PERCEPTIONS OF GRADUATE SUPERVISION:

RELATIONSHIPS WITH TIME OF REFLECTION

AND POST-SECONDARY CLIMATE[*]

Elizabeth Graham and Shannon A. Gadbois, *Brandon University*

This paper discusses the similarities and differences between Canadian doctoral students and new faculty members regarding their experiences with and perceptions of their graduate supervisors and mentoring. Participants' responses were considered in light of the current post-secondary culture that emphasizes increased productivity and accountability of faculty members and the student as customer (e.g., Turk, 2000). An examination of survey and interview responses from participants showed that whereas both groups valued supervision that includes both career and psychosocial functions of mentoring (Kram, 1983), doctoral students tended to place more emphasis on the psychosocial functions than did the new faculty. In addition, although, in general, both groups gave more favourable ratings of their supervisors for career as opposed to psychosocial functions, new faculty members were more satisfied with their supervisors and rated their supervisors higher on most mentoring functions. These differences between groups were considered in light of universities' adoption of a managerial, audit culture (e.g., Cribb & Gewirtz, 2006) that encourages students to perceive themselves as consumers and requires faculty to meet competing demands on their skills and time.

Introduction

Studies examining the relationship between graduate students and their supervisors have accumulated in the literature over the last several decades. Research indicates that a positive relationship between supervisors and students is essential for successful completion of a doctoral project (e.g., Mainhard, van der Rijst, Tartwijk, & Wubbels, 2009). In addition,

---

countless studies point to the necessity that these relationships be mentoring relationships. Zhao, Golde, and McCormick (2007) illustrated this idea when they commented: "The best advisor-student relationships approach the ideal of mentor and protégé" (p. 263). Indeed, as Rose (2005) and others have found, many graduate students hold the opinion that their supervisors should be their mentors and there is little doubt that such relationships are beneficial to students. However, despite the apparent consensus in the literature regarding the importance of mentoring as part of supervision, problems associated with such relationships have too often been neglected.

In this study, we examined current and former doctoral candidates' perceptions of their supervisors' primary role, how they chose their supervisors, and whether they thought (or think) of their supervisors as their mentors. We also examined their evaluations of their supervisors in relation to Kram's (1983) conceptions of career and psychosocial functions of mentoring, which have become essential considerations in mentoring research (e.g., see Metz, 2009; Mullen, 1998; Pollock, 1995; Stokes, 2003). Through the application of these concepts in conjunction with the literature on supervision and mentorship, we propose that any differences in perceptions between current and former doctoral students may be understood in part given their current roles but also given the academic context itself. Specifically, differences in perceptions may be understood given universities' adoption of a managerial, audit culture (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2006) that emphasizes the implementation of corporate terminology within which students are consumers and instructors provide a service (Turk, 2000). As "consumers," students (Lomas, 2007; Potts, 2005) expect educational experiences that fulfill both career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1983), and in addition the managerial, audit culture places demands on supervisors in terms of productivity (their own and their students'), service and administrative duties, and accountability (Delamont, Atkinson, & Parry, 2000). As a result, graduate students may be expected to show

different perceptions or expectations of graduate supervisors compared to faculty members, even new ones, given their roles and differences in the expectations placed on them in the academic context.

Mentoring Conceptualized

There is no doubt that the relationship between doctoral students and supervisors is qualitatively different from the relationship between students and professors, generally. However, what that relationship is or should be has been difficult for researchers to explain. Some have argued (e.g., Johnson, 2008) that supervision should emphasize an advisory role "characterized by technical guidance functions and facilitation of a student's journey through the academic program" (p. 32). Others (e.g., Ponce, Williams, & Allen, 2005) have proposed that the student-supervisor relationship should be primarily a mentoring relationship in which the mentor goes beyond knowledge transfer and builds an emotionally connected, reciprocal relationship with the student.

The consensus in the literature indicates that a mentoring relationship is preferred within the context of graduate studies by both students and supervisors, and that it has definite advantages over a non-mentoring relationship (e.g., Bell-Ellison & Dedrick, 2008; Mainhard et al., 2009; Paglis, Green, & Bauer, 2006; Rose, 2005; Zhao et al., 2007). These studies emphasized a common theme that mentoring relationships are essential in student retention and subsequent degree completion and career development. However, exactly what that mentoring relationship entails is anything but fixed.

Whereas mentoring is generally thought to be an important form of professional development, scholars in the area "acknowledge that there remains no commonly accepted

definition of mentoring and no unified, clear aim for mentoring programs" (Manathunga, 2007, p. 209). Other individuals have carefully and concisely conceptualized mentorship. For example, Roberts (2000) emphasized that mentoring has both formal and informal processes in a relationship that evolves over time. Similarly, Johnson (2008) defined faculty–student mentorship relationships as those which are long-term and "increasingly reciprocal and mutual" resulting in "identity transformation in the protégé . . . and positive career and personal outcomes" (pp. 32–33). However, there are still practical considerations with regard to identifying the specific behaviours that result in the interpersonal and professional support that mentors provide. In addition, the question of whether and which specific elements must exist for a relationship to be considered a mentoring relationship is not clear. This lack of clarity creates the conditions for differing expectations of faculty and students in the supervisor–student working relationship. Ultimately, this uncertainty may be associated with differing, even contradictory, perceptions of that relationship.

Despite this lack of clarity, research does indicate that some form of mentoring is invaluable in improving the success of a student in a doctoral program. The challenge is that our current education system may not provide the ideal environment required for such a relationship. Further, we found nothing in the literature that attempts to examine the ideas and realities of mentoring at the micro-interaction level in the larger institutional context within which it is meant to flourish.

The Changing Culture of Education

There has been a great deal of literature published in the past three decades examining the changes in higher education with respect to organization and function. The dominant conception, evident in many countries (Apple, 2007) has emphasized the shift to a corporate or audit culture (see Forrester, 2011; Holmwood, 2010; Lomas, 2007; Miller, 2003; Murphy, 2009; Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005; Polster, 2006; Potts, 2005; Turk, 2000; Watts & Robertson 2011). Specifically, authors have emphasized the changes that have arisen when thinking of universities as businesses with knowledge as the product (e.g., Polster, 2003; Woodhouse, 2001) and students (and others outside the university) as the consumers.

Though some have argued that the shift to a managerial model is desirable given the proposition that this approach should increase efficiency, cut operating costs, and increase accountability for services provided, much of the literature points to the threat it poses to academic standards, professorial autonomy, and ultimately the value of the education that students receive. For example, Woodhouse (2011, 2001) noted that the movement toward a corporate model has resulted in values in education arising from a de-emphasis on critical analysis (for students and by researchers) and an emphasis on education that provides students with generic skill sets. Moser (2002) noted that depending on the context (e.g., Canada compared to Britian) the business culture discourse is different. Despite this fact, the implementation of the business model in post-secondary education has resulted in some commonalities across contexts. For example, Michael Apple (2007), like Woodhouse, noted the "pressure to perform" (p. 8) and "the intensification of the work-load" (p. 9), especially given the decrease in full-time employees in the American university context. Of course, the same situation has arisen in Canada and is evident in the growing number of contract faculty employed in post-secondary institutions

(Omiecinski, 2003). Furthermore, Polster (2006) emphasized the focus on the increased pressure to quickly produce knowledge that is publically, rather than scientifically, valuable. In addition, Brophy and Tucker-Abramson (2012), in a case study of Simon Fraser University, noted the growing demand for universities to provide indices of their value including "students enrolled, numbers of patents produced, grants won, [and] corporate donations secured . . ." (p. 25).

Ultimately, much of the concern over potential negative consequences in higher education related to the adoption of a managerial model centres on two distinct and often incompatible elements. The first arises from the increased accountability measures and surveillance, loss of professional autonomy, and demands for increased responsibilities (Forrester, 2011). The second element is the re-definition of students as customers or consumers (Miller, 2003), which carries with it an ideological shift regarding what education should be and how it should be delivered. Some researchers such as Lomas (2007) and Morley (2003) argued that this particular shift is associated with a decrease in students' sense of responsibility with regard to their own educational success, and with the increased responsibilities placed on faculty to ensure that success. This re-definition alters the relationship among the various stakeholders and consequently "the development and 'delivery' of academic programmes" (Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005, p. 267). It makes sense that this general cultural shift could affect students' expectations regarding many aspects of education, including the supervisor–student relationship.

Specifically, Kram's (1983) concepts of career and psychosocial functions of mentoring are important. Career functions that include "sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure-and-visibility, and [providing] challenging work assignments" (p. 613) are related primarily to professional advancement. Psychosocial functions, meant to allow students to develop a sense of their own abilities or competence, include "role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation,

counselling, and friendship" (p. 614). These functions are meant to "enhance [a] sense of competence, clarity of identity, and effectiveness in the managerial role" (p. 614). Whereas in the past it seems the primary emphasis was placed on ensuring students' education fulfilled career functions, the increasing identification of students as consumers may have coincided with an emphasis on psychosocial functions as well as career functions.

In summary, the lack of a clear conception of mentoring, combined with the introduction of a managerial, audit culture in higher education, may be expected to coincide with student expectations for the supervisor-student relationship that emphasize the psychosocial, in additional to career, functions of mentoring (Kram, 1983). To our knowledge, the discussions about mentoring and the audit culture within higher education have tended to occur in isolation from one another, resulting in only a partial understanding of the mentoring emphasis in graduate student supervision. This paper is meant to encourage discussion about the interconnectedness of these issues by proposing the need to consider the supervisor–student relationship in the context of a managerial model that demands efficiency and productivity.

Importantly, we were interested in examining the similarities and difference between graduate students and new faculty members, given that they represent two points on the continuum of experience with student supervision. On the one hand, graduate students are currently, regularly involved with their supervisors. In contrast, early career academics have completed the formal component of their supervisory relationship but may also have begun supervising their own students. In essence, these two groups provided us with both a current view and a recent retrospective view of the student–supervisor relationship, and the responsibilities of the supervisor. Although we did expect that we would find differing perceptions between the groups, given their different contexts, on supervision and mentorship,

this study was intended to be exploratory in nature and as such we were interested in examining both similarities and differences between these two groups of individuals with regard to their perceptions of their supervisors, while keeping in mind their roles and the current audit culture, as related to their graduate student–supervisor relationships.

Methodology

Respondents in this study included 168 doctoral students (34 men; 134 women; age range of early 20s to 64) and 44 new faculty members (19 men; 25 women; age range of 27 to 52). A total of 87.4 percent of the doctoral students had been in their doctoral program for a maximum of five years, with almost half (45.6%) of them in their second or third year of their program. New faculty members were those who were in the first five years of a university faculty appointment. A total of 79.5 percent were in tenure-track appointments and more than half (54.5%) were in the first three years of their appointment. All participants were untenured at the time of the study. From the original participants, 36 of the doctoral students and 14 of the new faculty member participants volunteered to complete a follow-up interview.

All of the respondents were completing their studies or working in Canada and represented the following provinces: Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. The respondents' areas of speciality were diverse, including natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, education, health, and business.

Participants were recruited electronically. Doctoral students were recruited through graduate programs and graduate student associations, whereas early career academics were recruited through university faculty associations. Through these groups, invitations to participate

in an online survey were distributed to potential participants. Participants completed questions that included basic demographic questions (e.g., age, year of study), as well as questions about their experiences with their supervisors. The questions were both closed-ended and open-ended, and focused on a variety of questions meant to explore their expectations for and experiences in graduate studies and their satisfaction with their experiences.

One essential component of the survey focused on respondents' expectations of and experiences with their doctoral supervisors. This component was made up of a subset of questions that are the focus of this paper. Based on Rose's (2003) conception of an ideal mentor, each respondent ranked (on a 5-point Likert Scale from poor to superior) his/her supervisor as a mentor, contributor to his/her discipline, and contributor to his/her department. In addition, each participant rated his/her supervisor's ability to teach about the academic culture and how to handle the politics of academia. Each respondent also rated his/her supervisor's ability to share personal experiences, encourage new ways of behaving, help with meeting new colleagues, convey feelings of respect and empathy, encourage talk about anxieties and fears, and discuss concerns about personal and professional relationships. Respondents also rated their supervisors regarding their ability to reduce risks for their graduate students.

At the end of the survey, participants were invited to contact the researchers if they were willing to be interviewed. The respondents who agreed to participate in a follow-up interview were interviewed either by phone or in person. The interview guide included eleven open-ended questions focused on the respondents' perceptions of supervision and mentorship generally, and their experiences with their supervisors', particularly.

Given that this paper was intended to examine the perceptions of doctoral students' and new faculty members' evaluations of their supervisors in relation to mentoring, the outcomes

presented here are focused on a subset of data from the online survey and individual interviews including: definitions of mentoring, beliefs about the primary role of a supervisor, criteria used when selecting supervisors, and their assessment of their supervisors in relation to the generally accepted components of ideal mentoring as described by Rose (2003) and outlined above.

For the numeric ratings of supervisors by participants, mean ratings were calculated across all doctoral student participants and across all new faculty member participants. These mean ratings were compared (using independent samples t-tests) to determine any statistically significant differences between the two groups.

For the interview data, all responses were examined on a question-by-question basis, such that, for example, all ideas regarding the concept of mentoring were reviewed together but separately from conceptions of perceptions of the role of a supervisor. In addition, once common ideas were identified for each question, general differences across questions were noted. Our goal was to determine, whenever possible, shared or similar responses across the groups of respondents, regardless of their academic discipline or gender. Through our examination of the data we identified recurring comments and common themes across participants and across questions. In particular, we were interested in instances that demonstrated shared ideas between new faculty and doctoral students, and in instances that illustrated any noteworthy differences between the groups. Their responses were considered particularly with reference to Kram's (1983) conceptions of career and psychosocial functions of mentoring.

Results

Nearly all of our survey respondents (100% of new faculty and 97% of doctoral students) reported that mentoring is a necessary component of supervision. In addition, the two

groups were consistent, in both survey and interview responses, in terms of their definitions of a mentor, their perceptions of criteria for selection, and their ratings of their supervisors.

Respondents' definitions of a mentor generally made reference to both career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1983) as necessary in helping students successfully manoeuvre their way through graduate school. The following are examples of two respondents' comments that illustrate an acknowledgement of both:

> A mentor is somebody who has some experience and has some foresight to be able to recognize or quickly recognize your strengths and weaknesses and try to work with you on them. And try to, I guess, enhance not just who you are professionally but as a person as well. (*Student #27, Interview*)

> I think a mentor is someone that really, really takes on the life of their students. And, by that I mean . . . making sure they are getting their courses done, . . . looking after the bureaucratic mess that always goes into the program—are they meeting the dates and requirements, residency requirements, whatever. . . . But I think almost more importantly, because doing graduate work is such an emotional process that it consumes your life (pause) and it's not just like a job that you go to for nine to five . . . and I think a good mentor is a person who really recognizes that. (*Faculty #5, Interview*)

> . . . goes beyond the questions like, "Where are you applying for internship?" to, "How are you doing? Are you managing the stress?" . . . who guides your path because they see you as the individual, not because it's just part of their job or something. (*Student #7, Interview*)

When asked to explain the primary role of a supervisor, the majority of survey respondents stated that "mentoring" was the primary role or identified specific aspects of mentoring as essential for good graduate supervision. Individuals from both groups referred to facilitation of the students' professional development, and offering personal and professional guidance. The following responses are indicative of such emphasis:

> I expect my supervisor to be my mentor. To not only help me with the practical things of the thesis, but to be someone I can turn to and confide in for professional things (e.g., time management as a student). I expect my supervisor to guide me and to tell me what I can't do and to share her experience with me. (*Student #64, Survey*)

> To lead and inspire students; to help them achieve their personal, academic, and vocational goals; to teach them strong research and teaching skills via a good mentorship relation. (*Faculty #2, Survey*)

There was similar consistency between the two groups in terms of the criteria they used to select their supervisors. In general participants frequently made reference to the importance of "compatibility" between their supervisors and themselves. Individuals from both groups typically made reference to the importance of the supervisor's personality as well as his or her (shared) research interests as being among the more important criteria they used when selecting their supervisors. For example, faculty made reference to a "suitable match in area of interest" and a "suitable match in personality" (*Faculty #35, Survey*). Another faculty member indicated the importance of a match in terms of "research interests" and "mentorship style" (*Faculty #5, Survey*). Similarly, doctoral students made reference to the importance of "expertise in area, personality fit" (*Student #18, Survey*) and to personal traits like being "approachable" (*Student, #112, Survey*). Respondents often perceived personal compatibility as vital, as illustrated in this comment:

> The most important thing, um, I would say it's the personality and the communication with your potential supervisor. So, do you fit with their personality? Or, do they fit with yours? That would be kind of the number one, um, because everything else will come out of that, the interest in the actual specific area, you know, and interacting with others and things like that. I think those will all fall out of if you're able to get along with and communicate with your supervisor. (*Student #18, Interview*)

In addition, respondents also relied on a potential supervisor's demands on their time (e.g., number of graduate students), reputation within their discipline, and advice from the doctoral students already in their programs.

As indicated above, we examined a combination of participant responses to numeric ratings of their supervisors as well as their specific thoughts regarding the issues of interest.

Tables A1 and A2 reflect two conceptualizations of the quantitative data from the surveys. Table A1 includes the mean ratings for the doctoral and new faculty groups regarding overall evaluations of their doctoral supervisors, as well as their ratings of specific career and psychosocial functions of mentorship. Table A2 includes the percentage of participants in both groups who rated their supervisors positively on the overall ratings of supervisors and on the different mentorship functions.

As the survey responses indicated, participants emphasized mentorship as part of a supervisor's job. The supervisor ratings from the survey data support this emphasis. As Table A1 shows, the mean ratings of supervisors in relation to components of mentoring by both groups of respondents were quite similar and favourable. In fact, they did not differ in their ratings of supervisor as mentor or in their general perceptions of their supervisors' effectiveness or on most of the mentorship function items. The groups did differ on three items, all of which were rated more highly by new faculty members. The differences arose in the career functions item "teaches graduate students new academic behaviours," and in two psychosocial functions items: "supervisor shares own experiences" and "discusses relationship concerns regarding other faculty members and peers." In addition, though only the ratings for these items were statistically significantly different, there was a general tendency for new faculty to rate their supervisors more positively, particularly for psychosocial functions.

An examination of the percentage of each group who gave positive evaluations (i.e., Table A2) of their supervisors revealed interesting additional differences with reference to the supervisor/mentoring components. Specifically, these percentages reflect respondents who perceived their supervisors had been successful in incorporating each career or psychosocial function into their supervision. As can be seen, consistent with the mean ratings, the percentage

of participants who rated their supervisors positively is most different between the two groups for supervisor ratings regarding "teacher of academic behaviour," "shares personal experiences," and "discusses relationship concerns."

In addition, generally a greater percentage of new faculty members evaluated their supervisors positively than doctoral students (except for ratings of "teacher of academic culture" and "teacher of academic politics"). Importantly, differences between groups were evident in that new faculty were also more likely to rate their supervisors as "superior." For example, when the respondents ranked their supervisors as mentors the general trend was consistent for both groups with approximately 77 percent rating them positively. However, the breakdown of the 77 percent revealed that whereas 36.7 percent of the doctoral students rated their supervisors "superior," 45.5 percent of new faculty rated their supervisors "superior." Similarly, for the overall rating of supervisor efficacy, 39.5 percent of new faculty rated their supervisors' efficacy "superior" whereas 34.5 percent of doctoral students gave "superior" ratings. In contrast to the trend of more positive ratings by new faculty participants, a greater percentage of the responses for graduate students were positive for supervisors' "teaching about academic politics." Here, whereas just less than half of the new faculty rated their supervisors as "good" or "superior," almost 60 percent of doctoral students gave a positive rating on this item. In contrast, with respect to the psychosocial mentoring functions (Kram, 1983), again new faculty members showed consistently greater percentages of positive ratings of their supervisors (except with reference to ratings on "respect conveyed by mentor").

Generally, regarding career functions, more than half of the participants in each group rated their supervisors positively, although the percentages were at or below half, particularly for "helps meet new colleagues" and for doctoral students, particularly, regarding "teacher of

academic behaviours." Furthermore, in general, the ratings were higher for career functions compared to psychosocial functions. With the exception of participants perceptions of their supervisors' conveyed respect, both groups were less likely to rate their supervisors positively on all other aspects of psychosocial functions, and doctoral students consistently rated their supervisors less positively.

In combination with this descriptive data, the qualitative responses also showed differences between the two groups of participants. For example, new faculty members were more likely to refer to career functions than were doctoral students, whereas doctoral students more often made reference to psychosocial functions than did new faculty. That is, new faculty more frequently made reference to Kram's career functions in their definitions of mentor (69.6% compared to 64.2% of doctoral students) and their criteria for selection of supervisor (82.4% compared to 67.8% doctoral students). For example, one new faculty explained that a mentor

> is somebody who is there for you as a junior partner in that relationship to ask questions of whenever you come up against a new experience . . . but there is another part to mentoring in that I think the supervisor needs to inform the graduate student about new experiences that the graduate student may not even know is out there yet. So like I needed a little bit of prompting to submit my first conference paper and I needed a little bit of prompting to submit my first article for publication in a scholarly journal and I think that the supervisor needs to be a coach that encourages the mentee to take on new experiences. (*Faculty #12, Interview*)

Conversely, doctoral students more frequently emphasized psychosocial functions of mentoring which included: sharing experiences, conveying respect and empathy, talking about anxieties, and discussing relationship concerns. Though both groups discussed career functions more than psychosocial functions, it appears that psychosocial functions were more important to doctoral students. The percentages of references to psychosocial functions made by doctoral students and new faculty members were as follows: definitions of mentor—35.8 and 30.4,

respectively; and criteria for selection of supervisors—32.2 and 17.6, respectively. Doctoral students were also twice as likely as new faculty (7.1 compared to 3.6) to make reference to psychosocial functions as a primary role of a supervisor. The elements identified in qualitative responses often related to interpersonal compatibility and general personality of the potential supervisor. Characteristics such as friendliness, openness and sense of humour were illustrative of such personality focus. For example, one student explains:

> I would think she [a mentor] would be willing to be open about her experiences in this very same path that I am taking. Rather than letting me fumble through things that she fumbled through, offering to share what were the results of her path through the Ph.D. program for comparison. And, to me, a mentor, and a guide, is a person who cares about the person they are mentoring rather than the opposite, trying to see that they pay their dues. So I think it is a very positive relationship where the mentor is guiding . . . rather than just being there to ensure that the person in the program jumps through all of the hoops. (*Student #8, Interview*)

In contrast, new faculty participants noted that "you could have a supervisor that you think is a terrific person" (*Faculty #17, interview*) but that that was insufficient on its own without shared interest and opportunities to be autonomous. In addition, one faculty interviewee was clear that an effective relationship involved effort from both involved. This individual stated that a successful doctoral experience involved "nurturing that relationship, and I think I have as much responsibility in nurturing that as my supervisor" (*Faculty #21, interview*). Finally, one faculty respondent seemed keenly aware of the shift in focus from career to psychosocial functions and, similar to previous research findings (Lomas, 2007; Morley, 2003), seemed to imply a corresponding shift in students' sense of responsibility for their own education:

> I think a student needs to be aware of what the parameters of responsibilities are for the faculty advisor, also, and I think they have to have some degree of self-awareness that perhaps they are a particularly needy or demanding graduate student. I bet that's not a very popular response . . . for example, personality, [pause] of course it's always easier to get along with someone

who is cordial, but I don't know that that's essential. You are not developing a personal relationship, it's a professional relationship. (*Faculty #4, interview*)

In summary, the results across surveys and interviews demonstrated a pattern of responses that showed new faculty and doctoral students share common views on and experiences with doctoral supervision and mentoring. Both recognized the importance of a mentoring relationship between supervisor and graduate student and both perceived the necessity of career and psychosocial functions in that relationship. However, these two groups also showed some differences that were evident in the degree of importance and emphasis that they placed on these functions within the student–supervisor relationship.

Discussion

Our study was intended to examine the perceptions of and experiences in doctoral studies of two groups of participants who were at different points in their relationships with their doctoral supervisors. At the same time, we were interested in considering this data in light of the context of this relationship, the current consumer culture in education. Our results demonstrated that our participants reported generally positive perceptions of their supervisors, although early career academics reported more positive perceptions of their supervisors generally, compared to doctoral students. In particular, doctoral students rated their supervisors less positively, particularly regarding psychosocial functions, compared to career functions (Kram, 1983), of supervision. Furthermore, doctoral students' expectations of supervision emphasized psychosocial functions over career functions of mentoring, although both groups gave less positive evaluations of their supervisors' performance with respect to psychosocial functions compared to career functions. Importantly, new faculty also emphasized psychosocial functions in effective supervision. This finding is consistent with one study that indicates that new faculty

members believe that effective supervision must include psychosocial as well as career mentoring functions (Gadbois & Graham, 2012). The issue generally, is whether these expectations for a combination of career and psychosocial functions in effective supervision can be attained, or maintained, given the current audit culture and at a time where universities are exploring ways to increase completion rates and decrease time to completion for doctoral programs (e.g., Tamburri, 2013).

Given that the respondents in our two groupings are in sequential stages of their academic careers, though they showed many similarities, any differences between them are interesting. We suggest that the differences present in our data, though small, may reflect an emerging problem in academia—an incompatibility between what students want and what supervisors can reasonably provide given the consumer culture that has come to dominate higher education. As discussed above, this model emphasizes performance management and increasing productivity—productivity in terms of professors' research output, teaching, and student completion rates. In addition, this model simultaneously encourages the view that students are consumers entitled to the educational experience they desire. In this case, this means an experience that fulfills both students' career and psychosocial needs and wants. In essence, students (consumers) may be expecting psychosocial functions from their supervisors in an environment in which there is insufficient time for the supervisors to fulfill such expectations; a situation that may result in reduced graduate student satisfaction of the mentoring performed by their supervisors. Taken one step further it may be, as indicated in our data, that graduate students then become faculty members who also believe psychosocial functions are important. The question is whether, as supervisors themselves, they were perceived to effectively balance their multiple roles. It is important to emphasize that we did not look at the perceptions of our

participants' supervisors nor of our new faculty participants' students. In fact, it may have been for example that the doctoral supervisors also felt positively about this emphasis on personal and professional support and perceived that they had provided both in their supervision. Whether this was in fact the case cannot be answered here although it does not change the fundamental question of whether students' expectations and supervisors' responsibilities can be met given the current audit culture. Furthermore, whether there is a "causal" link between the audit culture and the expectations for personal (as well as professional) support of supervisors cannot be determined without a longitudinal examination of this issue.

In general, the responses of both new faculty and doctoral students in our study were consistent with Kram's (1983) emphasis on both career and psychosocial functions. All respondents identified at least some examples of either career or psychosocial functions and many identified examples of both. We also discovered some differences in relation to evaluations of supervisors. Although most of the mean ratings of supervisors were not statistically significantly different, there were three differences that indicated that new faculty (compared to doctoral students) perceived that their supervisors provided them with particular psychosocial supports (i.e., shares experiences, discusses relationship concerns). Furthermore, new faculty rated their supervisors' mentoring behaviours more positively in relation to both career and psychosocial functions although the differences between the two groups were more evident for psychosocial functions with a larger percentage of new faculty giving positive ratings than doctoral students. In addition, interview responses revealed that new faculty placed greater importance on career functions while doctoral students appeared to place greater importance on psychosocial functions of mentoring.

It is important to identify additional variables that likely influenced our outcomes. First, the difference in the number of men and women who participated in the study must be noted. The gender imbalance was particularly pronounced for doctoral student participants (80% women) compared to new faculty participants (57% women). We recognize that this imbalance can certainly influence the perceptions and experiences of participants, particularly because their individual life circumstances may be quite different. Though some studies, within particular disciplines (e.g., Singer, Cassin, & Dobson, 2005; Singer, Dobson, & Altmaier, 2007) reported that there are more similarities than differences between men and women, others have argued that there are differences that arise because of the disconnect between the academic environment and family life. Specifically, Mason, Wolfinger, and Goulden (2013) emphasized women and men experience the academic context in a systematically different way given the implications and impact on their family lives.

Second, an important factor that surely influenced our outcomes is that doctoral students in our study commented on relationships and experiences that were part of their *current* reality, whereas the new faculty were involved in *retrospection*. Because new faculty were somewhat removed from the graduate student experience they may have been inclined to think more positively about their supervisors. In addition, the items for which new faculty were less positive compared to doctoral students (i.e., teaching academic culture and politics), may reflect the fact that new faculty members had experience with the realities of academic politics and culture given their current positions within the academy. Furthermore, given that new faculty participants had successfully attained academic positions, it may be that they were the products of more successful supervisor–student relationships. The difficulty is that a majority of the doctoral students who participated in this study (61%) also indicated that they planned to pursue

academic careers. As such, the fact that they reported less positive experiences compared to the new academics, and perhaps had less realistic knowledge of academic culture and politics, may mean that they were at risk for failure if they pursued academic positions. In addition, it is also important to note that even though new faculty rated their supervisors more positively than did doctoral students, when asked during interviews to discuss themselves as supervisors and mentors new faculty participants often commented that the psychosocial factors were very important to these roles. Many reported that because their own supervisors were often lacking in providing psychosocial support so they tried to be aware of providing both career and psychosocial support in their own roles as supervisors.

As indicated in the introduction, the literature has consistently reported that mentoring is invaluable within graduate education and that good mentoring involves both career and psychosocial functions (even though what this means in practice remains vague). Our findings regarding our new faculty members' expectations of themselves in the role of supervisor and mentor, and our doctoral students' expectations that their supervisor meet both their personal and professional needs are consistent with this literature. Furthermore, in recent years, both formal and informal mentorship programs reflect this shift away from expectations of advising to expectations of mentorship.

Whereas such a student-centred approach has been adopted by many institutions of higher education over the past few decades, we argue that the managerial model may place other demands on supervisors, demands that we believe make successful mentoring difficult. First, the managerial emphasis on productivity, especially in relation to completion rates for graduate students, barely allows for the time required for the first two phases of a mentoring relationship, initiation and cultivation, which can take six months to four years (Kram, 1983). Second, the

emphasis on productivity may be expected to complicate an already complex workload for supervisors including increased teaching loads (influenced by the number of undergraduate compared to graduate courses supervisors teach), higher class enrolments (particularly problematic for supervisors who teach more undergraduate, especially first year, courses), greater research productivity (influenced by the number and year of study of graduate students as well as whether they have research release time), and service (demands and number of committees), all take up supervisor's time, leaving less time for effective supervision. The numerous studies in recent years that examine the systemic problem of balancing responsibilities within academia are testaments to these increasing demands (e.g., Graham & Gadbois, 2010; Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006; Johnson, 2007; Leisyte, Enders, & de Boer, 2009; Lero, Richardson & Korabik, 2009). Future research on perceptions of the student–supervisor relationship should include some index of the demands on supervisors' time.

In addition to pressures placed on faculty supervisors, it may be that a second component of the audit culture in higher education, treating the student as a consumer, has created the opportunity for students to make greater demands on the individuals and institutions providing educational services. In "The Consumerist Subversion of Education," Potts (2005) described the consumer as "a person shopping for products in the marketplace" (p. 54) and explained that when this model is applied to university education the actions, and indirectly the policies, of the institution encourage students to take on this identity with the expectation that they will be treated accordingly. The bottom line is that effective supervision, infused with effective mentorship, may not be efficient enough to meet the growing pressure to achieve particular outcomes, like increased doctoral completion rates and students' future success.

Conclusion

Although our ratings data implied few differences between current graduate students and new faculty participants' perceptions of their graduate supervisors, both the quantitative and qualitative responses indicated a general pattern that appear to reflect unique experiences between the two groups. The outcomes showed that graduate students expected mentoring relationships with their supervisors. According to the literature, faculty generally agree that mentorship, as opposed to the past practice of advising, makes for a better, more successful graduate experience. However, the establishment of such a relationship within an audit culture becomes potentially problematic because it may be associated with increased expectations by students and increased demands upon faculty supervisors' time. Even though graduate students and new faculty participants in this study agreed, at least in general, on the functions of supervision and mentoring, it appears that definitions of mentoring of these two groups may be becoming necessarily divergent.

Naidoo and Jamieson (2005) pointed out that ". . . little research has been conducted on the effects of consumerism on learning and teaching" (p. 269). Our research outcomes may provide some indication of the conditions that arise at the level of individual relationships within the current model of university education. More research is needed that explores the relationship between the audit culture and micro-level interactions between supervisors and students. Specific attention should be devoted to exploring the contextual factors that support or hinder these relationships and what steps need to be taken at the institutional level to strengthen and improve these relationships and their chances of success. It seems reasonable that within a context that supports these relationships the by-product may be the efficiency and productivity that the corporate model demands.

References

Apple, M. W. (2007). Education, markets, and an audit culture. *International Journal of Educational Policies*, *1*, 4–19.

Bell-Ellison, B., & Dedrick, R. (2008). What do doctoral students value in their ideal mentor? *Research in Higher Education*, *49*, 555–567.

Brophy, E., & Tucker-Abramson, M. (2012). Struggling universities: Simon Fraser University and the crisis of Canadian public education. *Topia*, *28*, 21–40.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2006). Doctoral student supervision in a managerial climate. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *16*, 223–236.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P., & Parry, O. (2000). *The doctoral experience: Success and failure in graduate school*. London: Falmer.

Forrester, G. (2011). Performance management in education: Milestone or millstone? *Management in Education*, *25*, 5–9.

Gadbois, S. A., & Graham, E. (2012). New faculty perceptions of supervision and mentoring: The influence of graduate school experiences. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, *5*, 44–49.

Graham, E., & Gadbois, S. A. (2010, May). Lack of preparedness and out of time: "The reason why they don't tell you is because otherwise you'd never do it." Paper presented at 27th Annual Qualitative Analysis Conference: Social Pragmatism as a Conceptual Foundation, Waterloo, Ontario.

Holmwood, J. (2010). Sociology's misfortune: Disciplines, interdisciplinarity and the impact of audit culture. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *61*, 639–658.

Houston, D., Meyer, L., & Paewai, S. (2006). Academic staff workload and job satisfaction: Expectations and values in academe. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *28*, 17–30.

Johnson, W. B. (2007). Transformational supervision: When supervisors mentor. *Professional Psychology Research and Practice*, *38*, 259–267.

Johnson, W. B. (2008). Are advocacy, mutuality, and evaluation incompatible mentoring functions? *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *16*, 31–44.

Kram, K. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 608–625.

Leisyte, L., Enders, J., & de Boer, H. (2009). The balance between teaching and research in Dutch and English universities in the context of university governance reforms. *Higher Education*, *58*, 619–635.

Lero, D., Richardson, J., & Korabik, K. (2009). Cost–benefit review of work–life balance practices—2009. Retrieved from http://www.caall-acalo.org/uploads/resource%20library/cost-benefit%20review.pdf

Lomas, L. (2007). Are students consumers? Perceptions of academic staff. *Quality in Higher Education*, *13*, 31–44.

Mainhard, T., van derRijst, R., Tartwijk, J., & Wubbels, T. (2009). A model for the supervisor–doctoral student relationship. *Higher Education*, *58*, 359–373.

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

Mason, M. A., Wolfinger, N. H., & Goulden, M. (2013). *Do babies matters? Gender and family in the ivory tower.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Metz, I. (2009). Organizational factors, social factors, and women's advancement. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *58*, 193–213.

Miller, T. (2003). Governmentality or commodification? US higher education. *Cultural Studies*, *17*, 897–904.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Moser, R. (April, 2002). Corporatization, its discontents and the renewal of academic citizenship. *The Faculty Advocate*, *2(4)*. Retrieved from http://cas.umkc.edu/aaup/facadv8.htm

Mullen, E. (1998). Vocational and psychosocial mentoring functions: Identifying mentors who serve both. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *9*, 319–331.

Murphy, M. (2009). Bureaucracy and its limits: Accountability and rationality in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *30*, 683–695.

Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Empowering participants or corroding learning? Towards a research agenda on the impact of student consumerism in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*, 267–281.

Omiecinski, T. (2003). Hiring of part-time university faculty on the increase. *Education Quarterly Review*, *9(3)*, 9–15.

Paglis, L., Green, S., & Bauer, T. (2006). Does advisor mentoring add value? A longitudinal study of mentoring and doctoral student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*, 451–476.

Pollock, P. (1995). A test of conceptual models depicting the developmental course of informal mentor–protégé relationships in the work place. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *46*, 144–162.

Polster, C. (2003, March). The privatization of our public universities. *Saskatchewan Notes*, *2(7)*.

Polster, C. (2006, November). Rethinking Canada's higher education policy: Corporatization of universities more harmful than helpful. *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor*, *13(6)*.

Ponce, A. N., Williams, M. K., & Allen, G.J. (2005). Toward promoting generative cultures of intentional mentoring within academic settings. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *61*, 1159–1163.

Potts, M. (2005). The consumerist subversion of education. *Academic Questions*, *18*(3), 54–64.

Roberts, A. (2000). Mentoring revisited: A phenomenological reading of the literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, *8*, 145–170.

Rose, G. (2005). Group differences in graduate students' concepts of the ideal mentor. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*, 53–80.

Rose, G. (2003). Enhancement of mentor selection using the ideal mentor scale. *Research in Higher Education*, *44*, 473–494.

Singer, A. R., Cassin, S. E., & Dobson, K. S. (2005). The role of gender in the career aspirations of professional psychology graduates: Are there more similarities than differences? *Canadian Psychology*, *46*, 215–222.

Singer, A. R., Dobson, K. S., & Altmaier, E. M. (2007). Professional interests and career aspirations of graduate students in professional psychology: An exploratory survey. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, *1*, 26–37.

Stokes, P. (2003). Exploring the relationship between mentoring and counselling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *31*, 25–38.

Tamburri, R. (2013). The PhD is in need of revision. *University Affairs*, *54(3)*, 12–20.

Turk, J. L. (Ed). (2000). *The corporate campus: Commercialiazation and the dangers to Canada's colleges and universities.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.

Watts, J. & Robertson, N. (2011). Burnout in university teaching staff: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research*, *53*, 33–50.

Woodhouse, H. (2001). The market model of education and the treat to Canadian universities. *Encounters on Education*, *2*, 105–122.

Woodhouse, H. (2011). Your money or your life! A critical Canadian perspective on the world bank's "reform agenda" for higher education. *International Education*, *40(2)*, 6–21.

Zhao, C., Golde, C., & McCormick, A. (2007). More than a signature: How advisor choice and advisor behaviour affect doctoral student satisfaction. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *31*, 263–281.

Appendix

Table A1
Means (and Standard Deviations) for Supervisor Ratings

Supervisor Rating Components	PhD Students (n=168)	New Faculty (n=44)	*F* Values
Supervisor as Mentor[1]	4.0 (1.11)	4.0 (1.21)	.134
General Efficacy as Supervisor[1]	3.9 (1.04)	4.0 (1.06)	.344
Career Functions:			
Contributor to Discipline[1]	4.3 (0.79)	4.3 (0.80)	.020
Contributor to Department[1]	4.2 (0.99)	4.3 (0.71)	.491
Teacher of Academic Culture[1]	3.8 (1.09)	3.6 (1.14)	.710
Teacher of Academic Politics[1]	3.6 (1.22)	3.3 (1.27)	1.79
Helps Meet New Colleagues[1]	3.3 (1.30)	3.4 (1.34)	.197
Teacher of Academic Behaviours[2]	2.8 (1.26)	3.6 (1.00)	14.64**
Reduces Risks Affecting Progress[2]	3.7 (1.27)	3.9 (1.21)	.412
Psychosocial Functions:			
Shares Own Experiences[2]	3.2 (1.26)	3.7 (1.18)	4.67*
Conveys Respect[2]	4.2 (1.02)	4.4 (0.93)	.320
Conveys Empathy[2]	3.7 (1.16)	3.8 (1.22)	.241
Encourages Discussion of Anxieties[2]	2.9 (1.30)	3.3 (1.19)	2.30
Discusses Relationship Concerns re: peers/faculty[2]	3.0 (1.29)	3.7 (1.24)	9.04**

[1]Ratings on a scale from 1="poor" to 5="superior."
[2]Ratings on a scale from 1="not at all" to 5="regularly."
*<.05; **<.01

Table A2

Percentages of Positive Supervisor Ratings

Supervisor Rating Components	PhD Students	New Faculty	% Difference[3]
Supervisor as Mentor[1]	77.5	77.3	- .2
General Efficacy as Supervisor[1]	72.0	79.0	7.0
Career Functions:			
Contributor to Discipline[1]	88.2	88.6	.4
Contributor to Department[1]	81.1	86.4	5.3
Teacher of Academic Culture[1]	69.8	61.4	- 8.4
Teacher of Academic Politics[1]	58.5	47.8	- 10.7
Helps Meet New Colleagues[1]	45.8	50.0	4.2
Teacher of Academic Behaviours[2]	29.7	55.8	26.1
Reduces Risks Affecting Progress[2]	64.8	71.4	6.6
Mean	**62.6**	**65.9**	**3.3**
Psychosocial Functions:			
Shares Own Experiences[2]	47.3	59.5	12.2
Conveys Respect[2]	81.0	81.0	---
Conveys Empathy[2]	59.0	64.3	5.3
Encourages Discussion of Anxieties[2]	31.9	40.5	8.6
Discusses Relationship Concerns re: peers/faculty[2]	39.0	59.5	20.5
Mean	**51.6**	**60.9**	**9.3**

[1]Positive ratings include "good" and "superior" (on a scale from "poor" to "superior").
[2]Positive ratings include "often" and "regularly" (on a scale from "not at all" to "regularly").
[3]Negative values indicate a higher percentage among doctoral students.