

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON CREATIVE PRACTICE AS RESEARCH AND HDR SUPERVISION

Prepared by Dr Elizabeth Ellison

For the project

Developed through the Office of Learning and Teaching grant:
Building distributed leadership for effective supervision of creative practice higher research degrees. LE12-2264

12 Principles for the Effective Supervision of Creative Practice Higher Research Degrees

<http://supervisioncreativeartsphd.net>

This annotated bibliography is a snapshot of some of the major works within the areas of supervision; creative practice; and higher education. Each article is given a subject area for reference.

Armstrong, Steven J. 2004. "The impact of supervisors' cognitive styles on the quality of research supervision in management education." *The British Journal Of Educational Psychology* 74 (Pt 4): 599-616. DOI: 10.1348/0007099042376436

Supervision style

Armstrong's article is an examination of the effect a supervisor's cognitive style could have on the quality and completion success rate of a student. It refers specifically to students within a United Kingdom university, from the field of management education. The article provides an overview of cognitive style, reviewing previous literature and noting the possible differences, for example, between an analytical and a nonconformist individual. Overall, the study discovered that supervisors who were analytical in their cognitive style were more likely to complete students and for the students to finish with higher grades on their dissertations.

Australian, Government. 2011. *Defining Quality for Research Training in Australia: A Consultation Paper*: Department of Innovation: Industry, Science and Research. <http://www.innovation.gov.au/Research/ResearchWorkforceIssues/Documents/DefiningQualityforResearchTraininginAustralia.pdf>.

Baker, Su, Brad Buckley, Australian Learning Council and Teaching. 2009. *Creative Arts PhD: Future-proofing the creative arts in higher education*: University of Melbourne, University of Sydney.

Creative Arts in higher education

Baker and Buckley's Office of Learning and Teaching supported project was a significant study into the creative arts doctorate process (including both PhDs and professional doctorates) over a wide

array of national universities. The report included quantitative data of the number of PhDs and their statistical information and also qualitative data, such as interviews with postgraduate supervisors. The project aimed to "provide an overview of current practices, which in turn could then provide the basis for the discussion of best practice and movement towards consideration by the sector of benchmark standards" (Baker and Buckley 2009, 12).

The project encountered issues defining creative arts disciplines at universities, acknowledging this as a limitation of the study. "These [inconsistencies in data figures] along with difficulties encountered in distinguishing specific creative arts disciplines mean that the statistical data within the report should be considered as providing an informed impression of a situation which is generally indicative of trends in the field" (15).

It is worth noting that one of the project outcomes was the apparent development of the website: www.creativeartsphd.com, however, this no longer appears to be an active site.

The project established many recommendations for the creative arts PhD/doctoral process, including issues around terminology confusion, admission processes, and examination concerns. Of particular importance to *Building Distributed Leadership* are the findings on supervision. Baker and Buckley ultimately recommend:

Further examination of patterns of supervision could assist in establishing some best practice models to assist in creative-arts-specific research supervision training programs. Similarly, some collation of the number of art and design staff with doctoral qualification would be useful (97).

They raise a number of issues that emerged from the interviews with postgraduate coordinators. These revolved around the differing practices universities took to selecting supervisors for their incoming candidates, the management of supervisor workload, and the review system for problematic candidates. The report identified the crucial role supervision plays in the success of a candidacy, stating: "supervision was seen as a critical factor in the success or otherwise of the student's experience and the quality of the submission" (77).

The final report lists the following seven issues related to supervision, which *Building Distributed Leadership* needs to consider:

- Register of supervisors
 - Some universities required registration of supervisors, whereas others did not. Ultimately the inconsistency in the requirements for supervisors was a trend across universities: for example, some supervisors were required to attend training while others were not (77).
- Number of candidates per supervisor
 - The report identified the issues around overloading supervisors with too many students and how to manage candidate demand. The report suggests that "the number of staff in combination with the number of candidates staff are allowed to supervise determines how many PhD students an art school can enrol" (77).
- Training for supervisors
 - As mentioned there are some differences in the requirements for supervisors at differing universities that ideally would be nationalised. These included who was providing training – local or central – and the mandatory attendance of such events.
- Supervision of the written component
 - Again, this was an area of difference between universities, and leads into the next point.

- Trend to have components supervised by one supervisor and changes in the qualifications of staff in art schools
 - The report identifies a shift to having supervisors oversee the entire thesis rather than only the exegetical component or the creative component. Also, the report identified that many universities would accept a doctoral qualification for a supervisor, or an equivalent, which established problems like generational differences and a lack of understanding related to the administrative elements of the PhD (89-90).
- Management of supervisors
 - “Assuring the quality of supervision is a really hard job [...] There’s no equivalent at postgraduate level for that kind of immediate feedback from students themselves. And so knowing what’s going on between a supervisor and a candidate is really difficult for me unless I have a really close involvement in the program” – excerpt of interview from postgraduate coordinator as quoted in the report (91).
 - The problems of accountability and management of supervisors was one raised in the report. The process is one often difficult to pin down.
- Number of supervisors available
 - The report raised the issue of shortages of supervisors in some areas, and especially the growing expectation for newly employed staff to have a PhD (91).

These concerns that Baker and Buckley have raised are ones that *Building Distributed Leadership* will refer to or address further in its examination of the processes around supervision of the creative arts. As mentioned, this project limited itself to a discussion of the visual arts and crafts discipline rather than a wider scope of candidates and supervisors. Therefore, there is still a gap around the best practice supervision models across the discipline of the creative arts as a whole. Similarly, there was not much articulation around creative practice as a methodological choice for candidates. This is a particular point of diversion for *Building Distributed Leadership* that aims to develop best practice principles for creative practice higher research degrees (HDR) supervision.

Bargar, Robert R. and James K. Duncan. 1982. "Cultivating Creative Endeavor in Doctoral Research." *The Journal of Higher Education* 53 (1): 1-31.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981536>

Bartlett, Alison and Gina Mercer, eds. 2001. *Postgraduate Research Supervision: Transforming (R)Elations*. Vol. 11. New York, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
<http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED455745>.

Supervision style (including creative practice)

Bartlett and Mercer’s book is now over ten years old. It is, as they describe, an “intimate and detailed” look at postgraduate research supervision, primarily telling stories. This approach resonates with *Building Distributed Leadership*; a result of our interviews was the emergence of an interest in case studies rather than prescriptive guidelines on how to supervise. Therefore, Bartlett and Mercer’s approach is an interesting one. The book includes a chapter specifically on creative practice (Perry and Brophy), written by a supervisor and his student completing a creative practice PhD. Primarily conversational and written as a form of dialogue, the chapter provides an example of a ‘real’ case. Considering the timing of the publication and the references to uncertainty around creative writing as research, it is likely that this chapter (while now somewhat outdated) remains an interest point.

**Barrett, Estelle. 2006. "Creative arts practice, creative industries: method and process as cultural capital. *Speculation and Innovation: (SPIN) Conference Proceedings, Brisbane, 2006: 1-13.* Queensland University of Technology.
<http://en.scientificcommons.org/38152153>.**

Creative Practice – valuable research

Barrett's article is a discussion of the integral role that creative practice has as part of the creative industries. She suggests that, at this time (2006), there was still a need to establish "the benefits of artistic production *as research* and to delineate criteria for measuring such benefits" (2006, 1). Barrett's article was written in a period where creative practice as a theoretical underpinning was still developing within the university framework. Barrett and her frequent co-publisher Bolt, are considered groundbreaking researchers in the area. This article was one of the first to cement the idea of creative practice as research as valuable.

Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt. 2010. "Practice as Research Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry". London: I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd.

**Berger, J. 2008. "Exploring ways to shorten the ascent to a Ph.D." *The New York Times*.
http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/03/education/03education.html?_r=1.**

Higher education - international

A short article, now outdated, about higher education – the PhD in particular – in the United States. The author discusses funding and timely completions, mentioning the average student (at time of publishing) finishes a PhD in 8.2 years.

Biggs, Michael and Daniela Buchler. 2008. "Eight criteria for practice-based research in the creative and cultural industries." *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education* 7 (1): 5-18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/adch.7.1.5_1

**Biggs, Michael and Daniela Buechler. 2009. "Supervision in an alternative paradigm." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses Special Is* (6).
<http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue6/Biggs&Buchler.pdf>**

Supervision style

Biggs and Buchler challenge the traditional academic questions and paradigms that surround HDR studies and instead suggest alternative paradigms (or worldviews) to use in the creative arts. Their research is particularly relevant to creative practice and suggests understanding that process is an integral part of successful supervision.

Firstly, they establish the four issues that suggest something is a research activity: "the possession of a question and an answer, the presence of something corresponding to the term 'knowledge', a method that connected the answers in a meaningful way to the questions that were asked, and an audience for whom all this would have significance" (2009, 8). These four elements form the basis of the science based, conventional approaches to HDR theses.

However, Biggs and Buchler argue that these are not appropriate for creative arts degrees, particularly those that incorporate elements of personal creative output. Instead, they suggest that the following four components are essential to creative arts research:

- The image (artefact) – not merely an illustration
 - This might refer to the thesis overall as a combination of both the theoretical and creative components: “[W]here the image or the artwork was either generating the question, or was an instrumental component in the response to the question, or formed an integral part of the communication of the outcome” (2009, 9). Importantly, the image is instrumental in *generating* the question (it is not only a response to it).
- Form of outcome – for example, the creative production
 - The creative production is, Biggs and Buchler stress, more than a descriptive work and does not stand in for creative research on its own. “*The mere presence of art was not indicative of a novel paradigm called artistic research*” – therefore, the form was not significant without the content (9).
- Vocabulary and rhetoric – not necessarily fitting with the established vocabulary of the research structure
 - This primarily responds to the theoretical component of the thesis (often known as the exegesis), however, this point refers to understanding the context of the field and its language.
- And, personal experience
 - “[P]ersonal experience, the subjective aesthetic response, was the beginning of the interpretation of the object” (9) and therefore was an important part of the process, despite traditional research methods excluding all personal experience and reflection. This is a key point of difference between creative practice and more traditional forms of research, as has been mentioned by many theorists in the area. Therefore, this reflective component must be carefully maneuvered alongside the theoretical and creative parts.

Biggs and Buchler’s article is more primarily concerned with establishing the points of difference between creative practice (the alternative paradigm) and conventional research degrees. Therefore, their discussion of supervision is somewhat limited. They do suggest that the supervisor must play a negotiated and flexible role in the creation of the product and continually throughout the candidature. The supervisor should also help the student establish their worldview (2009, 10): “[W]e claim that supervision of the PhD in areas of creative practice is perceived as complex only when it attempts to produce research that imitates received paradigms rather than being in accordance with its own worldview” (2009, 12). This article from as late as 2009, by suggesting its perceived complexity, shows that creative practice as a concept is often still considered intangible and misunderstood by people outside of the field.

Building Distributed Leadership continued this dialogue of complexity by asking questions around the advantages and disadvantages of creative practice degrees. Interestingly, the question of the *value* of creative practice and its difficult relationship with more traditional areas of research was one raised many times.

Bills, Dianne. 2004. "Supervisors' conceptions of research and the implications for supervisor development." *International Journal for Academic Development* 9 (1): 85-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1360144042000296099>

Blass, Eddie, Santina Bertone, Anne Jasman, Ronel Erwee, Ron Adams, Helen Borland, Kevin Tickle, Qing-Long Han, Joe Luca and Craig Standing. 2011. "Developing a toolkit and framework to support new postgraduate research supervisors in emerging research areas". Swinburne University of Technology: Office for Learning and Teaching.

Supervision style:

This is an ongoing OLT grant (funded in 2011 for two years). The project aims to provide a type of toolkit for novice PhD supervisors across emerging research areas (including the creative arts). The project at this stage has developed a web portal (log in access required), which can be found at <http://altcresearchsupervisionproject.ning.com>.

Bolt, Barbara. 2004. *Art beyond representation: the performative power of the image*. London & New York: IB Tauris.

**Bolt, Barbara. 2008. "A performative paradigm for the creative arts?" *Working Papers in Art and Design* (5).
http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol5/bbfull.html**

Creative practice:

An important addition to the growing field of creative practice research, Bolt's article extends on Haseman's introduction of the term 'performative research'. She develops the question of establishing validity for the performative paradigm; and also brings up questions of success and failure and the inherent assessability of performance itself. This is an important text in the area of creative practice research.

Boud, David and Alison Lee. 2009. *Changing practices of doctoral education*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Bourke, Nikki, Brad Haseman, Daniel Mafe and Richard Vella (eds). 2005. "Speculation and Innovation: (SPIN) Conference Proceedings, Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology, 2005.

**Bourke, Nike and Philip Neilsen. 2004. "The Problem of the Exegesis in Creative Writing Higher Degrees." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses Special Is* (3).
<http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue3/bourke.htm>
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/4598/>**

Creative practice: theory and practice interaction

Bourke and Neilsen's article is an examination of the exegesis, the theoretical component of the creative practice higher research degree. The article refers specifically to creative writing HDRs. In particular, their article addresses what they consider "the three main areas of concern: the validity of the exegesis, its necessity, and its usefulness" (1). Now somewhat outdated (for instance, at the time of publication the Creative Writing discipline at QUT, the case study for the article, had no PhD completions), the article introduces some critical ideas around the exegesis and its role in the creative practice higher research degree.

**Bourke, Sid, John Hattie and Lorin Anderson. 2004. "Predicting examiner recommendations on Ph.D. theses." *International Journal of Educational Research* 41 (2): 178-194.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S088303550500025X>**

Brew, Angela. 2001. "Conceptions of Research: a phenomenographic study." *Studies in Higher Education* 26 (3): 271-285.
<http://gateway.library.qut.edu.au/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=5203194&site=ehost-live>

Higher education:

Brew's article is a discussion around the articulation of what research is. Brew maintains that, at the time of publication, there was little research into examining definitions of research. Her article produces three 'conceptions' of research based on investigations into researchers in Australia based on interviews. While not strictly related to supervision or creative practice higher research degrees, Brew's article does raise interesting questions about the ability to articulate what research means. However, *Building Distributed Learning* found some evidence to dispute this idea – suggesting, perhaps, that in the creative practice research areas, researchers (in particular, supervisors) are likely to view articulating their research as an important part of validating it as worthwhile research outcomes.

Brien, Donna Lee, Sandra Burr, Jen Webb and Office of Learning and Teaching. 2010.
Examination of doctoral degrees in creative arts: process, practice and standards:
Central University Queensland, University of Canberra.
<http://creativedoexams.org.au/about>.

Brien, Donna Lee and Rosemary Williamson. 2009. "Supervising the creative arts research higher degree: towards best practice." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses Special Is* (6). <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue6/Brien&Williamson.pdf>

Supervision style:

Donna Lee Brien and Rosemary Williams, along with another colleague Jen Webb, have published and research much in the area of creative practice research and HDRs. Their OLT supported grant, around examination of creative practice HDRs, illuminated some of the continuing problems surrounding location, quality, and cost of creative practice (often exhibition based) research degrees. *Text* hosted a special issue in 2009, called *Supervising the creative arts research higher degree: towards best practice*. In this brief introduction, they maintain the necessity for establishing a best practice approach to supervision of the creative arts because of its areas of difference to more conventional supervision processes.

Initially, Brien and Williamson establish that all supervisors face struggles:

[T]he supervisor-student relationship today faces many pressures: workload demands; internal and external competition; conflicting individual needs; new modes of communication; an increasingly client-focused, customer-normed higher education sector; and a growing emphasis on metric evaluative mechanisms for measuring research quality, which includes the number of research degree completions (2009, 1).

A particular issue they mention is that many supervisor-student roles and relationships can be challenged by "unclear or differing expectations" (ibid). The *Text* issue attempts to explore aspects of best practice specifically in supervision of research higher degrees. Articles include discussions of face-to-face/distance supervision, the notion of 'transference', and identifying what factors are crucial for positive outcomes. What this introduction best shows is the importance that has been placed on creative practice HDRs and the significant role supervision plays within that.

Brown, Andrew R. and Daniel Mafe. 2006. "Emergent Matters: Reflections on Collaborative Practice-led Research", *Speculation and Innovation (SPIN) Conference, Brisbane, 2006*, edited by Richard Vella and Brad Haseman, 1-12.

Brown, A. R. and A. C. Sorensen. 2009. "Integrating Creative Practice and Research in the Digital Media Arts, edited by Hazel Smith and Roger Dean, 153-165. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/27515/>.

Bruce, Christine. 2009. *Towards a Pedagogy of Supervision in the technology disciplines*. Brisbane. <http://www.olt.gov.au/resource-towards-pedagogy-supervision-qut-2009>.

Supervision style

Christine Bruce's Australian Learning and Teaching Council (now the Office of Learning and Teaching) fellowship project was an exploration into the practice of supervision in the technology disciplines. The final report included the collection of data, findings, recommendations, and links to the best practice framework that Bruce and her team suggested should become employed in technology disciplines nationwide. This fellowship was a significant undertaking that generated many resources and recommendations. It is therefore, despite its difference in discipline, of great interest to the *Building Distributed Leadership* project because of its wide reaching coverage.

The report established some major points of interest in the supervision practice. Firstly, the project addressed the "dimension of the teaching-research nexus" (2009, 9), and questioned how supervisors were approaching their practice. The report found:

In practice, while many universities position research higher degree supervision at least in some respect as a teaching and learning practice, typically supervisors largely consider supervision as part of their research endeavour rather than as part of their teaching endeavour (9).

Therefore, the report raises the question of how to approach supervision practice, and also importantly, has connotations for the development of supervisor training. Ultimately, Bruce suggests that the key element of supervision practice is to encourage conversation around supervision practice and self-reflection to establish personal preference and engagement with pedagogical tools. This is a similar suggestion to Williamson et al's suggestion in their article from 2008 and it is something that emerged from the *Building Distributed Leadership* project as well: self-reflection is a key component to supervision. For creative practice supervisors, considering the familiarity of many practitioners with reflection as an integral part of the practice, this approach to supervision therefore makes logical sense.

Bruce and her team held interviews and small group discussions to collect their data. The scope of the project allowed for a significant period of data collection. They qualitatively analysed the issues raised and used the results to shape the best practice framework points of discussion. This then formed the third phase, which asked supervisors to comment on the suggested approaches to pedagogy of supervision.

The report includes a table of the Nine Pedagogies, or the nine ways "of thinking about teaching and learning in supervision in the technology disciplines" (13-14). The table addresses various orientations with curriculum (for example, academic discipline, personal relevance, social impact, and so on), and also arranges the information in terms of the supervisors' experience with content, their intentions and strategies. Ultimately what the table suggests is to show that the student perspective and the supervisory practice necessarily exist alongside one another.

The report found three approaches to supervision in the technology discipline:

- **Scaffolding** – *When adopting a scaffolding approach, we emphasise the procedures of supervision. The scaffolding approach is concerned with the need for structure for students, especially around project management to encourage systematic progress.*
- **Relationship** – *When adopting a relationship approach, we emphasise personal interactions. The relationship approach is concerned with the interactions and needs of the people involved in supervision.*
- **Direction Setting** – *When adopting a direction setting approach, we emphasise research objectives and outcomes. The direction setting approach is concerned with forwarding the research agenda more than with pedagogy (14).*

These three approaches are potential comparison points with creative practice supervision, to establish whether they are interdisciplinary concepts that are identifiable beyond the technology environment.

The report also identified eight types of supervisory strategies:

- **Creating groups** – *drawing key players together for conversation, on a regular basis.*
- **Creating or structure** – *project managing planning, with an emphasis on the process.*
- **Generating outputs** – *ensuring timely deliverables, the outcomes aspect of project management.*
- **Creating space** – *providing intellectual space, reducing structure to allow creativity and inspiration. Establishing collaboration – forming learning communities, with the student as a colleague.*
- **Focusing on the big picture** – *incorporating the context of the candidature, for example the student's career goals.*
- **Negotiating expectations** – *setting up the program for success, by establishing high standards. Pursuing established programs – contributing to previously determined research agendas (14).*

Again, these are concepts that are probably of interest in an interdisciplinary context and could play a part in the *Building Distributed Leadership* project by providing a base for supervision exploration.

Supervisors were identified as fitting within one of three roles. The report clarifies that these are not classifications, rather capture the range of options that supervisors may adopt through their students' candidature (16):

- **Directing roles** *emphasise the supervisor's input into the candidacy, for example Manager or Director.*
- **Collaborative roles** *emphasise supervisors working with students as equals, for example Partner or Colleague.*
- **Responsive roles** *emphasise meeting students' needs. They are adopted as required throughout the candidature, for example, Mentor, Coach, Advisor, Networker, Supporter, Editor, Nurturer, Counsellor, Intermediary, Parent and Friend (16).*

These roles may prove universally accepted, and may be relevant also to supervisors of creative practice students.

The report makes a number of recommendations to improve and encourage awareness of supervision practice in the technology discipline. There are eight recommendations, all of which have the possibility to translate to alternative disciplines. They encourage adopting and adapting the pedagogical framework that the report has generated and establishing it within universities. The report suggests conversations around supervision practice are crucial, as is promoting communication about supervision as a teaching and learning practice. Like other reports (including

the fIRST project), Bruce recommends a mentor scheme for less experienced supervisors, and to increase support for both supervisors and students. Finally, the report believes the introduction of faculty level awards and the increase of postgraduate researchers (with an aim to provide regeneration of the supervision pedagogy in the future) will greatly assist in the improvement in supervision practices in the technology disciplines.

The report suggests directly to the OLT that the framework could be adapted and developed to coordinate with other disciplines. Bruce also suggests building on Borthwick and Wissler's (2003, 10) theory to consolidate a large scale enquiry into "views and practices of individual supervisors in relation to graduate capabilities" (21). A point of interest from the report is also the way the report data collection – interviews and small group discussions – also had benefits:

Holding conversations with supervisors in small group and workshop contexts raised awareness of each others' approaches. Interest in adopting the approaches of colleagues was explicitly commented on in evaluation responses. Individual interviews enabled supervisors to become aware of their own, previously implicit, thinking. Supervisors' new self-awareness was commented on explicitly in their evaluation comments (24).

The below references are all outputs of Bruce's fellowship.

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2009. *A pedagogical framework for the technology disciplines*. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28536/>.

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2009. "Resource for supervisors." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28542/>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2009. "Resource for supervisors and cases." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28592/1/c28592.pdf>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2009. "Student resources for the use of supervisors." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28585/>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2009. "Towards a pedagogy of RHD supervision in the technology disciplines." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/18869/1/c18869.pdf>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2010. "Science and technology supervision resources." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/38456/>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2012. "Resources to assist research student supervision." <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/50553/>

Bruce, Christine and Ian Stoodley. 2013. "Experiencing higher degree research supervision as teaching." *Studies in Higher Education*. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/40969/>. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2011.576338.

Candlin, Fiona. 2000. "A proper anxiety? Practice based PhDs and academic unease." *Working Papers in Art and Design* 1. http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol1/candlin2full.html

Creative practice + higher education

Candlin's article, now 13 years old, is a reminder of when creative practice PhDs remained an area of academic unease. She examines the role anxiety can play in a PhD candidature, both for supervisor and student. Some of this anxiety is arguably lessened in the contemporary climate which acknowledges creative practice PhDs more readily.

Carey, Janene, Jen Webb and Donna Lee Brien. 2008. "A plethora of policies: examining creative research higher degrees in Australia." *Creativity and Uncertainty: AAWP 2008 University of Technology, Sydney, 2008*, edited by Donna Lee Brien and Lucy Neave. <http://www.aawp.org.au/files/CareyWebbBrien.pdf>.

Creative practice + higher education

Carey, Webb, and Brien were funded by the Office of Learning and Teaching to explore the process of examination in creative practice higher research degrees. Their final report is also included in this reference list. Their strongest recommendation was to generate a sense of cohesiveness and consistency in the examination process across institutions nationally. Something of relevance to *Building Distributed Leadership* is the question "whether these [creative practice] degrees should be required to make a contribution to knowledge or to culture, or both" (10).

Carson, Susan. 2012. "Risky Business: managing creative practice postgraduates". Adelaide, South Australia.

Carter, Paul. 2004. *Material thinking: the theory and practice of creative research*. Carlton, Vic: Melbourne University Publishing.

Cater-Steel, Aileen and Jacque McDonald. 2009. "Developing research supervisors: breaking down internal barriers and drawing on resources from the Australasian academic community". Coventry, United Kingdom.

Cleveland, Paul. 2009. "Poetics of the Visual", *ACUADS 2009: Interventions in the Public Domain, Queensland College of Art, Griffith University*, edited by Ross Woodrow. <http://kali.qca.gu.edu.au/ACUADS/acuads2009-web/authors09.htm>.

Council of Australian, Deans and Studies Directors of Graduate. 2008. *Framework for Best Practice in Doctoral Research Education in Australia*. www.daad.de/id-e_berlin/media/pdf/australia_best_practice.pdf.

Higher education:

This document is an important policy document that outlines the guidelines all national universities in Australia are required to follow.

Cumming, James. 2007. "Representing the complexity, diversity and particularity of the doctoral enterprise in Australia." PhD Thesis, Australian National University. <https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/46612>.

Dally, Kerry, Allyson Holbrook, Miranda Lawry and Anne Graham. 2004. "Assessing the exhibition and the exegesis in visual arts higher degrees: perspectives of examiners." *Working Papers in Art and Design 3*. http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol3/kdfull.html

Higher education

In this paper, Dally, Holbrook, Lawry and Graham provide findings from their research into the examination process of visual arts creative practice PhDs. The report includes general discussion of findings and excerpts from the interviews conducted. The analysis itself is not of great significance to our project because of its lack of specific reference to supervision. Examination, however, is an integral component of the PhD candidate's journey and its significance to supervision is apparent.

The article does help establish the murky ground of creative practice HDRs and flag the need for clearer terminology across the board. Interestingly, the report suggests that there was a surprising level of consistency across the 15 Visual Arts examiners that they interviewed. Despite the differences institutionally, the consensus on what was considered acceptable both in terms of artistic merits and with the exegetical component was almost absolute:

The fact that there was a general agreement about the qualities and standards that examiners anticipated in a Visual Arts doctorate seem all the more remarkable given that there is such variation in the guidelines provided by Australian institutions and that this group of examiners came from a range of different backgrounds, including curators, art historians, art practitioners and academics (end).

Initially, Dally et al covers the literature, suggesting the barriers between scientific and creative research: "Some members believe that scientific methods, such as formulating hypotheses, pursuing solutions and reaching conclusions may be incompatible with artistic practice" (2004, para 3). The article uses Eisner's (1995) definition of research, the aim of which is to advance understanding, to articulate the importance of artistic representations: "[they] have the capacity to contribute to this advance by recontextualizing the familiar and awakening viewers to new ways of seeing, thinking and knowing" (para 4).

The article highlighted the importance, according to the examiners, of both the exhibition (product) and the exegesis (process). The two elements have to speak together in order to be successful for the awarding of the degree, but the examiners also suggest that there is a likelihood to allow the exhibition to a) speak for itself (para 17), and b) to potentially 'carry' the exegetical work if of a lower quality (para 34).

The idea of quality assurance is one that came up frequently throughout the *Building Distributed Leadership* project and Dally et al (as well as Brien and Webb's examination project) both make mention of the sometimes difficult balance between the creative and the theoretical/exegetical component.

de Freitas, Nancy. 2002. "Towards a definition of studio documentation: working tool and transparent record." *Working Papers in Art and Design* 2. http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol2/freitasfull.html

Delamont, S., P. Atkinson and O. Parry. 2004. *Supervising the Doctorate: A Guide to Success*. 2nd ed. Maidenhead: Open University.

Delamont, Sara, Odette Parry and Paul Atkinson. 1998. "Creating a delicate balance: The doctoral supervisor's dilemmas." *Teaching in Higher Education* 3 (2): 157-157. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1356215980030203>

Denholm, Carey and Terry Evans. 2006. *Doctorates Downunder: Keys to Successful Doctoral Study in Australia and New Zealand*. Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press.

<http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=321455427359632;res=IELHSS>.

Denholm, Carey, Tony Evans and Barry Jones. 2007. *Supervising Doctorates Downunder Keys to Effective Supervision in Australia and New Zealand*: ACER Press International Specialized Book Services Distributor.

Deuchar, Ross. 2008. "Facilitator, director or critical friend?: contradiction and congruence in doctoral supervision styles." *Teaching in Higher Education* 13 (4): 489-500.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510802193905>

Durling, David. 2002. "Discourses on research and the PhD in Design." *Quality Assurance in Education* 10 (2): 79-85. DOI: 10.1108/09684880210423564

Egan, Rylan, Denise Stockley, Brenda Brouwer, Dean Tripp and Natalie Stechyson. 2009. "Relationships between area of academic concentration, supervisory style, student needs and best practices." *Studies in Higher Education* 34 (3): 337-345.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597143>

Eley, Adrian and Roy Jennings. 2005. *Effective Postgraduate Supervision: Improving the Student/Supervisor Relationship*. Berkshire, Great Britain: McGraw-Hill Education..

Eley, Adrian and Rowena Murray. 2009. *How to be an Effective Supervisor: Best practice in research student supervision*. Berkshire, Great Britain: McGraw-Hill International.

Elphinstone, L., E. Martin and E. Foster. 1996. "Supervising postgraduate students-strategies for departments and supervisors": Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Melbourne.

Evans, Terry, Peter Macauley, Margot Pearson and Karen Tregenza. "A brief review of PhDs in creative and performing arts in Australia, *Newcastle, Australia, 2003*, edited by Ruth Jeffrey and Wendy Shilton, 1-14: AARE.
<http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30004959>.

Higher education + creative practice

This article is now out of date. It maps the development of the creative arts PhD over time, and specifically examines the creative practice PhD. "In effect, the broad definition encompasses all PhDs in and about the creative and performing arts, and the narrow definition specifically includes PhDs involving a creative work or performance" (4).

The first creative arts PhDs were awarded in the 1970s. The first creative arts professional doctorate was offered in the 1984 at the University of Wollongong. The figures that Evans et al (5) established suggest that "Thirteen percent of PhDs in or about creative or performing arts involved a creative or performing arts work." The creative and performing arts make up 0.8% of all PhDs awarded in Australian universities. Therefore, it is clear that the practice-based or practice-led PhD thesis is a significant minority in the PhD climate of Australia.

However, this data was collected in 2003, and the significant rise since this period of the creative industries and the non-traditional thesis mode has undoubtedly shifted the figures.

Evans, Terry, Peter Macauley, Margot Pearson and Karen Tregenza. "A decadic review of PhDs in Australia, NZARE/AARE 2003: Educational research, risks and dilemmas: New Zealand Association for Research in Education and the Australian Association for Research in Education, edited by E. van Til, 1-15: Australian Association for Research in Education. <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30013921/evans-decadicreview-2003.pdf>.

Higher education

This conference paper is peer reviewed and published in the conference proceedings. It is a qualitative study of the PhD in Australian history, examining the numbers per discipline over ten year periods. The creative arts is very rarely mentioned with minimal impact on the overall numbers (figures stop in the 2000s). The only specific comment is about the Music PhD: "Of note is that Music was also a field in which PhDs were beginning to be awarded. Music remains the strongest of the Creative and Performing Arts PhDs today (Evans, Macauley, Pearson & Tregenza, 2003)" (Evans et al 2003, 6). Primarily this paper is a discussion of the historical development of the PhD, and it includes figures on when the Arts PhD emerged and so on.

Firth, Ann and Erika Martens. 2008. "Transforming supervisors? A critique of post-liberal approaches to research supervision." *Teaching in Higher Education* 13 (3): 279-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562510802045303>

Frappell, Peter, Sara Booth and Gail Reardon. 2011. *HDR Student Benchmarking Project 2011: A collaboration between Deakin University, the University of Tasmania and the University of Wollongong*: Deakin University. http://www.utas.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/242441/HDR-Benchmarking-final-report.pdf.

Higher Education

The HDR Student Benchmarking Project 2011 (Frappell, Booth and Reardon 2011) aimed to "review and compare support processes for higher degrees by research (HDR) candidates in depth at different Australian universities" (2011, 4). It examined three universities (University of Tasmania, Deakin University, and University of Wollongong), each with quite different approaches to HDR journeys and identified some recommendations for improvement. Supervision was one of the elements explored, and the findings suggested that, at the universities reviewed, all needed "clearer articulation of role of supervisors in providing academic support" (14). This issue of articulation speaks to the often mentioned concern with terminology: if the process of supervision is not always understood it is very difficult to prescribe approaches. Although this is frequently an institution issue, it is something that could be addressed on a national scale to include clearer definitions around supervisory expectations, especially within the creative practice thesis pathway.

Fraser, Rob and Anne Mathews. 1999. "An evaluation of the desirable characteristics of a supervisor." *Australian Universities' Review* 42 (1): 5-7. <http://www.nteu.org.au/library/download/id/668>

- Fry, H. 2009. *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Enhancing Academic Practice*: Taylor & Francis.
- Gardiner, H. and C. Gere. 2010. *Art Practice in a Digital Culture, Digital Research in the Arts and Humanities*. Surrey: Ashgate Pub. <http://books.google.com.au/books?id=xHDu-2DzfDIC>.
- Gray, Carole and Julian Malins. 1993. "Research Procedures / Methodology for Artists and Designers." Centre for Research in Art & Design, Gray's School of Art, Robert Gordon University. <http://carolegray.net/Papers/PDFs/epgad.pdf>.
- Gray, Carole and Julian Malins. 2004. *Visualising research: a guide to the research process in art and design*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Gray, Carole and Ian Pirie. "'Artistic' research procedure: Research at the edge of the chaos?" *Proceedings of Design Interfaces Conference, The European Academy of Design*. University of Salford. <http://design.osu.edu/carlson/id785/ead.pdf>.
- Green, Bill. 2005. "Unfinished business: subjectivity and supervision." *Higher Education Research & Development* 24 (2): 151-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360500062953>
- Green, Bill and Alison Lee. 1995. "Theorising postgraduate pedagogy." *Australian Universities' Review* 38 (2): 40-45. <http://www.nteu.org.au/library/download/id/675>
- Green, Bill and Alison Lee. 1999. "Educational research, disciplinarity and postgraduate pedagogy: On the subject of supervision." *Review of Australian research in education* 5: 95-111.
- Green, Pam. 2005. *Supervising Postgraduate Research: Contexts and Processes, Theories and Practices*. Melbourne: RMIT University Press.
- Gurr, Geoff M. 2001. "Negotiating the "Rackety Bridge" — a Dynamic Model for Aligning Supervisory Style with Research Student Development." *Higher Education Research & Development* 20 (1): 81-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07924360120043882>
- Hadley, Bree J. 2009. "Practice as method : the ex/centric fixations project." In *Material Interventions: Applying Creative Research*. Deakin University, Melbourne.
- Hamilton, J. G. 2011. "The voices of the exegesis, *In Practice, Knowledge, Vision: Doctoral Education in Design, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong*, edited by Ken Friedman and Lorain Justice: Hong Kong Polytechnic University, School of Design. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/41832/>.

Creative practice – theory and practice interaction

Hamilton's article examines the process of writing what she terms a 'connective' exegesis, one that differs from the context and commentary models previously established. The connective exegesis is a type of hybrid, a "dual orientation—looking outwards towards the contextual field of established research, exemplars and theories, as well as inwards to the methodologies, processes, experiences, discoveries and

outcomes of the practice" (2011, 1). Hamilton notes that a key aspect of the connective exegesis is that of its polyvocality, "multiple speech genres and voices" that incorporate theory, personal reflection, questioning, and reflexivity (2). Hamilton's work provides framework for the creation of this type of exegetical work as well as suggesting its advantages and limitations for articulating the research project.

While it does not address the process of supervising the creation of the exegesis, it does provide interesting qualitative data around the construction of the work. For instance, a mapping of a number of connective exegetical works from one institution revealed a majority were structured around five areas: introduction; situating concepts; precedents of practice; the researcher's creative practice; and a conclusion. This provides a potential framework for supervisors when discussing the exegesis. It is worth noting that this analysis comes from one university and therefore has potential institutional limitations that need to be considered.

Hamilton, Jillian G. and Luke O. Jaaniste. 2009. "Content, structure and orientations of the practice-led exegesis". *Proceedings of the Art.Media.Design: Writing Intersections Conference and Workshop*, edited by Gavin Melles. Swinburne University, Melbourne

Hamilton, Jillian G. and Luke O. Jaaniste. "The Effective and the Evocative: Practice-led Research Approaches Across Art and Design, *ACUADS: Interventions in the Public Domain. Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland*, edited by Ross Woodrow: ACUADS Publishing. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/29700/>.

Hamilton, Jillian G. and Luke O. Jaaniste. 2012. "The effective and the evocative: a spectrum of creative practice research, edited by Estelle Barrett. London, United Kingdom; New York, New York: IB Tauris.

Hammond, Jennifer, Kevin Ryland, Mark Tennant, David Boud, Australian Learning Council and Teaching. 2010. *Building research supervision and training across Australian universities*: University of Technology, Sydney. <http://www.olt.gov.au/resource-building-research-supervision-and-training-across-australian-universities-uts-2010>.

Haseman, Brad. 2007. "Rupture and Recognition: identifying the performative research paradigm", edited by Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt, 147-157. London, United Kingdom: IB Tauris. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/27515/>.

Haseman, Brad. 2007. "Tightrope Writing: Creative Writing Programs in the RQF Environment." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* 11 (1): 1-15. <http://www.textjournal.com.au/april07/haseman.htm>

Haseman, Brad. 2006. "A manifesto for performative research." *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy* (118): 98-106. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/00003999>

Haseman, Brad. 2009. "Performance as research in Australia: legitimating epistemologies, edited by Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter, 51-61: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/31465>.

- Haseman, Brad. 2009. "Performance as research in Australia: legitimating epistemologies, edited by Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter, 51-61. United Kingdom, Hampshire, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/31465>.
- Haseman, Brad and Daniel Mafe. 2009. "Acquiring know-how: research training for practice-led researchers", edited by Hazel Smith and Roger Dean, 211-228. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/30309>.
- Hockey, John. 1997. "A complex craft: United Kingdom PhD supervision in the social sciences." *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 2 (1): 45-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13596749700200004>
- Hockey, John. 2003. "Art and Design Practice-Based Research Degree Supervision: Some empirical findings." *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 2 (2): 173-185. <http://ahh.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1474022203002002005>
- Hockey, John and Jacquelyn Allen-Collinson. 2000. "The Supervision of Practice-based Research Degrees in Art and Design." *Journal of Art & Design Education* 19 (3): 345-355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-5949.00237>
- Hodge, Bob. 1995. "Monstrous knowledge: doing PhDs in the new humanities." *Australian Universities' Review* 38 (2): 35-39. <http://www.nteu.org.au/library/download/id/675>
<http://search.informit.com.au/fullText;res=APAFT;dn=961000033>
- Holbrook, A. and S. Johnston. 1999. *Supervision of postgraduate research in education*. <http://www.voced.edu.au/word/29953>.
- Holmes, J. 2010. *Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Statement: Creative and Performing Arts*: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Homewood, Judi, Theresa Winchester-Seeto, Jacqueline Mackaway, Christa Jacenyik-Trawoger, Australian Learning Council and Teaching. 2010. *Development and evaluation of resources to enhance skills in higher degree research supervision in a cross-cultural context*: Macquarie University, The University of Queensland, The University of Newcastle. <http://www.olt.gov.au/project-development-evaluation-resources-macquarie-2007>.
- Ingham, Mark. 2010. The Literature Review. <http://ualscopingphd.wordpress.com/2013/06/21/ongoing-literature-review/> (accessed September 12, 2012).
- Supervision style**
- Ingham's website appears to be part of a project that has unclear outcomes and is no longer active. However, the literature review does encompass some resources for creative practice higher research degrees.
- Ings, Welby. 2011. "The internal pathway of the self: supervisory implications of autobiographical, practice-led Ph.D design theses". *Doctoral Education in Design conference, Hong Kong, People's Republic of China*: AUT University; Hong Kong

Ings, Welby J. 2013. "Narcissus and the muse: supervisory implications of autobiographical, practice-led PhD design theses." *Qualitative Research*. doi: 10.1177/1468794113488128.

Supervision style

Ings is a project partner and known for his research into design research. This article examines some of the issues when supervising practice-led PhDs, such as authenticity and agency, the self-reflexive practitioner, and so on. Ings using case studies from his own supervisions to illustrate his findings.

Ives, Glenice and Glenn Rowley. 2005. "Supervisor selection or allocation and continuity of supervision: Ph.D. students' progress and outcomes." *Studies in Higher Education* 30 (5): 535-555. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070500249161>

Ives and Rowley conducted a longitudinal study with 21 PhD students and their main supervisors over three years, involving one-on-one interviews and (one per year). They discovered similar results across the cohort that encouraged them to make recommendations on supervisor allocation:

It appears students who felt involved in supervisor selection, whose topics were matched with their supervisor's expertise and who developed good interpersonal working relationship with supervisors were more likely to make good progress and be satisfied (2005, 535).

The focus of the article was on the selection process of determining the supervisory relationship and the ongoing satisfaction of the student; and also the continuity of supervision and how this effects the ongoing satisfaction.

Interestingly, 12 out of the 21 students had only one supervisor. Six had one main supervisor and an "inactive associate supervisor". One student had a main and active associate supervisor, who met several times throughout the year (540). These figures appear to be not remarkable – the article references a survey (Heath 2002) of University of Queensland students which discovered a third of PhD candidates had a single supervisor.

The three key areas that played a part of the supervisor allocation were: academic match, interpersonal working patterns, and research methodology. The primary reason was usually academic match. Both supervisors and students "thought the match in interpersonal working patterns was crucial" (541).

"Nearly all of the students in this study had their supervision temporarily interrupted and progress on their thesis slowed by a variety of personal problems and illness" (542). The sample included supervisors who had taken leave, retired from the university, or had permanent change after students requested a shift in supervision.

There is minimal results that differentiate the students from the arts as to those from 'other faculties', except for this statement: "The arts faculty had fewer procedures in place to monitor students and appeared more inclined to let struggling students continue than the other faculties" (545).

Overall, the major sources of dissatisfaction with the student-supervisor relationship was the students' "perceived needs for more detail guidance, more feedback from their supervisors and more structure to their supervision" (548).

The study did note that in this sample, the more senior academic staff and experienced supervisors appear to have generated a more satisfying experience for students (550). None of the dissatisfied students in the sample had completed their thesis after three annual interviews. "Their supervisors were from lower levels of academic appointment and were less experienced as PhD supervisors" (550).

Ives and Rowley made 4 recommendations about the supervisor selection process, including choosing supervisors for the right reasons. There was a focus on providing two active supervisors that meet together every three months at least, and also to establish working relationship. They also recommended support for "inexperienced supervisors, particularly for a first PhD supervision experience" (552).

This article is not of exceptional relevance because it does not differentiate (if it included at all) creative practice PhDs from traditional theses. However, the concepts of supervision selection and the ongoing satisfaction of the student are supervision concepts that can be taken on board as they remain obviously relevant to students across a variety of disciplines.

Jaanieste, Luke O. and Brad Haseman. 2009. "Practice-led research and the innovation agenda: beyond the postgraduate research degree in the arts, design and media." *ACUADS: Interventions in the Public Domain. Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland*, edited by Ross Woodrow, 1-15: ACUADS Publishing. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/31813>.

James, Richard, Gabrielle Baldwin and The University of Melbourne. 1999. *Eleven practices of effective postgraduate supervisors*. Parkville, Victoria: Centre for the Study of Higher Education and The School of Graduate Studies, The University of Melbourne. http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/resources_teach/teaching_in_practice/docs/11practices.pdf.

Supervision style:

This document is specifically from the University of Melbourne. It is a non-academic document, primarily providing strategies and information for supervisors that are supported by statistics from the University of Melbourne.

A point of interest is the apparent figures (now out of date) that suggested 50% of PhD students have a single supervisor. 10% of PhD students have a panel and 40% have joint supervisors (James and Baldwin 1999, 7). This is different, for instance, to the expectations at QUT, which indicate a minimum of two supervisors for PhD candidates.

The report is considered a reference that is recommended to new and continuing supervisors, and is advertised throughout their website. In general, the handbook is designed to provide some possible solutions to problems that may arise as a supervisor and offer advice for how to structure and manage supervision. The 11 strategies listed are split into 3 "stages" – Foundations, Momentum, and Final Stages:

1. Ensure the partnership is right for the project

2. Get to know the students and carefully assess their needs
3. Establish reasonable, agreed expectations
4. Work with students to establish a strong conceptual structure and research plan
5. Encourage students to write early and often
6. Initiate regular contact and provide high quality feedback
7. Get students involved in the life of the department
8. Inspire and motivate
9. Help if academic and personal crises crop up
10. Take an active interest in students' future careers
11. Carefully monitor the final production and presentation of the research

This document, by its own admission, is designed as a guideline and useful resource rather than an academic exploration of supervision practice. There is minimal reference to academic sources (although there are some activities that have been developed from other material), and the primary motivation appears to be to provide practical advice.

Johnson, Lesley, Alison Lee and Bill Green. 2000. "The PhD and the Autonomous Self: Gender, Rationality and Postgraduate Pedagogy." *Studies in Higher Education* 25 (2): 135-147. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ613188>

Johnston, Bill and Rowena Murray. 2004. "New Routes to the PhD: Cause for Concern?" *Higher Education Quarterly* 58 (1): 31-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2004.00258.x>

Kiley, Margaret, Jim Cumming and Rachael Pitt. 2010. "I've done a coursemasters and now I'd like to do a doctorate: can I?". Australian National University: Office for Learning and Teaching.

Kiley, Margaret and Gerry Mullins. 2005. "Supervisors' Conceptions of Research: What are they?" *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 49 (3): 245-262. <http://gateway.library.qut.edu.au/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=17485287&site=ehost-live>

Supervision style:

This article is part of a longer, on-going study into the role of supervision in higher degree researchers. This article in particular focuses on the way students and supervisors' conceptions of research are different and what impact this has on the success of the HRD.

Kiley and Mullins hypothesise that *"the development of a conceptual framework that identifies postgraduate students' concepts of 'research' and how these articulate with a given set of academic institutional values and expectations enable support mechanisms to be developed and used to assist students early in their career"* (2005, 246).

The research is primarily concerned with the idea that how postgraduate students perceive research influences their approach to research and how they engage with it as a process – in the same way that learning and concepts of learning influence students' learning processes.

Kiley and Mullins discuss Brew's research in much depth, identifying the similarities between their findings in terms of how researchers' conceptions of research have been useful. Brew established four categories that describe the type of research approach students take: domino, tradition, layer,

journey concepts (Brew 2001 276). Kiley and Mullins see an overlap in their development of four categories: technical, creative/innovative, integrating complexity, and new ways of seeing (2005, 249).

In this document there are very few, if any, new developments into the supervisory role. Kiley and Mullins' approach has been to explore conceptions of research rather than the supervisor's role. One section, sub-titled *Supervisor Strategies*, lists the following ideas as crucial for supervision as discovered through their data analysis:

- Communication (especially dialogue)
 - This could include bolstering confidence and developing a rapport with the student (256).
 - Expose students to the work of peers
- More formal structures (although these are not explained – some case studies are provided)
- Mentor relationship – model the skills/attitudes expected (257)
- Develop research skills (no clear suggestion for how to do this) (258)
- “get rid of” unsuitable students – flag issues, establish problems early, shift to master's program (258)

This paper does not provide many solid resources or findings about the role of the supervisor. It establishes the groundwork and suggests that the follow-up research (of which this was only one part) will ask the question of whether supervisor and student concepts of research should differ, and if they do, will this impact their research/candidature?

Krauth, Nigel. 2002. "The preface as exegesis." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* 6 (1). <http://www.textjournal.com.au/april02/krauth.htm>

Kroll, Jeri. 2009. "The supervisor as practice-led coach and trainer: getting creative writing doctoral candidates across the finish line." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* (6). <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue6/Kroll.pdf>

Kroll, Jeri and Jen Webb. 2012. "Policies and Practicalities: Examining the Creative Writing Doctorate." *New Writing* 9 (2): 166-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2012.665930>

Leder, Gilah C. 1995. "Higher degree research supervision: a question of balance." *Australian Universities' Review* 38 (2): 5-8. <http://www.nteu.org.au/library/download/id/675>

Lee, A. 2007. "Developing effective supervisors: Concepts of research supervision." *South African Journal of Higher Education* 21 (4): 680-693. <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/492/>

Lee, Anne. 2008. "How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision." *Studies in Higher Education* 33 (3): 267-281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070802049202>

Lee, Alison and Bill Green. 2009. "Supervision as metaphor." *Studies in Higher Education* 34 (6): 615-630. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597168>

- Lee, A. and C. Williams. 1999. "Forged in fire: Narratives of trauma in PhD supervision pedagogy." *Southern Review* 32 (1): 6-26.
- MacBeath, John. 2005. "Leadership as distributed: a matter of practice." *School Leadership & Management* 25 (4): 349-366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13634230500197165>
- Madoff, S. H. 2009. *Art School: Propositions for the 21st Century*: Mit Press.
- Mafé, D. 2009. "Theoretical critique of the work of art: co-producers in research". *ACUADS: Interventions in the Public Domain, Queensland College of Art, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland*, edited by Ross Woodrow: ACUADS Publishing. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/31682>.
- Malfroy, Janne. 2005. "Doctoral supervision, workplace research and changing pedagogic practices." *Higher Education Research & Development* 24 (2): 165-178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360500062961>
- Malins, Julian and Carole Gray. 1995. "Appropriate research methodologies for artists, designers & craftpersons: research as a learning process": Gray's School of Art.
- Manathunga, Catherine. 2005. "The development of research supervision: "Turning the light on a private space"." *International Journal for Academic Development* 10 (1): 17-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13601440500099977>
- Martin, E., N. Drage, J. Sillitoe and D. Clingin. "Knowledge creation and research training: Meeting the academic development needs of postgraduate students and their supervisors in small and new universities, *Adelaide, 2006*, edited by Margaret Kiley and Gerry Mullins: The Centre for Educational Development and Academic Methods, The Australian National University. <http://qpr.edu.au/2006/sillitoeetal2006.pdf>.
- McAlpine, Lynn. 2012. "Identity-Trajectories: Doctoral Journeys from Past to Present to Future." *Australian Universities' Review* 54 (1): 38-46. <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ968518>
- McCormack, C. E. 1998. *Constructive and Supportive Postgraduate Supervision: A Guide for Supervisors*: Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship (CELTS), University of Canberra.
- McNamara, Andrew. 2012. "Six rules for practice-led research." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* 14 (Special Is): 1-15. <http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue14/McNamara.pdf>
- Melrose, M. "A university-wide workload policy for postgraduate supervisors, *Adelaide, 2002*, edited by Margaret Kiley and Gerry Mullins, 89-93: The Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship, University of Canberra. <http://qpr.edu.au/2002/melrose2002.pdf>.
- Montag, Daro. 2000. "Bioglyphs: generating images in collaboration with nature's events." PhD, University of Hertfordshire. http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/resdegs/dm2000.htm.

Mullins, Gerry and Margaret Kiley. 2002. "'It's a PhD, not a Nobel Prize': how experienced examiners assess research theses." *Studies in Higher Education* 27 (4): 369-386. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0307507022000011507>

Murphy, Noela, John D. Bain and Linda Conrad. 2007. "Orientations to Research Higher Degree Supervision." *Higher Education* 53 (2): 209-234. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29735050>

Neumann, Ruth. 2003. *The doctoral education experience: Diversity and complexity: Evaluations and Investigations Programme, Research, Analysis and Evaluation*, Department of Education, Science and Training.

Neumann, Ruth. 2007. "Policy and practice in doctoral education." *Studies in Higher Education* 32 (4): 459-473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070701476134>

Higher education

Neumann's article from 2007 focuses primarily on policy in doctoral supervision, and only distinguishes between hard and soft sciences. This makes it somewhat difficult to apply to creative practice. Her major findings revolve around the deterioration of supervision in times of financial strain at a university, and the shifting trend to supervising within fields of expertise: "Consequently, instances where a supervisor is 'far removed' from a student's research topic would now be the exception rather than the norm" (466). This is interestingly in contrast to the majority of findings from *Building Distributed Leadership*, which instead discovered that most supervisors tend to supervise students in an interdisciplinary fashion. What does appear to be of value is the so-called 'PhD-ness' of the journey. This article does also mention the trend towards a mix of individual and group meetings with students or 'cohorting', also referred to by Webb, Brien and Burr (2012; see below).

Newbury, Darren. 1997. "Research and Practice in the PhD: issues for training and supervision". Warwick: United Kingdom Council for Graduate Education.

Newbury, Darren. 2003. "Doctoral education in design, the process of research degree study, and the trained researcher." *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education* 1 (3): 149-159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/adch.1.3.149>. doi: 10.1386/adch.1.3.149.

Nimkulrat, Nithikul. 2007. "The Role of Documentation in Practice-Led Research." *Journal of Research Practice* 3 (1): 1-8. <http://jrp.icaap.org/index.php/jrp/article/viewArticle/58>

Paltridge, Brian, Sue Starfield and Louise Ravelli. "Writing in the academy: the practice-based thesis as an evolving genre". University of Sydney, University of New South Wales: ARC Linkage.

Parry, S. and M. Hayden. 1994. *Supervising higher degree research students: An investigation of practices across a range of academic departments*: AGPS.

Percy, Alisa, Michele Scoufis, Sharon Parry, Allan Goody, Margaret Hicks, Ian Macdonald, Kay Martinez, Nick Szorenyi-Reischl, Yoni Ryan and Sandra Wills. 2008. *The RED report*:

- recognition, enhancement, development*: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
http://www.cadad.edu.au/file.php/1/RED/docs/red_report.pdf.
- Phillips, Maggi, Cheryl Stock and Kim Vincs. "Dancing Doctorates Down-Under? Defining and assessing 'doctorateness' when embodiment enters the thesis, *Canberra, ACT, 2009*, edited by Cheryl Stock, 13-18: Australian Dance Council and Queensland University of Technology. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28809/>.
- Phillips, Stock and Vincs. 2009. *Dancing between Diversity and Consistency: Refining Assessment in Post Graduate Degrees in Dance*, ALTC.
- Piccini, Angela. 2006. *Practice as Research in Performance: 2001 - 2006*.
- Powles, M. 1984. *The role of postgraduates in Australian research*: Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations.
- Ryland, Kevin. 2012. *fIRST - for Improving Research Supervision and Training*.
www.first.edu.au
- Sambrook, Sally, Jim Stewart and Clair Roberts. 2008. "Doctoral supervision . . . a view from above, below and the middle!" *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 32 (1): 71-84.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03098770701781473>
- Schoen, D. 1983. *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schoen, D. 1987. *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schulze, Salome. 2012. "Empowering and disempowering students in student-supervisor relationships." *Koers - Bulletin for Christian Scholarship* 77 (2): 8-8.
<http://www.koersjournal.org.za/index.php/koers/article/view/47/564>
- Scrivener, Steven. 2000. "Reflection in and on action and practice in creative-production doctoral projects in art and design." *Working Papers in Art and Design* 1.
http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol1/scrivener2.html
- Scrivener, Steven. 2002. "The art object does not embody a form of knowledge." *Working Papers in Art and Design* 2.
http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/vol2/scrivenerfull.html
- Sheridan, Lyn and Thomasin Litchfield. 2008. *Literature Review*.
<http://www.cadad.edu.au/file.php/1/RED/docs/LiteratureReview.pdf>.
- Sinclair, Mark. 2004. *The pedagogy of 'good' PhD supervision: A national cross-disciplinary investigation of PhD supervision*. Sydney: Department of Education, Science and Training Sydney, Australia. http://www.tempus.ge/files/PhD/phd_supervision.pdf.
- Stewart, Robyn. 2001. "Practice vs praxis: constructing models for practitioner-based research." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* 5 (2).
<http://www.textjournal.com.au/oct01/stewart.htm>

**Stock, Cheryl. 2010. "Aesthetic tensions: evaluating outcomes for practice-led research and industry." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses Special Is* (8): 1-13.
<http://www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue8/Stock.pdf>
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/39348/>**

Sullivan, Graeme. 2005. *Art Practice as Research Inquiry in the Visual Arts*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Symonds, Judith and Aileen Cater-Steel. 2009. "Important themes in postgraduate research supervision and examination for communities of practice." *ACIS 2009 Proceedings Paper 46*. <http://aisel.aisnet.org/acis2009/46>

**Webb, Jen, Donna Lee Brien, Axel Bruns, Greg Battye, Jordan Williams, Craig Bolland, Jude Smith, Australian Learning Council and Teaching. 2008. *Australian Writing Programs Network Final Report*: University of Canberra, University of New England, Queensland University of Technology, Central Queensland University.
<http://www.olt.gov.au/project-australian-writing-programs-network-uc-2006>.**

Webb, Jen, Donna Lee Brien and Sandra Burr. 2012. "Examining Doctorates in the Creative Arts: A Guide". Canberra, ACT: Australasian Association of Writing Programs.

Higher education + creative practice

The final report by Webb et al (2008) suggests that the Australian Writing Programs Network was a successful venture that encouraged a community of postgraduate writers and supervisors from the creative writing disciplines at a variety of universities. One of the major outputs was the development of both a member database and examiner database that includes easily accessible information on interested practitioners in certain areas.

The AWPN also aimed to generate interaction with supervisors, and did hold a supervisor workshop in 2008 (the report includes a description of the workshop by Craig Bolland – page 28) that covered the following topics:

- Selection of candidates Research ethics
- The inclusion of coursework in creative writing HDRs
- Practices around introducing students to appropriate research methodologies Examination practices
- Personal issues relating to supervision
- Cohorting of HDR students (formally and informally)

The aims for the workshop were specifically designed for early career researchers who were comparatively new to supervision. It was hoped the workshop would provide information for approaches to supervision, knowledge transfers, networking opportunities, and a building of publications on supervision on the website (although this information appears not to be available).

As of this stage, it was difficult to assess from the website whether the supervisor workshops have continued to run. The current forum for supervisors only has five members associated with it and has not been updated lately.

The executive summary suggests that the AWPN was hoping to develop and promote “knowledge building about supervisory best practice” (6). The report identifies the inherent issues that arose

out of the rapid growth of creative writing programs in Australian universities, such as the inconsistencies of policy, and the mix of supervisor experience and practice:

...teaching staff come from highly diverse academic and professional backgrounds... many have little research training, or knowledge of what is involved in preparing a candidate to complete a doctoral program. Other supervisors are experienced researchers in cognate fields but have limited background in creative practice (7).

The project specifically is aimed for creative practice supervisors of the creative writing discipline. The conceptual framework behind generating a network of supervisors and encouraging inter-institutional discussion is sound. However, it is difficult to assess how successful the AWP is as a supervisory tool. Its impact is somewhat unclear without obvious data of website or resource use. Also, while it answers the need of one discipline within the creative arts, its specificity potentially makes it a source unhelpful to the creative arts as a whole – particularly when considering the studio aspect of some creative works.

**Willcoxson, Lesley. 1994. "Postgraduate Supervision Practices: Strategies for Development and Change." *Higher Education Research & Development* 13 (2): 157-166.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0729436940130206>. doi: 10.1080/0729436940130206.**

**Williamson, Rosemary, Donna Lee Brien and Jen Webb. "Modelling Best Practice in Supervision of Research Higher Degrees in Writing, 2008, edited by Donna Lee Brien and Lucy Neave: The Australian Association of Writing Programs.
<http://www.aawp.org.au/files/WilliamsonBrienWebb.pdf>.**

Supervision style + creative practice

Williamson, Brien, and Webb's paper from 2008 stems from their development of the Australian Postgraduate Writers' Network, a website portal designed to connect postgraduate students in creative writing across the nation. Their work attempts to be a significant milestone in providing a "disciplinary scholarly, theoretical and methodological framework that will inform and support supervisory practice in the discipline of writing" (2008, 1).

Initially, Williamson et al establish that the democratic approach to supervision, usually in the form of a panel (as mandated by DDOGS), is rarely followed. Instead, a "supervisor-student dyad" approach emerges most frequently, which usually positions one supervisor in a more active role than the other. It is also formed on "an uneven power relationship: uneven in terms of knowledge, skills and experience, as well as access to resources and authorities". This point can be considered alongside Baker and Buckley's – there is not much in the way of accountability for supervisors that do not fulfill their requirements.

What Williamson et al also clearly illustrate is that the supervisor, and by extension the institution, are fundamental in determining the research project of the student. Their guidance is crucial in shaping the project and helping support their student apply for the appropriate resources available and the "kinds of identities students and supervisors can construct within the parameters of the university" (3). A supervisor, like the student, is bound by institutional guidelines, but where an institution has many recourses of action available to investigate an under-performing supervisor, the student may feel like they are unable to act if their supervisor is not suitable.

Most importantly, the article further supports the lack of available creative practice supervision scholarship. Williamson et al refer to their annotated bibliography, but highlight that a 'best practice' model is, at best, incomplete and at worst, varying and unclear. Many sources have no specific reference to

the Australian situation; others give no practice solutions; still others are limited or from non-relevant disciplines. Their overall recommendation about supervision scholarship is that it tends to cluster around two ideas: the first described by Grant (in Williamson et al, 6) as “a fundamentally rational and transparent practice between autonomous individuals” and the second “murky rather than transparent” (in Williamson et al, 6).

Ultimately, Williamson et al do not have an answer as to the perfect supervisor. They consider institutional, personal, and industry frameworks as three important components to developing supervisory practice. Perhaps most tellingly, based on their own investigation into the supervision process through interviews, they discovered:

The abundance of metaphors to describe the supervisory process suggests the dynamism and fluidity of the process, and that the idea of a ‘model’ supervisor in writing is, to add our own metaphor, a mirage (10 – 11).

Instead, like what *Building Distributed Leadership* has discovered, frameworks (in our instance, case studies and principles) of possible approaches is the best way to capture a form of best practice.

Wissler, Rodney Charles. 2004. *Innovation in Australian arts, media, design: fresh challenges for the tertiary sector*. Flaxton, Queensland: Post Pressed. <http://nla.gov.au/nla.cat-vn3110597>.

Yeates, Helen. 2009. "Embedded engagements: the challenge of creative practice research to the humanities." *The International Journal of the Humanities* 7 (1): 139-147.

Yeates, Helen and S. J. Carson. 2009. "Bend and stretch: pedagogical calisthenics in creative practice honours." *Text: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* (Special issue): 1-13. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/30369/>