++ so that we MIGHT not need to do + a
2		huge amount of statistical analysis anyway \
3		++ the results I would hope would be clear
4		cut + one way or the other + and identify \
5		++ um the causes of ++ of ah a lack of
6		infection of (cultivar) / + and the poor
7		health of (cultivar)\ (3 secs) how does that
8		sound to you \ (2 secs)
9	St	well (laugh) since it's a concern I mean I
10		was really thinking as far as ++ the time
11		goes [???] \ you know \ + but it's all right
12		/++ I should just + ah \++ let it \++ let this
13		+ ah
14	Su	mm
15	St	++ much + go ahead \ (5 lines missing)
20	Su	uh huh + what do you see as the
21		alternatives X + to doing this \
22	St	ah alternatives as far as + ah ++
23	Su	the experimental alternatives \ ++
24	St	ah I see
25	Su	caus we we talked about + um + what +
26		YOU think would be a good thing to do +
27		but you obviously have reservations about
28		it \ ++ so \ + what would you see as the

29		possible alternatives to + dealing with this
30		problem / (2 secs)
31	St	well I + really hope ++ in a way that ah one
32		of the factors that is going to be hh the
34		isolates ++

1	Su	and so once the crossing's finished and we've
2		got a bit more time again \
3	St	yeah + [?]
4	Su	let's try it again /
5	St	OK (6 secs)
6	Su	yeah so ++that should be fine \ /+ I think ++
7		I don't know what the problem was last time
8		+ but + hopefully we can
9		| overcome it /
10	St	| laughter
11	Su	+++ get things to work \+++
12	St	yeah ++
13	Su	[???]

14	St	yeah ++ yeah maybe next time however we'll
15		+ succeed
16	Su	yeah +++ shou + it SHOULD work + I don't
17		know why not / (2 secs) yeah (1.5 secs)
18		YEAH + is there anything else /+++
19	St	ah + yes ++ ah=

| 20 | Su | =just at the moment |
| 21 | St | ah + about the + enrolment / |

Table 1: Transcription conventions used for supervision meetings

short pauses (tone group or breath divisions) are indicated by	+
longer pauses (less than 1 second)	++
overlappings	| |
unclear parts	[?]
rising tone on tone group	/
falling tone on tone group	\
rise / fall	/ \
fall / rise	\ /
prominent syllable	CAPS

Introduce Expectations Questionnaire

The final element of this workshop program is to provide supervisors and students with a resource they may use during the candidacy to help them negotiate their mutual needs and expectations. We provide a 12-item questionnaire that includes paired statements about student and supervisor responsibilities. It has proved to be a very useful prompt for raising issues which too frequently are not discussed openly.

This questionnaire, in various versions, has been around for a long time and used in many training sessions for supervisors, and in combined sessions for supervisors and students. People keep using it because it works so well. A slightly different version appears in another fIRST site workshop for supervisors; that workshop includes summaries of discussions that have taken place in sessions conducted with many groups.

In this program you will probably decide simply to distribute the Expectations Questionnaire and suggest that supervisors and students fill it in after the workshop and then compare their responses in one of their first meetings together.

Alternatively, you could ask the group to do the exercise during the workshop and discuss it together. You will need about 45 minutes if you are going to use the questionnaire as another workshop activity, and this will complete a long and intensive day's work. Consider your group and its willingness to commit a large block of time carefully before you decide to extend the workshop with this activity.

Questionnaire: Opinions about research supervision

http://wallace.iim.uts.edu.au/staging/first/members/activities/pgso/task1.html

References

Cadman, Kate. 2000. 'Voices in the air': evaluations of the learning experiences of international postgraduates and their supervisors. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 5(4), 475-491.

Cadman, Kate and Grey, Marianne. 1997. *Action Teaching: Student managed English for academic contexts*. Gold Coast, Queensland: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

Cargill, Margaret. 1996. An integrated bridging program for international postgraduate students. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 15(2), 177-188.

Cargill, Margaret. 1998. Cross-cultural postgraduate supervision meetings as intercultural communication. In *Proceedings: Quality in postgraduate research: managing the new agenda*, Adelaide, Advisory Centre for University Education, The University of Adelaide, 175-188

Cargill, Margaret. 2000. Inter-cultural postgraduate supervision meetings: an exploratory discourse study. *Prospect: a journal of Australian TESOL* 15(2), 28-38.

Cargill, M., Cadman, K. and McGowan, U. 2001. Postgraduate writing: using intersecting genres in a collaborative content-based program, in I. Leki (Ed.) *Case Studies in TESOL: Academic Writing Programs*, TESOL, USA

Jordan R. R. 1990. Pyramid discussions. *ELT Journal*, *44*, 46–54.