Emerald

International Journal for
Researcher Development

Supervisor wellbeing and identity: Challenges and strategies

Journal:	<i>International Journal for Researcher Development</i>
Manuscript ID	IJRD-03-2016-0006.R2
Manuscript Type:	Main Section (Research and Theory Papers)
Keywords:	Doctoral supervision,, wellbeing, resilience,, doctoral student learning, stress in research learning.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Supervisor wellbeing and identity: Challenges and strategies

Gina Wisker, University of Brighton, UK; University of the Free State, South Africa.

Gillian Robinson, Anglia Ruskin University ,UK.

Structured abstract

Purpose

The research aims to explore the professional identity of supervisors and their perceptions of stress in doctoral learning supervision. The research determines ways of developing strategies of resilience and wellbeing to overcome stress, leading to positive outcomes for supervisors and students.

Design/methodology

Research is in two parts: first, rescrutinising previous work and second, new interviews with international and UK supervisors gathering evidence of doctoral supervisor stress, in relation to professional identity, and discovering resilience and wellbeing strategies.

Findings

Supervisor professional identity and wellbeing are aligned with research progress, and effective supervision. Stress and wellbeing/resilience strategies emerged across three dimensions: personal, learning and institutional, related to emotional, professional and intellectual issues, affecting identity and wellbeing. Problematic relationships, change in supervision arrangements, loss of students and lack of student progress cause stress. Balances between responsibility and autonomy; uncomfortable conflicts arising from personality clashes; and the nature of the research work, burnout and lack of time for their own work, all cause supervisor stress. Developing community support, handling guilt and a sense of underachievement, and self-management practices help maintain wellbeing.

Research limitations Only experienced supervisors (each with four doctoral students completed) were interviewed. The research relies upon interview responses.

Social and practical implications Sharing information can lead to informed, positive action minimising stress and isolation; development of personal coping strategies and institutional support enhance the supervisory experience for supervisors and students.

Originality/value The research contributes new knowledge concerning doctoral supervisor experience, identity and wellbeing, offering research-based information and ideas on a hitherto under-researched focus: supervisor stress, wellbeing and resilience impacting upon supervisors' professional identity.

Keywords

Doctoral supervision, wellbeing, resilience, doctoral student learning, stress in research learning.

Article classification: Research Paper

Aim and introduction

Considerable research exists on supervision practices and interactions. More recently researchers have turned to concerns about doctoral student wellbeing, but to date the other half of that equation, supervisor wellbeing, seems to have largely been overlooked. Supervisors also experience stress in their academic roles. This stress may be in response to student lack of progress, or poor communication, or perhaps to work overload in the current context of increased demands in higher education, or any combination of these. This article concentrates on the broad areas of the personal (experiences, identities, interactions), learning (student progress, achievement impacting on supervisors) and institution (pressures on completion). It contributes new knowledge about doctoral supervisor experience, identity and wellbeing. It does so by exploring supervisor perceptions of concerns, conflicts and stress in the supervision experience, in terms of relationships with students and student knowledge construction and expression, in the changing context of Higher Education. In the former, concerns emerge regarding interactions and student progress, which impact on supervisor identity. In the latter, supervisors are faced with expectations more familiar from the business world, such as increased productivity, faster throughput of doctoral completions, and enhanced scrutiny of process and practices. These expectations can lead to a rather mechanical compliance, to students producing a 'good enough' PhD just in time, which can limit the contribution to knowledge. Such compliance to time and productivity can affect the quality of the research and publications and potentially impact supervisors' own work and reputation. The research reported here first identifies supervisors' perceptions of stress. It then elicits from supervisors the strategies which help them manage the supervision experience effectively in terms of their own identity, stress, wellbeing, interactions and student progress. The research study takes place in a framework foregrounding supervisor experience and identity. It focuses, in particular, on concerns experienced by supervisors, and wellbeing and resilience strategies which have been or could be developed.

Literature review

Supervision-challenges, changes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Previous research into supervision considers supervisory approaches for the development of a project, and personal and research skills applicable beyond that project (Lee, 2008). It also looks at power-related interactions (Grant, 2008), and emotional dimensions of supervisors' support for students' wellbeing in interactions in formalised institutional processes (Strandler *et al.*, 2014; Johanssen *et al.*, 2014; Vekkaila *et al.*, 2013) on the research journey (Wisker and Robinson, 2011). Much of this work focuses on doctoral candidates, such as challenges related to cognitive demands, personal wellbeing issues, and the sheer hard grind of doing a doctorate, over time, sometimes in another culture, whether that be one of discipline, learning or context. While there is much work on the experience of being supervised and supervising, and some on the accompanying intellectual development and the construction and production of knowledge (Stevens-Long and Barner, 2006; Wisker, 2008), there is, more generally, still a lack of research on the personal, emotional and affective elements of supervision, and particularly on issues concerning wellbeing and resilience. Little has been written which explores doctoral journeys from the point of view of the supervisor. Questions remain about 1) the relationships between affective experiences and the learning, personal and professional relations between doctoral candidates and the supervisor, and 2) supervisors' sense of identity, professional learning and experience, stress, wellbeing and resilience.

There is work on the affective elements of doctoral students' learning journeys including that of Holbrook, Bourke, Cantwell, Scevak and Budd from the SORTI group at University of Newcastle, New South Wales (Budd *et al.*, 2010) while at the University of Gothenburg (Johanssen *et al.*, 2014a; Strandler *et al.*, 2014b) research has looked at the emotional work of supervision, considering the practical and emotional issues of students who 'leave'. Our own work (Wisker and Robinson 2013) concerns the perceptions of supervisors who variously retired, left the university, experienced breakdowns in relationships with students, or acquired students midway in the research process. The latter resulted in supervisors 'adopting' what one of our participants termed 'doctoral orphans'. Our research, and that of others to date, indicates that far from being a systematic supervision relationship and intellectual developmental process from start to finish, supervisory arrangements are, quite frequently, subject to changes for many reasons.

Changes in supervisor relationships and arrangements are perhaps surprisingly common, and much of this has positive outcomes for students (Wisker and Robinson, 2012, 2013). However, some change produces challenge and stress. For supervisors, this stress can lead to a sense of inadequacy or loss, leading to an undermining of professional identity and security. Our earlier work which focused on doctoral student experiences revealed various stresses, including the perception by supervisors that they had invested a great deal of emotional and intellectual work in students, only to find students moved to other supervisory relationships. Such

moves were often for the best of reasons, but nevertheless in some instances left a sense of loss, and frustration. Other supervisors reported ongoing questioning of their own capabilities to supervise through to completion when faced with lack of intellectual movement and transformation in students who were often needy, made little progress, or in some extreme cases, began grievance procedures which felt unfounded.. Issues of supervisor stress and concern are evident between the lines in research focusing on student experiences of student/supervisor interactions in relation to problems, challenges, wellbeing and resilience.

Barbara Grant defines supervision as ‘such a challenging and “chaotic” pedagogy’ (Grant, 2003, p. 189). Intellectual, personal, and professional relationships are at the core of this pedagogy. Supervisory relationships are opportunities to engage with fruitful learning dialogues and to support and empower doctoral students through their research learning journey, to completion. However, while supervisors might well benefit from interactions with doctoral students, they can also experience stress when little progress is made, personal professional relations break down, communication is lost, and when students move on or leave. Idealised notions of a supportive supervisor and student ‘dyad’ (Lee, 2008; Wisker, 2012; Delamont, Atkinson and Parry, 1997) are questioned in the work of Grant and Manathunga who identify the potential ‘master-slave’ relationships of power (Manathunga, 2007; Grant, 2008), and in our own work on doctoral orphans and ways of trying to reconstruct and deal effectively with problematic relationships between supervisors and students (Wisker and Robinson, 2012, 2013). While one might question the hierarchies of power inherent in the supervisor-student interaction, it is still palpable and enshrined in institutional hierarchies. The literature shows that the supervisor-student relationship can isolate and disempower students. Yet, when relationships or projects show problems, experienced supervisors can be left questioning their own professional abilities and identities, and worrying about where to turn for clarification and support. Supervisors skilled at research processes do not always know what to do next when faced with issues of student non-progress or students’ personal problems. Given their professional standing, they often feel they should have this knowledge and ability and as a result could feel stressed because their professional skills are challenged.

Identity

Professional identity lies at the heart of some of these issues. However most literature on academic identity focuses on student identity development related to their disciplines (Golde, 1998), and on challenges to academic identities in the current contexts of high expectations and changes in academics’ circumstances and university structures (Archer, 2008a; Clegg, 2008). These issues also impact on supervisors. As Halse has pointed out, current expectations that supervisors ‘learn the new “rules of the game”’ and ‘comply with a raft of policies, practices and

procedures that the university decreed essential for good supervision' (Halse, 2011, p. 56), accompanied by new forms of accountability and high productivity, could increase workload. This could also shift what historically can be a personal partnership model of a learning journey over time (often a very long time), into one that is more managed by the demands for systematic processes and productivity and the new doctoral experience of funding tied to completion.

Far from being fixed, identity (in this case academic and specifically supervisor identity) can be seen as changing in relation to external change (Ivanic, 1998), and development (Baker and Lattuca, 2010). The notion of an 'identity-trajectory' leads to the sense of both a core of self, and change over time (McAlpine, Amundsen and Turner, 2013). In this regard, notions of 'becoming' and 'unbecoming', offer insight into the changing identities of academics as supervisors over time and place. Some of these changes can be enforced and some are the result of personal choice (Archer, 2008; Pyhältö *et al.*, 2012a).

Other work considers the response to ideas, tensions and demands of what it means to be a researcher in terms of identity, stress and resilience. Davies and Danaher (2014) focused on early career researchers in relation to efforts aimed at empowerment in the context of prioritisation of certain research activities over others in the higher education context. The work of one of the authors (Castillo *et al.*, 2015) looks at developing professional identities of early career researchers in response to changing 'signals' in a research career. However, there is to date little work on supervisors' sense of stress, risk, or management regarding their own research when supervising that of others. For supervisors, some of their positive and negative experiences could be related to conducting research and being a supervisor of others' research, whether it contributes to their own work or is free standing. Supervisors might start out hesitant or confident in their roles, and have these affected by interactions with students including breakdowns, losses or successes, and by the development of the project.

Stress, wellbeing and resilience

In studies such as that of Halse and our own, the tensions that supervisors report lead to stress and challenges to academic identity. Not all changes are bad, and not all challenges to academic identity are damaging. Some supervisors in Halse's study react badly to the insistence on training for the role, while others in her study as well as in that of Spiller and colleagues (Spiller *et al.*, 2013) and our own, find forms of ongoing development supportive, an opportunity to share complex issues, enable community and reduce stress. Work on stress, wellbeing and resilience often tends to be in the (often unresearched) 'top tips' training model so for example training for senior managers, 'the hub' runs events on resilient leadership and thriving under pressure. However the report 'Five ways to wellbeing ' (online) offers an evidence

base for improving wellbeing particularly at work, focusing on a range of proven behaviour strategies: connect; be active; take notice; keep learning; give. It is argued that these enable wellbeing, resilience and reduce stress, proffering a positive forward-looking attitude. It also suggests that older people can be lifted from depression through work, and that sharing, giving, participation in social and community life are associated with a sense of wellbeing, positive feelings and happiness.

This advice resembles that suggested by supervisors, in the data (below). While working and community contexts might be useful for the positive mindsets and resilience for 'older people', we argue that this could be translated into considering the academic workplace as a community, where academic participation and the supervision support to others could also produce a form of happiness. So too could involvement in supervisor support and development systems, and team supervision, since it is otherwise quite an isolating role. Work on future consciousness also aligns with that on stress, emotional resilience and wellbeing in the workplace. This advises predicting, then variously avoiding, planning and coping with stressful situations. Lombardo notes that research 'in positive psychology also shows that our emotional states strongly affect our thinking capacities; we do not think as creatively and intelligently about the future when we are emotionally miserable as we do when we are hopeful and happy (Fredrickson, 2005).' Intellectually complex futurist visions express hope and fear and while fear and negative emotions including 'anxiety, stress, despair, and depression, have been extensively studied within psychology (Reading, 2004)', The issue we are mainly concerned with is one of resilience and in this respect Lombardo argues that positive mindsets and behaviours that are hopeful and proactive can be learned through anticipating a positive future and working towards it rather than a negative one over which one has no control (Seligman, 1998; Lombardo, 2006a, pp. 48-49; Lombardo, 2007c). Optimism is more realistic than pessimism, he suggests, since pessimists avoid problems and run or hide from reality, while optimists seek solutions (Carver and Scheier, 2005). These theorists and practitioners suggest that thinking, planning, problem solving and decision making are all positive behaviours building wellbeing and resilience. In times of such rapid technological change and, we would argue, change in the demands on university staff including supervisors, planning ahead is advised (Lombardo and Richter, 2004; Lombardo, 2006a, pp. 61-6) as is the construction of positive narratives about success. In the case of supervisors this could for example be success of the students being supervised, of joint research, of publication), towards which you can plan, rather than negative ones, advice which is also given to postgraduate students (Morris and Wisker, 2011). Wilkinson's 'fear course' (online) helps develop similar forward-looking mindsets. This work is related to Positive psychology which is also useful in considering psychological health, strength, and wellbeing. Built both on evidence and value judgments regarding

what is “good” versus ‘not good’ in humans, positive psychology focuses on hope, wisdom, optimism, happiness, self-efficacy, flow, and love (Keyes and Lopez, 2005). This sounds a little abstract perhaps, but in some universities (including Brighton, where one of the authors works) there are communities focusing on wellbeing and happiness which is evidence of a research-based and practical strategic connection with wellbeing and resilience. Such institutional support systems and culture could be further activated to support supervisors.

Supervisor stress, resilience and wellbeing

Our new work reported here is influenced by and builds on earlier work on education doctoral students’ wellbeing and emotional resilience (Morris, 2010; Author). Most research into stress, wellbeing and resilience amongst students focuses on undergraduates. Ryff and Keyes (1995) and Howard and Johnson (2004), for example, identify illnesses developing from poor study experiences. Taking that work further into postgraduate study, Poyatos Matas (2008, 2009) builds on the work of Haksever and Manisali (2000) and Nightingale (2005) to show that lack of clearly defined goals and milestones can cause anxiety during research and writing a thesis. Muurlink and Poyatos Matas (2010) and Poyatos Matas and Tannoch-Bland (2011) explored ways to alleviate stress and enable wellbeing and emotional resilience, and earlier work of one of the authors helped develop a toolkit (Morris and Wisker, 2011) to identify difficulties and support postgraduate students’ wellbeing and resilience. These efforts underpinned our interpretation of successful strategies for doctoral orphans and informed our work on the supervisors who have lost or gained the doctoral orphans.

This article focuses on the supervisor point of view, opening up a broader and deeper range of problematic moments, particularly in the supervisory relationship and supervision journey. These moments lead to concerns, stress, challenges to professional identity, and in several instances to the development of strategies for wellbeing and resilience. While much of the earlier work focuses on doctoral students (Author), and work is being carried out by Van den Berg (2015) on early career supervisors, we consider how experienced supervisors (who have supervised four or more PhD students through to completion) recognise concerns and variously cope (or not) in a number of potentially stressful situations. We consider this both in terms of response to enhanced and changed expectations in the more managerial, productivity-oriented university, and more particularly in relation to working with students on their research.

Situations related to working with students include change in supervisory relationships, where supervisors take on a student previously supervised by another during the research project, or have to ‘hand over’ a student to another supervisor’s care, and when there are conflicts and stalled projects. We found supervisors

acknowledging concerns about challenges to their sense of professional identity combined with these situations. Other issues and complications regarding the students' work, which impact supervisor stress, arise from institutional time demands on the project, such as achievement at certain stages, writing quality, breakthroughs in the research, and successful on-time PhD completion. Interesting information began to emerge during the course of our earlier explorations of doctoral candidate and supervisor experiences; however, we only now turn to considering experienced supervisors in particular.

Methodology and methods

The research is in two parts. While working with earlier projects we became aware of supervisor stress and resilience, but lacked space to focus on this. We felt it useful to rescrutinise that earlier work to discover any explicit comments on these topics. Having identified issues regarding changing context and expectations; student interactions and challenges; and stress and professional identity arising from the rescrutinised material, we built new questions which specifically focused on those areas. Qualitative methodology enables us to explore the perspectives of the supervisors through asking them to tell their own stories since it is their perceptions and experiences which are of interest here. We conducted semi-structured open-ended interviews with experienced supervisors (who had supervised four or more students to completion), and who indicated their willingness to take part in the interviews. We met these supervisors while running internationally based supervision workshops, and at conferences focused on postgraduate supervision that deliberately built on established trust. The research is in two linked parts:

1) The 'troublesome encounters' project on postgraduate students' wellbeing and stress in education (Author) and work which led to the publications 'Doctoral Orphans' (Author) and 'Picking up the Pieces' (Author). These were re-scrutinised for evidence of supervisor stress, wellbeing, resilience strategies and effects on identity. This earlier work is used to inform thinking and questioning which led to the interview data in this article (this part is referred to throughout as 1, with no quotations from participants).

2) Ten new semi-structured, open-ended interviews were conducted face-to-face and by email with supervisors across a range of discipline areas – business, computer science, medicine, health, education, and the humanities, in the UK, Canada, Sweden and South Africa. The sample was opportunistic. Supervisors were invited to participate. We knew some of these supervisors professionally, having met them at conferences. We knew others because of their interest in the work voiced during internationally based supervision workshops (this part is referred to throughout as 2, with participants labelled A, B, etc.). Supervisors operate in different international, institutional and disciplinary contexts, but each had at least four student

‘completions’. We do not focus on these contextual differences, since our approach was not a quantitative one with fine tuning on different cultural differences, but rather an exploration of common issues regarding stress and wellbeing in supervision. Questions focused on supervisor stress, wellbeing, strategies and effects on identity.

The data from both 1 and 2 were collated, coded, thematically analysed, interpreted and reported here, from 1 to form general comments and underpinning arguments, and from 2 using direct quotations to illustrate and take the arguments forward. Certain themes emerged, broadly collected into the predetermined personal, learning and institutional dimensions.

The themes indicate challenging experiences and concerns; the development of quality of student research learning; supervisors’ own professional practice, status and time; and how they link emotional responses with gatekeeping roles and supervisor identity. Some supervisors note stresses and complications arising from institutional time demands, such as achievement at certain stages, writing quality breakthroughs in the research itself, and successful on-time student completion. Other findings emerged when supervisors were asked about their strategies for resilience and wellbeing. These findings indicated issues with managing stresses, and developing strategies for resilience.

Findings: difficulties, issues faced, and responses.

Personal: Difficulties met included problematic relationships and supervisors coping with change in supervisory relationships.

Supervisors identified stress and concerns of wellbeing deriving from interactions with students, related to emotional, professional and intellectual issues, which affected their own sense of identity and wellbeing in emotional, professional, and intellectual terms. These issues included responses to individuals’ needs and demands; balances between responsibility and autonomy; and some uncomfortable conflicts arising from clashes in personality and/or clashes related to authority and ownership. Supervisor stress could also be caused by experience of changes in the student/supervisor relationship, particularly concerning students who do not get on with their supervisor or who leave (Wisker and Robinson, 2012; Johanssen, Wisker, Claesson, Strandler and Saalman, 2014; Vekkaila, Pyhältö and Lonka, 2013). Supervisors’ personal feelings are tied in with loyalty to students, so that they often felt a challenge to their own professional ability if students made little progress, and a personal sense of loss if the students chose to end the supervisory relationship and seek another supervisor. Some also reported stress related to learning and research when students exhibited confusions in understanding which the supervisor could not help clarify or overcome.

They managed this sense of loss and difficulties of being in a new supervisory relationship:

I don't recommend getting more involved in interpersonal or political issues than you have to ... you can't be of use to the student unless there's mutual respect. (2, D)

Tensions existed between professional, intellectual and personal issues. There were also concerns exhibited by supervisors over their contribution to student learning development, and the continuity and eventual completion of a sufficiently successful project which makes a quality contribution to knowledge. In this respect, supervisors were aware of the value of and challenges to their contribution to the student's research development and the development and completion of the project. This response occurred in the context of institutional expectations and expected quality in the disciplines, where supervisors often saw themselves as the first gatekeepers of quality. Some supervisors noted tensions and issues around completion and success, with the pace and development of the student's work, and with the institutional expectations and professional pressures. In terms of the quality of the work, supervisors specifically commented on issues concerning the demands of theory. More generally, some were concerned with lack of time and opportunity to enable their own research and development.

Institutional

Institutional expectations, formal milestones and 'training' could cause stress but were also seen to offer structured strategies for moving forward.

Some issues related to time allocated and balancing other demands on supervisor time.

The diversity together with the overload has to do with it, it takes more energy from a person to actually be dealing with many diverse tasks and having to juggle ...it's all their teaching work, undergrad post grad, many administrative activities. (2, H)

Another issue arose from the supervisor's allocation of projects, since some supervised in their specialist area and others in much broader areas. This allocation was probably due to understaffing, the status of the university in terms of focus on specialisms, and the supervisor's willingness to help support projects with no local specialist. The scope of the research and variety of students could be an issue, spreading the supervisor's focus too broadly and thinly so their work ranged between different research projects, those of students and their own:

It could be research that is quite different from the research that the student is doing because we often find that you constantly move between these different projects. (2, H)

Another issue causing extra work and stress was language differences. If students were from a different language and culturally inflected background to the supervisor, reading, suggestions for work, critical thinking and the fine elements of the nuances of language and research behaviours communicated through language might be confused. Another language issue occurred in dual language institutions where translation, level of interpretation and writing quality in the second (or third, or fourth) language was often of concern, a block, and an extra time constraint for both student and supervisor:

Remember they teach in two languages, everything has to be translated, something that significantly adds to the workload of our staff members. (2, S)

From participant responses and our own experiences, it becomes clear that institutions need to take these practical issues into account when allocating time, resources and support.

In their interactions with university committee and management structures, and with the scaffolded moments of student work development, such as proposal approval, transition/transfer to full PhD study, progress reporting and acceptance for examination, supervisors were aware of acting both as advocates, and gatekeepers of quality. Their advocacy extended to ensuring students have adequate facilities and sometimes to working for funding.

One supervisor noted the consistent political work conducted on the student's behalf, an experience which was stressful for the supervisor as well as the student. Their concerns with interactions with university structures and representatives were mixed with an awareness that student difficulties or success impacted supervisor reputation. Researcher identity, status and personal sense of success are bound up with institutional expectations and practices for both student and supervisor. For some supervisors, the moments of approval of the project proposals, transfer/confirmation of candidature and progress reports were also stressful, since they often felt their *own* work was being put under scrutiny. Alternately, the involvement of others in working with student progress and a form of peer review of that work offered supportive confirmation and direction for future work with the student.

However, systems and structures could also be seen as useful and supportive. Supervisors used structures and institutional processes to manage issues of lack of student response or progress, plagiarism, lack of internal justice, non-completion and transfer.

When relationships broke down irrevocably or students were not making progress sufficient to be able to move on with their PhD, institutional structures were often perceived as taking the weight of some of the most complex decisions. This perception confirmed the supervisors' own professional sense that it was better to halt the supervision progress and the student research at that time, or for the student to change supervisor or topic, methodology, etc. The institutional processes offered confirmation and support, which prevented confusion and a sense of guilt.

Learning

A few supervisors commented on stress arising from the nature of the research work, an issue which merits further attention. A supervisor with extensive experience talked about distressing incidents related to veterinary research work, something identified as 'compassion fatigue' (2, H), most commonly seen in health, nursing, ageing, abuse or trauma-related research.

Some responses related to nudging students to cross conceptual thresholds (Wisker *et al.*, 2010), such as working at an appropriate conceptual, critical and creative level for a PhD rather than, for example, merely being busy. Supervisors admitted conflict in their own sense of self-worth when they could neither engage students as learners on their journey, nor fully understand how they conceptualised.

I'm not always sure if I'm doing the right thing with them. I would offer them certain theory responses ... I think that a doctoral student should really be doing their own research. (2, B)

Another supervisor commented on the difficulties of working with students who cannot be persuaded to think critically or engage with research, writing and a viva examination in such a way that recognises that research is a dialogue, rather arguing that they alone are right. This supervisor felt that their own relative newness in the role meant they did not have the range of strategies to manage this intransigence. When this limited thinking and arguing led to the student being given major modifications on their thesis, the supervisor felt immense guilt at letting the student down. With hindsight the supervisor could see how the support of others with more experience could help to work out a response to the issues., and to this end many supervisor development programmes include case studies of such situations for groups to consider so that joint wisdom is shared and developed . The supervisor commented:

I think the impact of something that goes wrong is probably stronger because you haven't had experience so much of the fact that it can happen so you think it's all your fault. (2, G)

And of one inexperienced student:

Where he didn't listen to any advice, and virtually went head on into his viva convinced that he could talk the examiners into thinking the same things that he wanted to think, when that didn't happen and he had major corrections to do, he was very distraught and therefore I felt that I had failed him. (2, G)

For some supervisors, such blockages and problems directly impacted their sense of self-worth, professional effectiveness and identity. Some individuals responded functionally using university systems to structure research learning or 'letting go' of non-developing students. Other individuals used nudging and support, intellectual challenge, and incremental work leading to student 'learning leaps', noting satisfaction, happiness and achievement with student learning success.

Supervisors acknowledged challenges, issues related to identity, concerns about their professional practice and about the lack of progress made by some students, when their own sense of professional practice and success was tied up with such cognitive intellectual development and achievement. This conflict emerged as a main contributor to supervisor stress and insecurity about professional identity. Other contributors were lack of information, lack of support and over-work as well as university expectations of productivity in terms of throughput of successful students within the allotted time.

Strategies for wellbeing and resilience suggested by supervisors

In data from both research parts, supervisors offered fewer strategies for wellbeing and resilience than expected. These strategies were rarely related to the specific role of supervision or the higher education context. They are gathered here as general strategies and strategies which were more specific to the context and role.

General strategies included personal coping strategies; time management; work/study/life balance; and motional and practical support from family/friends; peers; supervisors and varied support services.

Everyday practical strategies included recognising the importance of taking breaks from the work of supervision and research, and doing almost anything else other than research and focusing on the research and student; regular physical exercise of a variety of sorts, from sports, to walks in the country; artistic and aesthetic activities, including listening to music and plays on the radio, watching drama on the TV, going to the theatre or concerts; and gardening. Supervisor stress management in this series of responses resembled stress management and wellbeing in a number of other contexts. These strategies resonate with those offered in the world of psychology and business, for example the five ways of behaving which enable wellbeing, resilience, reduce stress and offer a positive forward looking attitude: 'connect, be active, take notice, keep learning, give'(5 ways). Some mentioned problem-solving behaviours in relation to dealing with institutional

1
2
3 blockages, or alternatively using institutional processes to support them in their
4 work with students who were making little progress or wanted to leave.
5

6 Other authors identify similar or further, generic resilience and wellbeing
7 characteristics for coping (Dewe, P, 2008 p. 12), such as active participation in sport,
8 walking, running and also reading, socialising. Specifically, and in relation to the
9 literature, community and learning, all of these begin to appear in supervisors'
10 responses, although the practice of 'giving' is absent. However some supervisors did
11 talk about the positive aspects of a form of giving, of their time, their advice,
12 considered as 'leaning' on them, so that in times of mutual difficulty over the
13 project:
14
15
16
17

18 ...you might say I was kind of more of a maternal type of supervisor, holding
19 onto them to make sure they get there. (2, K)
20

21 Many supervisors are working long hours, although they derive pleasure from
22 the learning development of engaging with students' intellectual journeys,
23 investment in working alongside and helping students develop, being part of an
24 intellectual community sharing the issues around supervisory practice (for instance
25 in development sessions).
26
27
28

29 Those strategies specifically related to wellbeing in the research development and
30 student engagement areas engaged issues to do with the community, professional
31 identity, role, and the institution. They included developing a supportive community
32 of peers; management of the supervisor role; attending relevant training; self-
33 awareness; perseverance; open mindedness, being prepared to listen to criticism;
34 intercultural awareness; and encouraging students to manage expectations. One
35 supervisor focused on managing the role, managing expectations and developing
36 independence which will reduce supervisor as well as student stress:
37
38
39

40 In terms of positive wellbeing you want a level of clarity and I like the
41 students to have a level of clarity of exactly what they're supposed to be
42 doing so, you know, there will, you know, in my case there will be negotiation
43 of exactly what we're going to do over the coming year, there will be
44 deadlines, and that might be the first step. You obviously want them to get a
45 sense of, you know, become more independent so you may relax that over
46 time.(2, J)
47
48
49

50 Supervisors said that in times of conflict and difficulty that it was important to
51 develop the skills of positive thinking; an ability to keep perspective; and to be
52 compassionate with yourself.
53
54

55 Some specific supervisor wellbeing enhancement strategies aimed to support the
56 student. However, by managing the role and student experience, supervisors felt
57 that they can develop a more rounded sense of wellbeing. These strategies include:
58
59
60

holistic view of student; supervision tailored to needs and learning styles; encourage questioning; sharing experiences; signposting (colleagues, peers, networks) so student also relies on others and develops networks; encouraging participation in conferences; listening skills, empathy; regular contact (e.g. email); constructive feedback; and pastoral care. Taking care of the student, being aware of their differences and different needs, joining them into communities and groups and discussing learning expectations all seemed to help manage the relationships and the students' own progress, and so lessen supervisor stress and enhance resilience and wellbeing. Their learning from reflection and experience seems to show evidence of taking control, optimism, strategies supported by the work from positive psychology and future consciousness (Lombardo 2006a, 2007c). They often transferred their own learning to support for students, as one commented:

‘As a PhD is intrinsically an individualistic enterprise, it is important to nurture student resilience through creating a sense of belonging and developing relationships.’ (2, B)

Conditions for academic wellbeing for both students and supervisor include: a pro-research student culture – guidance, mentoring; training opportunities – personal/professional, technical and academic skills; access to funding; academic community with formal and informal opportunities to contribute; a pro-wellbeing culture – proactive, built into academic life; supportive infrastructure – access to services, facilities, pastoral care, monitoring.

One supervisor noted that the infrastructure and involvement of others helped relieve the sleeplessness and stress of their sense of inability to support and move a student on, when the student was stuck at a cognitive level which prevented theorising and critical engagement with the research:

I reduced my stress by getting confirmation of the problem but also by bringing other people in because I thought if other people approach this from different angles maybe they will make the breakthrough that I can't make. (2, G)

The supervisor noted 'the stress is empathy' (2, G) for the student and their experience of being stuck. Following a solution to the problem, this supervisor shared the idea of engaging in developmental dialogue and seeking support when difficult moments occur, noting that otherwise supervision is a lonely business, and one tied up with professional identity, which makes it even more problematic for some individuals:

I can now counsel supervisors who are stuck in the same positions because it's happened so I've learnt from it. (2, G)

For supervisors, resilience, wellbeing needs and strategies are necessary in the context of high stakes work with complex, intellectually engaged research. These strategies are also necessary for the personal interactions with the researchers, which continue over a long time, following the trajectory of discoveries, theorising blockages, and iterative enhancing of the research project and its written culmination: the thesis and research publications. Beyond the generic practices of relaxation, sport, diversion, and self-management, supervisors' resilience and wellbeing is specifically tied in with learning and community.

Theoretical and educational significance

Most of the work considering resilience and wellbeing has been carried out on student-supervisor interactions and latterly there has been work on difficulties in relationships and on learning progress (Strandler, et al 2014; Wisker and Robinson 2012, 2013). New work focusing on student-supervisor identity, wellbeing and resilience in the face of such difficulties offered and developed here offers useful insight into the more stressful areas of supervision and the interactions between personal, learning and institutional levels of problems and of support. The research study presented here looks at some of the successful strategies which supervisors recognise they have used and developed to support the whole process to a positive result. Many supervisors we consulted acknowledge stressful issues and resilience strategies centering around managing expectations, developing sound habits which reduce the stress of research and interactions, sharing good practice with others, and making good use of the infrastructural support of the university. They acknowledge that while the supervisor relationships and practices relate centrally to their own academic and whole identity, they need to step back, put it in perspective, and find local, personal, learning and institutional ways of managing the role. They also need to manage the ways in which the problems the role produces offer a threat to professional identity in terms of competency, and take note of the stress and ways of managing it in order to function in a successful and healthy manner. Interestingly, some of the negative responses to 'training' and development which emerged early in our work were countered by supervisors suggesting that development opportunities offered support, community and the sense that sharing issues and successful practices could make them both more effective and 'considerate' of themselves.

Conclusions

Little research to date focuses on issues related to PhD supervisor/student learning interactions and progress, even though these interactions specifically affect supervisor stress, wellbeing and resilience as well as professional identity among experienced supervisors. Our previous work and that of others on students and supervisor breakdowns, losses or terminations focused on emotional, stressful experiences in doctoral supervision relationships and the learning journey, largely

from the student perspective. However, supervisors also reported stress which was largely unexplored and un-researched. This stress included quite fundamental questioning of their ability to support and enable students to achieve their potential and a finished doctorate. We determined to look further into supervisor stress, wellbeing and resilience to bring these issues to the surface.

Research reported here suggests there is a range of concerns and issues, including many impacting upon supervisors' sense of professional identity. These results are shared here in the expectation that clarification can lead to positive action minimising stress and isolation, informing development of personal coping strategies, and enhancing institutional support. These actions will enhance the supervisory experience for the supervisor, and potentially for the students and their outcomes (this latter is hoped for but beyond the scope of the current research). These conclusions contribute new knowledge concerning supervisor experiences of interactions with students, projects and the institution; their sense of distress, confusion, blockage, and stress; and their strategies for wellbeing and managing expectations. The conclusions are understood using theories of academic identity and wellbeing, resilience considering relationships between supervisor, student, project and institutional context. Supervisors identify perceptions and practices enabling them to act professionally and personally for positive outcomes for wellbeing and identity, and for student research learning and project success.

References

Archer, L. (2008), "Younger academics' constructions of 'authenticity', 'success' and professional identity", *Studies in Higher Education*, 33, pp. 385-403.

Baker, V.L. and Lattuca, L.R. (2010), "Developmental networks and learning: toward an interdisciplinary perspective on identity development during doctoral study", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 35 No.7, pp. 807-827.

Budd, J., Scevak, J. and Cantwell, R. (2010), "'I don't want to do a PhD any more': Speaking the unspeakable in an online discussion forum", in Kiley, M. (Ed.), *Quality in Postgraduate Research Conference: Educating Researchers for the 21st Century*, Conference Proceedings, 13-15 April, 2010, Adelaide, p. 255.

Carver, C. and Scheier, M. (2005), "*Optimism*", in Snyder, C.R. and Lopez, S. (Eds), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Castello, M., Kobayashi, S., McGinn, M.K., Pechar, H., Vekkaila, J., Wisker, G. (2015), "Researcher Identity in transition: signals to identify and manage spheres of activity in a risk-career", *Frontline Learning Research*, Vol. 3 No. 3, Special Issue, pp. 19-33.

Clegg, S. (2008), "Academic identities under threat?", *British Educational Research Journal*, 34, pp. 29-345.

- Davies, A. and Danaher, P.A. (2014), "Capacity-building for western expatriate nurses and Australian early career researchers' procedia", *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, pp. 373-381.
- Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1997), *Supervising the PhD, A Guide to Success*, Bucks: Open University Press.
- Dewe, P. (2008), Well-being and work challenges report, London: Foresight mental capital and wellbeing project, p. 12.
- Fredrickson, B. (2005), "Positive emotions", in Snyder, C.R. and Lopez, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Golde, C.M. (1998), "Beginning graduate school: explaining first year doctoral attrition", *New Directions for Higher Education*, 101, pp. 55-64.
- Grant, B.M. (2008), "Agonistic struggle master-slave dialogues in humanities supervision", *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 9-27.
- Haksever, A.M. and Manisali, E. (2000), "Assessing supervision requirements of PhD students: the case of construction management and engineering in the UK", *European Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 19-32.
- Halse, C. (2011), "'Becoming a supervisor': the impact of doctoral supervision on supervisors' learning", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 557-570.
- Howard, S. and Johnson, B. (2004), "Resilient teachers: resisting stress and burnout", *Social Psychology of Education*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 399-420.
- Ivanic, R. (1998), *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Johansson, T., Wisker, G., Claesson, S., Strandler, O. and Saalman, S. (2014), "PhD. supervision as an emotional process – critical situations and emotional boundary work", *Pertanika: Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 22, p. 21.
- Keyes, C. and Lopez, S. (2005), "Toward a science of mental health: positive directions in diagnosis and interventions", in Snyder, C.R. and Lopez, S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Kiley, M. and Wisker, G. (2008), "'Now you see it, now you don't': identifying and supporting the achievement of doctoral work which embraces threshold concepts and crosses conceptual thresholds", Paper presented at the Threshold concepts: From theory to practice, Queen's University, Kingston Ontario Canada.

Lee, A. (2008), "How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 267-281.

Lombardo, T. and Richter, J. (2004), "Evolving future consciousness through the pursuit of virtue", in Didsbury, H. (Ed.), *Thinking Creatively in Turbulent Times*, World Future Society, Bethesda, MD.

Lombardo, T. (2005), "The value of future consciousness", in Wagner, C. (Ed.), *Foresight, Innovation, and Strategy*, World Future Society, Bethesda, MD.

Lombardo, T. (2006a), *The Evolution of Future Consciousness: The Nature and Historical Development of the Human Capacity to Think about the Future*, Author House, Bloomington, IN.

Lombardo, T. (2006d), "Developing constructive and creative attitudes and behaviors about the future: part I – deep learning, emotion, and motivation" in *World Futures Study Federation*, *Futures Bulletin*, Vol. 31 No. 6.

Lombardo, T. (2007b), "Developing constructive and creative attitudes and behaviors about the future: part II – Thinking and Imagination" in *World Futures Study Federation*, *Futures Bulletin*, Vol. 32 No. 1.

Lombardo, T. (2007c), "Developing constructive and creative attitudes and behaviors about the future: part III – the self-narrative, optimism and self-efficacy, and the evolving future self" in *World Futures Study Federation*, *Futures Bulletin*, Vol. 32 No. 2.

Lombardo, T. (2007d), "Developing constructive and creative attitudes and behaviors about the future: part IV – wisdom, virtues, and the ideal future self-narrative" in *World Futures Study Federation*, *Futures*, 32 No. 3.

Lombardo, T. (2009) "Understanding and teaching future consciousness", *On the Horizon*, Vol. 17 Iss: 2, pp.85-97, available at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10748120910965476>

Manathunga, C. (2007), "Intercultural postgraduate supervision: ethnographic journeys of identity and power", in Palfreyman D. and McBride D.L. (Eds.), *Learning and Teaching across Cultures in Higher Education*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 93, 95.

McAlpine, L. and Amundsen, C. (2009), "Identity and agency: pleasures and collegiality among the challenges of the doctoral journey", *Studies in Continuing Education*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 109-125.

Morris, C. and Wisker, G. (2011), "Troublesome encounters: strategies for managing the wellbeing of masters and doctoral education students during their learning

processes", HEA ESCalate subject centre report, available at: <http://escalate.ac.uk/6828>.

Morris. C. (Ed.) (2010), *Wellbeing and the Research Student*, Falmer: University of Brighton Press.

Muurlink, O. and Poyatos Matas, C. (2010), "A higher degree of stress: academic wellbeing", in Morris, C. (Ed.), *Wellbeing and the Research Student*, Falmer: University of Brighton Press.

Nightingale, P. (2005), "Advising PhD candidates", Milperra, New South Wales: HERDSA.

Park, A., Curtice, J., Thomson, K., Philips, M., Johnson, M. (Eds.), (2005) *The British Social Attitudes Survey: Perspectives on a changing society*. NatCen Social Research London: Sage.

Poyatos Matas, C. (2008), "An innovative approach to research supervision", Paper presented at the University of Brighton Learning and Teaching Conference, Brighton, UK.

Poyatos Matas, C. (2009), "A new approach to research supervision", in Barlow, J., Louw, G. and Rice, M., (Eds.), *Social Purpose and Creativity – Integrating Learning in the Real World*, Falmer: University of Brighton Press.

Poyatos Matas, C. and Tannoch-Bland, J. (2011, under review), "The academic life balancing skills program: a window into academic wellbeing for research students", *The International Journal of Doctoral Studies*.

Pyhältö, K., Nummenmaa, A.R., Soini, T., Stubb, J. and Lonka, K. (2012a), "Research on scholarly communities and development of scholarly identity in Finnish doctoral education", in Ahola, T.S. and Hoffman, D.M. (Eds.), *Higher Education Research in Finland: Emerging Structures and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 337–357). Jyväskylä, Finland: Jyväskylä University Press.

Pyhältö, K. and Keskinen, J. (2012b), "Doctoral students' sense of relational agency in their scholarly communities", *International Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 136-149.

Reading, A. (2004), *Hope and Despair: How Perceptions of the Future Shape Human Behavior*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Ryff, C. and Keyes, C. (1995), "The structure of psychological wellbeing revisited", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 69 No. 4, October, pp. 719-72.

Seligman, M. (1998), *Learned Optimism: How to Change Your Mind and Your Life*, Pocket Books, New York, NY.

Spiller, D., Byrnes, G., and Bruce Ferguson, P. (2013), "Enhancing postgraduate supervision through a process of conversational inquiry", *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 833-845.

Stevens-Long, J. and Barner, R. (2006), "Advanced avenues in adult development and learning: the role of doctoral study", in Hoare, C. (Ed.), *Handbook of Adult Development and Learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 445-75.

Strandler, O., Johansson, T., Wisker, G. and Claesson, S. (2014), "Supervisor or counsellor? – emotional boundary work in supervision", *International Journal of Researcher Development*.

Van den Berg, H. (2014), "The well-being of inexperienced doctoral supervisors", Paper delivered to the Quality Postgraduate Research conference, Adelaide.

Vekkaila, J., Pyhältö, K. and Lonka, K. (2013), "Experiences of disengagement – a study of doctoral students in the behavioral sciences", *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 8, pp. 61-81.

Wilkinson, D., The Fear Course at: www.fearcourse.com/David-Wilkinson.html (accessed 24/12/2015)

Wisker, G. (2005, 2012), *The Good Supervisor: Supervising Postgraduate and Undergraduate Research for Doctoral Theses and Dissertations*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wisker, G. (2008), *The Postgraduate Research Handbook* (2nd edn.), Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wisker, G., Morris, C., Cheng, M., Masika, R., Warnes, M., Lilly, J., Trafford, V. and Robinson, G. (2010), "Doctoral learning journeys – final report of the NTFS-funded project", available at: http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/ntfs/Projects/Doctoral_Learning_Journeys.

Wisker, G., Morris, C., Warnes, M., Lilly, J. (2009), "Doctoral learning journeys", *Assessment Learning and Teaching Journal*, Leeds Metropolitan University.

Wisker, G and Robinson G. (2012), "Doctoral 'orphans': nurturing and supporting the success of postgraduates who have lost their supervisors", *HERD*, Vol. 32 No. 2.

Wisker, G and Robinson G. (2013), "Picking up the pieces: supervisor and doctoral 'orphans'", *International Journal for Researcher Development*, Vol. 3 No. 2.

(Author), "Crossing liminal spaces: encouraging postgraduate students to cross conceptual thresholds and achieve threshold concepts in their research", in Kiley, M. and Mullins, G. (Eds.), *Quality in postgraduate research: Research education in the new global environment – Part 2: Conference Proceedings*, Canberra: CEDAM, ANU.

[http://www.businessballs.com/freespecialresources / Five_Ways_to_Well-being-NEF.pdf](http://www.businessballs.com/freespecialresources/Five_Ways_to_Well-being-NEF.pdf) (accessed 24 /12/2015), available at:
<http://www.thehubevents.com/events/resilient-leadership-how-to-survive-under-pressure-55>