Introduction

As a JCU academic staff member or adjunct you can undertake the role of Chair or Independent Academic if you are registered as a JCU Advisor* (Note: Advisor Mentors and Primary advisors can be Chairs and Independent Academics; Secondary advisors with limited supervisory experience can be Independent Academics), and have viewed a short professional development video. Once you have viewed the video email s.gasson@jcu.edu.au to confirm you have viewed the video and raise any questions. We will then email to confirm your new status has been recorded on the HDR Advisor database.

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Susan Gasson, Coordinator HDR Advisor Development (susan.gasson@jcu.edu.au or grs@jcu.edu.au).

Contained in this document:

* The application for advisor registration, procedure and requirements can be found here.

Candidature Committee: Independent Academic

Appendix One – HDR Supervision Procedure extract defining the requirements of Independent Academic and Candidature Committee

Independent Academic	An Independent Academic is nominated by the Advisory Panel and appointed by the ADRE on behalf of the College. The Independent Academic's role is to support timely completion and may be negotiated to include: • assessing the candidate's capacity and scope of work required for successful completion • critiquing aspects of the project or candidature • informing effective communication within the panel • advocating for the candidate and their candidature The Independent Academic will be a member of the JCU Register of Advisors. The Independent Academic is encouraged to complete GRS professional development requirements and may be briefed by the ADRE on particular responsibilities associated with the role.
Candidature Committee	A Candidature Committee is constituted to monitor the progress of an individual HDR candidate. A Doctoral Candidature Committee includes a Chair, Independent Academic and the Advisory Panel. At least one of the Chair and Independent Academic will have relevant expertise. A Masters of Philosophy (MPhil) Candidature Committee does not require an Independent Academic. A Candidature Committee is normally appointed in preparation for the Confirmation of Candidature Milestone and is appointed for the duration of candidature.

4. Composition of Candidature Committee

4.1 The role of the Candidature Committee is to monitor the progress of an individual HDR candidate with respect to achievement of milestones; thesis submission and examination; and the application of progress, review and/or discontinuation procedures.

4.2 The Candidature Committee of a doctoral candidate must include, but is not limited to:

- Chair of Candidature Committee
- Independent Academic
- All members of the candidate's Advisory Panel

Candidature Committee: Independent Academic

4.3 The Candidature Committee of an MPhil candidate must include, but is not limited to:

- Chair of Candidature Committee
- All members of the candidate's Advisory Panel

NOTE: An Independent Academic is not required.

5. Continuity of Candidature Committee

5.1 The Chair of the Candidature Committee and the Independent Academic may change during the candidature but must always be independent of all members of the Advisory Panel; for example, must not raise a conflict of interest. Where conflicts (e.g., co-authorship or shared grants, near-relatives or partners) are present, a conflict of interest should be declared and managed in accordance with the JCU Code of Conduct.

5.2 Chairs of Candidature Committees and Independent Academics must undertake appropriate professional development to be eligible to hold the status on the JCU Register of Advisors.

Appendix Two - HDR Milestone and Reporting Procedure extracts detailing Committee role at Confirmation, Mid-Candidature and Pre-Completion milestones

Confirmation

2.13 The Candidature Committee must meet to complete COC-Assessment Form and advise the candidate of the recommendation of the Confirmation of Candidature Milestone. The decision about the recommendation of the process will be made by the Chair of the Candidature Committee and, in the case of doctoral candidates, the Independent Academic. The Advisors and the candidate should not be present when this decision is made. The signatures of the candidate and the Advisors must be obtained subsequent to the decision having been explained to them, in acknowledgement that they have been advised of the recommendation. The Candidature Committee may recommend that the Confirmation of Candidature milestone be passed or failed. Not passing one or both of (RD7001/RM7001)and (RD7002/RM7002) constitutes a fail.

Mid-Candidature Review

3.8 One week before this meeting, the candidate must provide each member of their Candidature Committee with materials from clause 3.5.

3.9 If the candidate is delivering an oral presentation to the Candidature Committee, this presentation must be delivered in person or by live-feed and viewed by all members of the Candidature Committee. Other persons should be encouraged to attend unless such an arrangement is precluded by a confidentiality agreement. The presentation should be no longer than 30 minutes including questions and should provide a synthesis of one aspect of the research findings. If the candidate is presenting a poster to the Candidature Committee, the poster must be evaluated by all members of the Candidature Committee and the candidate must be available for questions.

3.10 The Candidature Committee must review all materials provided and meet to finalise MCR-FORM-01 and any additional written feedback to the candidate. The program of professional development must also be checked against requirements and recorded in MCR-FORM-01. The Candidature Committee may recommend that all of the Professional Development requirements have either been “met” or “not met.” For the other assessable components of this milestone, the candidature committee may recommend “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.

3.11 The decision about the outcome of the process will be made by the Chair of the Candidature Committee and the Independent Academic. The Advisors and candidate should not be present when this decision is made.

Pre-Completion Milestone

4.11 One week before the seminar, the candidate must provide each member of their Candidature Committee with materials from clause 1.2, plus a plan for the publication of unpublished components of the research. This plan should include the proposed authorship arrangements and the protocol for publication if the candidate does not initiate manuscript preparation within a mutually agreed time period.

4.12 The seminar must be delivered in person or via live-feed and viewed by all members of the Candidature Committee. Other persons should be encouraged to attend unless such an arrangement is precluded by a confidentiality agreement. The presentation should be no longer than 40 minutes excluding questions and should provide a synthesis of the research findings.

4.13 If the candidate is unable to deliver the seminar in person or via live-feed, they may provide a video of their seminar presentation in an appropriate format to the Administrative Officer responsible for organising the seminar. This video will be viewed by their Candidature Committee in the normal manner and the candidate will be questioned at a pre-arranged time by teleconference.

4.14 The Candidature Committee must meet after the seminar to complete PCE-FORM-01 and provide feedback to the candidate.

4.15 The decision about the outcome of the process will be made by the Chair of the Candidature Committee and the Independent Academic. The Advisors and the candidate should not be present when this decision is made.

Reflective Practice
Vol. 11, No. 1, February 2010, 19–32

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Feedback and self-regulated learning: insights from supervisors'and PhD examiners' reports

Elke Stracke[a] and Vijay Kumar[b]*

[a]*Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra, Canberra, University Drive, Bruce, ACT 2601, Australia;* [b]*Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication,*
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Malaysia
(*Received 24 April 2009; final version received 15 October 2009*)

This paper provides insights into the doctoral journey of a supervisee by analysingwritten feedback provided by supervisors and thesis examiners. As one aim of doctoral education is to train scholars to become independent researchers, that is highly self-regulated learners, this study paves the way for an understanding of the link between written feedback and the self-regulated learning process. Based on an analysis of speech functions, written feedback provided by two supervisors andthree examiners were classified into three main categories: referential, directive and expressive. The results indicate the value of expressive feedback for the development of self-regulated learning in doctoral supervision.
Keywords: examiner reports; feedback; functions of speech; PhD supervision; reflective practice; self-regulated learning

Introduction

Supervisors and thesis examiners play a crucial role in a doctoral journey. They provide the doctoral supervisee with guidance to move from a zone of current development to a zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978), that is, to gradually move from being a novice to becoming an expert in a specialised field of study. This is usually done in the form of feedback. The ultimate aim of doctoral education is to train scholars to become independent (i.e. highly self-regulated) learners. Like the supervisee, supervisors also travel a journey of discovery. This study paves the way for an understanding of the link between written feedback and the self-regulated learning (SRL) process of a doctoral supervisee and a supervisor. Written feedback provided by two supervisors and three examiners was classified into three main categories: referential, directive and expressive. Our results indicate the value of expressive feedback for the development of SRL in doctoral supervision.

Furthermore, our collaborative research has also allowed us to reflect on our supervision practice as academics. Whereas this research had its origin when one of the authors (Vijay Kumar) was a doctoral candidate and the other author (Elke Stracke) was his primary supervisor, now both authors supervise higher degree by research (HDR) students as part of our work as academics. This paper illustrates how our research into feedback practices and our reflection have shaped our current practice assupervisors as examiners of HDR students.

In this paper, we first provide an overview of the goals of doctoral education and put forth

an argument that one of the main goals of doctoral education is to enable SRL. We then provide a brief synthesis of literature on SRL, show how key features of SRL are linked to the aims of doctoral education, and emphasise the role of feedback at the heart of the supervisee's learning process. Next, we provide insights as to how we conducted a pragmatic analysis of written feedback provided by super- visors and examiners. After presenting the results of this study, we reflect on how ourresearch into supervisor and examiner feedback has shaped our current practice as supervisors and examiners of HDR students.

Theoretical background

Goals of, and roles in, doctoral education

An expected outcome of a PhD is that a supervisee is trained to become a member of an academic scholarly community. This is usually accomplished by a process of scaffolding whereby supervisors guide doctoral supervisees to gain membership into specific academic communities. Scaffolding may include aspectsof academic writing, research skills, time management, research management, publishing and also academic leadership. The process culminates in the examination of the thesis.

The scaffolding by the supervisors and developmental experiences provided by theexaminers are usually in the form of written feedback. Such feedback provided by both supervisors and examiners has a heavy informational load (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), as feedback offers suggestions to facilitate improvement and opportunities for interaction (see Hyland, 2004 for discussions on interactions in academic writing). One of the main roles of examiners is that they decide a 'rite of passage into the guildof academics' (Denicolo, 2003, p. 86). Examiners play an explicit gate-keeping role and mark the standards of the thesis (Tinkler & Jackson, 2004). They have the final say with regard to the acceptance of the thesis. However, examiners of a doctoral thesis not only provide a summative assessment of the thesis, they also provide developmental experiences (Joyner, 2003) to the supervisee. This is based on the expectation of examiners that doctoral supervisees can always learn more from examiner reports (Holbrook, Bourke, Lovat, & Fairbairn, 2008, p. 36). These developmental experiences may include some aspects that are the domain of supervisors, such as methodological issues, academic writing and research skills. In a way examiners provide additional scaffolding to enable the supervisees to develop as scholars. Thisis based on the theoretical underpinning that examiners view a thesis as work-in- progress (Bourke, Hattie, & Anderson, 2004).

Self-regulated learning (SRL)

The concept of self-regulated academic learning emerged in education in the mid- 1980s. With its clear focus on the individual learner, it deals with 'the question of howstudents become masters of their own learning process' (Zimmermann, 2001, p. 1). Zimmermann identifies learners as 'self-regulated to the degree that they are meta- cognitively, motivationally, and behaviourally *active participants in their own learning process*. These students self-generate thoughts, feelings, and actions to attaintheir learning goals' [italics by authors] (Zimmermann, 1986, cited in Zimmermann, 2001, p. 5). The active involvement of the learner in his or her learning process is an important characteristic of SRL. SRL can be viewed as the decisive factor for successful learning and academic success (Boekaerts, 1999). SRL can encompass learning byoneself, that is without others, and with the presence and support, and – most important in the context of this research – feedback of others (Zimmermann, 2001). Indeed, highly self-regulated learners actively seek such support more often than poorly regulated learners (Zimmermann & Schunk, 2001).

It seems important to keep in mind that in SRL the focus is on process, development and

transferability. SRL is an ongoing process; thus, self-regulated learners are moving, not standing or static. Boekaerts (1999) emphasises these aspects aptly whenshe describes SRL as 'a series of reciprocally related cognitive and affective processes' (p. 447), as the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes, as well as the learner's ability to transfer these from one learning context to another.

Doctoral education and SRL

While the research on SRL has mostly been on learning styles and theories in main- stream educational settings, the literature appears void of SRL research in doctoral education. SRL studies in classroom contexts have been described as unsatisfactory by attributing teachers' and students' 'difficulty to adapt to disturbance' (Boekaerts, 2002, p. 602) to this inadequate situation (this disturbance occurs in traditional class- rooms due to the shift from the (traditional) world of instruction to the (new) world oflearning). In doctoral education, however, SRL does not seem to play any role at all, be it as a 'disturbance' or, positively viewed, as a 'challenge' (Boekaerts, 2002,

p. 603). This apparent gap in the literature is quite surprising given the fact that doctoral education is at the top end of the educational system, but might be explainedthrough the dominant current discourse that seems to view a PhD course as training rather than education. From our educational perspective, one would certainly expect and require doctoral supervisees to become highly self-regulated learners duringthe process of completing their doctoral journey so as to ensure that they become contributing members of an academic community of researchers and scholars.

Developing Boekaerts' (1999) description of SRL further for doctoral education,

SRL means that

(1) The supervisee develops:

- discipline-specific knowledge that allows membership in an academic community;
- skills like goal-setting and monitoring (Butler & Winne, 1995, p. 246), or research management skills such as time-management that enable thesupervisee to achieve his or her goal during candidature; and
- attitudes expected from an academic such as openness and receptiveness to criticism and ethical standards; and

(2) The supervisee is able to transfer the knowledge, skills and attitudes from one learning context to another.

SRL is also associated with effective self-directed learning for which feedback is 'an inherent catalyst' (Butler & Winne, 1995, p. 246). We consider feedback as a catalyst for SRL as it involves a 'series of reciprocally related cognitive and affective processes' (Boekaerts, 1999, p. 447) that is SRL. Our experiences lead us to believe that feedback lies at the heart of the SRL experience of a doctoral student.

In order to understand SRL experiences in doctoral education, this study takes a reflective stance by analysing feedback. The supervisee and one supervisor analysed written feedback, reflected on internal feedback during the process and used examiners' feedback as external monitors to regulate learning experiences. The focus of this paper is on the analysis of written feedback based on the framework developed by theauthors (Kumar & Stracke, 2007).

In the following section we first describe how we collected, managed and analysedthe data before discussing the findings of this research as well as the impact that this research has

had on our professional practice as supervisors and examiners of HDR students.

Methodology

Data collection and management

After gaining ethical approval for this project, we sought consent from the three supervisors and three examiners who commented on the thesis under investigation. The data for this study were eventually procured from two sources. The first source ofdata was from two supervisors, Vera and Jack (both pseudonyms),[1] in the form of in- text written feedback as well as overall feedback on three full drafts of a doctoral thesis. The in-text feedback consists of all comments written by one supervisor(Vera) in the text, mostly in the margin of the draft. This feedback can best be described as the supervisor's spontaneous thoughts, expressed as if she were having adialogue with the supervisee. As the in-text feedback was completely transcribed, it yielded a comprehensive list of the supervisor's comments. The overall feedback is a letter-like text, in which the supervisors summarised their main concerns and offered more general feedback on the complete draft as well as on the individual chapters. The overall feedback was already available in electronic format. Due to the self- investigative nature of this paper, the researchers' reflections added to the analysis of the data available.

Besides the data from the supervisors (and self-reflection by the researchers), examiner reports constituted the second main source of data. In the university where this study was conducted (located in New Zealand), the supervisee was given the full version of all examiner reports. The examiners' reports, comprising reports from an international examiner (E1), a domestic examiner (E2) and a departmental examiner (E3), were transcribed word for word.

Data analysis

Based on the analytical framework and categorisation procedures as developed in Kumar & Stracke (2007) (for one set of feedback data, i.e. Vera's feedback on draft 1), we next coded the complete feedback dataset based on its speech function(s), i.e. by analysing what the comments *do*. Our analysis is based on the main three functionsof speech, as noted in the field of applied linguistics: referential, directive, and expressive. These functions find agreement among linguists (Holmes, 2001, p. 259), as the basic components of any interaction that include:

- the message/feedback (these are referential utterances providing information);
- the hearer/supervisee (directive utterances trying to get the hearer to do some-thing); and
- the speaker/supervisor (expressive utterances expressing the speaker's feelings) (Holmes, 2001, p. 259).

For this research, we elaborated this basic model with nine subcategories. Referential comments focus on editorial, organisational and content matters, while the directives are subdivided into suggestions, questions and instructions. Finally, expressive utterances fulfil the functions of offering praise, criticism or an opinion (refer Kumar & Stracke, 2007 for further details). Table 1 provides examples from supervisors and examiners for all nine subcategories:

Table 1. Examples from supervisors' and examiners' feedback.

Main function	Subcategory	Examples
referential	editorial	• *p.22, mid-page, add 's' to 'cognitive tack'* • *use italics consistently*
	organisation	• *The brief comparison with inner circle native speakers strategies seems premature here; it more properly belongs tosection 5 of Chapter two.* • *This section is not mentioned in your overview.*
	content	• *More discussion is needed about the validity, limitations andaffordances of a case study approach to research.* • *(It is reported that the four students obtained an A1 grade inthe public examination, two months after the research…)*
directive	suggestion	• *For example, the data might have been fruitfully interrogated in terms of ….* *In brief: the methodology could be foregrounded as one of themain 'contributions to knowledge' of the thesis.*
	question	*Didn't Melinder also generate ideas?* • *How have other TA [Think Aloud] researchers set aboutanalysing protocols?*
	instruction	• *The figures should be consistently presented …* • *Avoid all statements to the effect that 'the literature informsus…'*
expressive	praise	• *The thesis study is unique in several respects, representing notable advances over previous studies of …* • *I find the cross case analysis well done.*
	criticism	• *This kind of last-minute hand-waving should be taken outunless actual comparative work has been carried out.* • *For much of the thesis, you seem to take the public examiners'assessment as God's Truth.*
	opinion	• *More statistical data of this kind can potentially lead to the discovery of possible correlations between different revisionstrategies.* • *As your focus is on revision and process, I wonder howimportant this assessment is anyway?!*

Note: It should be noted that many of the utterances could fall into more than one category. Consequently,some of the feedback was double-coded or triple-coded. Refer to Kumar and Stracke (2007) for more examples and coding procedure.

In the next section, we provide a brief overview of the distribution of the speech functions in the data, followed by a discussion of the relationship between the supervisors' and examiners' comments based on their speech function(s) and the subsequent revisions by the supervisee.

Findings

If one first examines the distribution of feedback given with regard to the three main functions of speech, the dominance of referential feedback is evident. With one exception (E3), referential comments providing information rank first, followed by expressives, and then directives. Table 2 provides the raw figures and percentages for feedback from both supervisors and examiners.

As a second step, we looked at possible differences between the in-text feedback and overall feedback for drafts 1 and 2 provided by Vera. The analysis of draft 2 confirmed our earlier finding for draft 1 (Kumar & Stracke, 2007, p. 465), namely thatthe expressive function comes first in the overall feedback (draft 1: 44.9%; draft 2: 50.8%), as we can see in Tables 3 and 4.

When analysing and reflecting on Vera's feedback, the supervisee realised that he found the expressive comments (in particular in the overall feedback in the letter-liketext that Vera provided) to be the most useful (see Kumar & Stracke, 2007 for furtherdiscussion of examples from draft 1). We will revisit this important insight in the discussion section.

Meanwhile, Jack provided overall feedback only (see Table 2), and his ratios changed little between drafts 1 and 2. In his feedback, the referential function dominates with about half of all comments made; directives and expressives share thesecond position.

As a final step, we analysed the three examiners' feedback covering all three categories. The vast majority of E 1 (67.3%) and E 2 (57.9%) (see Table 2) comments provide referential feedback, with expressives following on the second rank. Directives only play a minor role; E1 only uses them two times. The feedback provided by E3 stands out, since this examiner's feedback was more expressive than referential innature. Turning to the expressive feedback provided, it seems noteworthy that this examiner uses praise only once. Table 5 provides a detailed analysis of the feedback given by E3.

Discussion: reflective practice

In the following sections, we discuss the feedback of both supervisors and examiners and what it *did* to the supervisee in his self-regulated learning experiences. It should be recalled that the four main components of SRL that are pertinent to doctoral education are the mastery of knowledge, skills, attitudes and the transferability of these to new learning environments. We also reflect on how our research into feedback practices and our reflection have shaped our current practice as supervisors and examinersof HDR students. We believe that this reflective practice is part of our life-long learning process as professionals. We are aware that life-long learning encompasses both planned and unplanned learning and the key to this sort of learning is by means of engaging in self-reflective practice. Our understanding of reflective practice, in particular, *reflection-on-action* (Schön, 1987), is that it provides professional development and helps us to reframe (Schön, 1987) and restructure our understanding to develop

Table 2. Distribution of feedback according to speech functions (raw scores and percentage).

Function	Vera draft 1 (N = 289)	Vera draft 2 (N = 251)	Vera draft 3 (N = 191)	Jack draft 1 (N = 120)	Jack draft 2 (N = 61)	Examiner 1 (N = 55)	Examiner 2 (N = 171)	Examiner 3 (N = 61)
referential	130 45%	141 56.2%	113 59.1%	57 47.5%	29 47.5%	37 67.3%	99 57.9%	21 34.4%
directive	80 27.7%	44 17.5%	36 18.9%	31 25.8%	11 18%	2 3.7 %	30 17.5%	14 23%
expressive	79 27.3%	66 26.3%	42 22%	32 26.7%	21 34.4%	16 29%	42 24.6%	26 42.7%

Table 3. Distribution of Vera's feedback on draft 1 according to speech functions (raw scoresand percentage).

Function	In-text feedback (N = 191)	Overall feedback (N = 98)
referential	91 = 47.7%	39 = 39.8%
directive	65 = 34%	15 = 15.3%
expressive	35 = 18.3%	44 = 44.9%

Table 4. Distribution of Vera's feedback on draft 2 according to speech functions (raw scoresand percentage).

Function	In-text feedback 2 (N = 192)	Overall feedback 2 (N = 59)
referential	124 = 64.6%	17 = 28.8%
directive	32 = 16.7%	12 = 20.3%
expressive	36 = 18.7%	30 = 50.8%

Table 5. Distribution of E3's feedback according to speech functions and subcategories (rawscores and percentage).

Function	Overall feedback (N = 61)	
referential	21 = 34.4%	
		Raw scores
	editorial	2
	organisation	1
	content	18
directive	14 = 23%	
		Raw scores
	suggestion	5
	question	5
	instruction	4
expressive	26 = 42.7%	
		Raw scores
	praise	1
	criticism	16
	opinion	9

new strategies for approaching similar situations in the future. In other words, self-reflection turns the experiences into learning (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985).

In the following, we first present the supervisee's (Vijay Kumar) reflection on hisexperience of the feedback received and the impact it has had on his current practice. Subsequently, we also show how one supervisor's (Elke Stracke) reflection hasshaped her own practice through critical analysis and subsequent adaptation.

Reflection by supervisee (Vijay Kumar)

Self-reflection shows that expressive feedback (praise, criticism, opinion) played a major role in Vijay's SRL process; so much so that it continues to influence his current practices as an academic.

Praise

Vijay felt that the large amount of expressive feedback (praise) provided by the supervisors and examiners meant that he had gained membership into an academic community. To him, the supervisors' use of praise indicated that he was slowly becoming an effective writer. Moreover, such comments from his supervisors provided a sense of security to him: 'The draft is a considerable improvement onthe last one. I am pleased to see that you have very successfully addressed mostof the concerns.' The supervisors' use of praise provided him with the confidence during his developmental stage as an academic towards gaining membership into a scholarly community. Vijay also felt that his own peers in the doctoral journey(his supervisors) had been successful in scaffolding him into a community of practice.

On the other hand, Vijay viewed the examiners' use of praise as summative judgement that indicated that he had become an expert in his specialised field of research. He felt that external experts in his area had opened the gates for him to be a peer. Among the praise which strongly motivated Vijay was: 'The results of the study are certainly worth reporting in an international journal, and I expect an article length manuscript about the thesis would be welcomed at such international journals as …' To him, this seemed to confirm his success.

Ultimately, Vijay felt that his learning was a success in that he became more confident of his own research and writing abilities. In other words, two key features of SRL were evident: mastery of knowledge and mastery of skills. As suggested by Butler and Winne (1995), the external feedback provided by the examiners indicated that SRL had been effective.

Criticism

The supervisors and examiners were also critical towards Vijay's drafts.[2] Some of thecritical comments are as follows: 'At no point, however, are comparisons or contrastsmade between writing strategies. Your writing here is not (yet) as smooth as in the other parts'. One form of criticism was usually supported by suggestions to revise. 'The candidate has shown the ability to exercise critical and analytical judgment of the literature … it is considered that a wider awareness of the literature relating to alterative theoretical perspectives should have been demonstrated.' Vijay welcomed these types of criticisms as they provided a clear sense of direction. While Vijay accepted the drawbacks of some aspects of his work, he was comfortable receiving guidance and advice from his supervisors and external experts in the field. He felt that the comments made were justifiable, since he was always provided a justification for his work and an alternative perspective by which to view it. This showed that, in terms of SRL, he had demonstrated a professional attitude when handling negative comments.

Besides providing critical comments and offering suggestions, there was also overt criticism. Initially he was devastated by these highly critical comments. Clearly there were methodological differences in the responses of examiners. One might be criticaland another complimentary and comments like: 'This is reflected in the thesis failing to demonstrate the candidate's ability to exercise critical and analytical judgment of the literature …', '… the thesis does not sufficiently explore, let alone discuss …'or 'In this respect, the thesis does not seem to have much to contribute to the field' servedto de-motivate the supervisee.

However, this was his initial reaction. This inconsistency in the examination reports proved to be the most rewarding experience for him. Even though he was de- motivated, upon reflection he found these comments the most challenging in his SRLprocesses. As suggested by Butler and Winne (1995), part of the SRL process involvessetting goals for upgrading knowledge. Vijay, who viewed revision as a process of discovery, took negative criticisms as a challenge and an opportunity to discover newmeanings in his thesis. By revising sections of the thesis, he was able to enhance his knowledge while strengthening his understanding of the qualitative research pertinentin his field. During this process of monitoring and adjusting his initial goals of strengthening his thesis, he was highly motivated. Attending to negative criticism provided a new and challenging perspective that he could incorporate into his thesis. He needed to read more and write more. This led to a juggling of ideas and, in the process, he increased his knowledge and became more competent with the research paradigms of his discipline.

Opinion

The supervisors and examiners provided positive and critical feedback by offering their own opinions. As an example, the supervisors wrote the following on drafts of the supervisee's thesis: 'Somewhat broad, I think, I feel that many of your sentences are not optimally constructed' or 'Assuming that the students were not stimulated to perform to their full potential, who/what is to blame?' The examiners also provided opinions: 'I also appreciated the extensive data and analyses'. Some of these opinionsindicated a non-understanding of what the supervisee had written. From such opinions, Vijay deduced that he had provided insufficient information to enable his readersto understand his context; and he subsequently revisited what he had written. However, the opinions also showed an interest and curiosity, which indicated to Vijaythat his research would be of value to an academic community. Thus, the opinions expressed by the supervisors and examiners also contributed to the facilitation of his development as an emerging scholar. As a result of these forms of feedback, he reworked the drafts by considering an audience who did not have the contextual information that he had. Those opinions that asked for more information stimulated essential modifications to subsequent drafts. He was able to set new goals and to maintain cognitive planning and engagement with the revision.

In including opinions as a form of feedback, the supervisors and examiners have played a role as 'reflective responders' (Hyland & Hyland, 2001, p. 188). Reflective responders focus on nurturing emerging ideas and do not attempt to be dictatorial. Relating this to SRL, it seems evident that Vijay was able to rewrite and stay motivated because of the non-dictatorial role played by the supervisors and the examiners. In the process, he was provided with an opportunity to play an active role in the learning process, discover new knowledge and develop disciplinary literacy by considering the opinions of the supervisors and examiners.

Academic practice

As an academic who now supervises postgraduate students Vijay is of the view that the SRL experiences gained from the supervisors' feedback and examiner reports haveinfluenced his own feedback practices. It should be recalled that the supervisors and examiners provided referential, directive and expressive

feedback on his drafts. Thoseforms of feedback now shape his own feedback practices.

For example, as a consequence of Vijay's preference for expressive feedback overreferential feedback, he delays editorial (referential) feedback until the final draft. This is to ensure that '[student] motivation and self-confidence is not damaged' (Hyland & Hyland, 2001, p. 186). He also uses the 'sandwich' technique (Hyland & Hyland, 2001), whereby he first offers written praise on an academic paper before noting any criticism. He gives additional praise at the end of the paper. This is becausehis own SRL experiences indicate that praise motivates emerging writers and gives them a sense of accomplishment. This understanding originated from the way his supervisors provided feedback and motivated him to set achievable goals for each of his drafts. It is also a clear indication that some learning goals have been achieved. It creates an academic interactive practice where the writer views the academic as providing a form of acceptance. When he has to make criticism, he usually does this by offering suggestions to help the writer to discover new meanings in the emerging text. On some occasions he offers his opinions and well directed suggestions (but avoids instructions, see below), while on other occasions he poses questions toencourage the writer to make new connections and discover new links in the writer's arguments. As some of the examiner comments developed his critical writing and thinking skills, he uses criticisms to encourage his writer-students to consider new directions to orchestrate their writing.

Vijay also felt rather uncomfortable when receiving instructions (directives), as hewas of the opinion that such directives postulated a master-apprentice model of super-vision whereas he was more in favour of a peer-to-peer model. Taking this into consideration, when using directives, he includes hedging in his feedback practices, i.e. he includes intentionally noncommittal or ambiguous statements to lessen the impact of an utterance. As an example, when he is not happy with a paragraph, insteadof merely deleting the paragraph, he may write: 'Is this paragraph necessary?'

The discussion above seems to shed light as to how reflection-on action has provided developmental learning experiences to the supervisee who is now a supervisor himself. The theoretical perspective of Scanlon and Chernomas (1997), which postulates a three-stage model of reflection seems pertinent. The first stage of reflection is awareness and during this stage, awareness is stimulated by both comfortable and uncomfortable thoughts. From the data provided above, the supervisee indicated both comfortable and uncomfortable thoughts about the feedback he received. It was the uncomfortable thoughts, for example about the use of directives, that led him to analyse the effect of such feedback and become aware of new perspective in providingfeedback to his own students. This second stage is the critical analysis stage which leads to the third stage of learning. In the learning stage, the supervisee adapted his perspective to accompany his growing self-awareness of the impact of the type of feedback.

Reflection by supervisor (Elke Stracke)

On a similar note, Elke too reflected on the feedback that she provided. Sincereflection-on-action (Schön, 1987) encompasses the self-reflection that takes place after feedback has been provided, this research into feedback practices that included her own comments presented a unique opportunity for raising her awareness about theimpact that her comments might have, such as intended or unintended consequences.

Coding and analysing her own as well as her colleagues' feedback had a strong impacton Elke. The scholarly analysis of the feedback and the conversations and reflection with Vijay also allowed her to realise the need for some changes if she wanted her feedback to be effective.

Specifically, she learnt that when she gave expressive feedback, the supervisee was much more likely to pick it up. She also realised that she needed to praise more often if she wanted to continue motivating students on their long journey towards thesis completion. Elke feels encouraged in her frequent use of expressive feedback and, in particular, making use of opinion. Another insight concerns the use of directives. When reading the feedback and in her discussions with Vijay, she became moreconscious of these potentially 'risky devices' (Hyland, 2002, p. 215) that can threatenthe peer-to-peer relationship she wishes to have with her doctoral students. Such directives might include:

Revise! Looks messy to me. Somewhat sarcastic.

Avoid! Review your Internet referencing.

Do not use the narrative past tense in a literature review.Be consistent.

Realising the possibly face-threatening nature of such instructions made Elke decide to use directives more cautiously in her feedback practice, without, however, completely giving up the practice. The latter might have to do with her cultural and linguistic background (L1 is German), where more direct levels for such

requests are acceptable, but might be awkward in the English language. This confirms Hyland's (2002) statement that 'culture intrudes our communicative practices in significant ways' (p. 220).[3] Nevertheless, Elke now believes that it might be more appropriate tophrase her requests more indirectly, e.g. 'I wonder if you would mind revising …' instead of 'Revise! Looks messy to me' as in the example above.

Conclusion

Our analysis and reflections appear to indicate the value of expressive feedbackin promoting self-regulated learning during the doctoral journey. It is this self- regulation that seems to be the ultimate goal of doctoral education whereby the supervisee becomes part of an intellectual community. It is these SRL experiences that also form the '… platform on which the standards of doctoral qualifications rest' (Johnston, 1997, p. 333). It should be reiterated that content knowledge, skills, attitudes and transferable skills are key components of SRL that aid in the 'formation of scholars' and prepare 'doctoral supervisees … for a fast-changing, highly fluid,competitive and demanding professional world. …' (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008, p. 61). In the case of the supervisee in this study, it is these SRL experiences that have been vital in ensuring his confidence as a memberof an academic community.

We would also claim that examiner written feedback, in addition to supervisor feedback, plays a socio-emotional goal in the doctoral journey. In other words, would argue that there is a necessity to structure feedback to ensure emerging writers feel that they are achieving definable goals in each of their drafts. It seems pertinent that examiners too should provide a context for the attainment of socio-emotional goals. One also needs to be aware of the potential that examiner reports have for nurturing SRL during the doctoral journey. Not all supervisees may be able to view criticisms as opportunities for revising and discovering new ideas. As such, the interactive nature of examiner reports (in the form of feedback) seems essential to ensure SRL takes place. In addition, for both authors this research has opened an avenue into reflective learning that enriches their current practice as supervisors. Our research provides us with a clearer understanding of how feedback practices can pave way for lifelong learning by considering doctoral education as a process. We hope that this paper will also make others reflect upon their practice of providing feedback.

Acknowledgements

This paper has been prepared equally by the authors, who wish to thank the University of Canberra and Universiti Putra Malaysia for partially funding this research. The authors would also like to thank Tony Harland for his comments on a first draft of this paper. Earlier versionsof this paper were presented at the HERDSA (Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia) Conference (Adelaide, 2007), the QPR (Quality in Postgraduate Research) Conference (Adelaide, 2008), the ALAA (Applied Linguistics Association of Australia) Conference (Sydney, 2008), and AILA (Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée or International Association of Applied Linguistics) (Essen, Germany, 2008) and at seminars in Malaysia and Australia. The authors wish to acknowledge the thoughtful suggestions provided by the participants, and to record their appreciation to their research partners, supervisors and examiners, as well as by the anonymous reviewers.

Notes

1. One supervisor chose not to participate in this study. Supervisor Vera gave more feedbackthan Supervisor Jack, which explains why the focus is more on Vera than on Jack in the following discussion.
2. We use the term 'draft' to emphasise that we consider the thesis that is being examined stillwork in progress.
3. Just how far the supervisors and supervisee were influenced in their practice by their cultural and linguistic background is a topic that, based on our cultural insights, seems worthwhile investigating in future research.

Notes on contributors

Elke Stracke is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Arts and Design at the University of Canberra, Australia. Her research interests include blended language learning, independent learning and learner autonomy, the use of computer technology in language learning, students'and teachers' beliefs, language teacher education, and postgraduate supervision development.

Vijay Kumar is a Senior Lecturer with the Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia. His research interests are in academic writing, postgraduate development, and doctoral pedagogies. Both Elke and Vijay collaborate on doctoral research.

References

Boekaerts, M. (1999). Self-regulated learning: Where we are today. *International Journal ofEducational Research, 31,* 445–457.

Boekaerts, M. (2002). Bringing about change in the classroom: Strengths and weaknesses of the self-regulated learning approach – EARLI Presidential Address, 2001. *Learning and Instruction, 12,* 589–604.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (Eds.) (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning.* London: Kogan Page.

Bourke, S., Hattie, J., & Anderson, J. (2004). Predicting examiner recommendations on Ph.D theses. *International Journal of Educational Research, 41,* 178–194.

Butler, D.L., & Winne, P.H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 65,* 245–281.

Denicolo, P. (2003). Assessing the PhD: A constructive view of criteria. *Quality Assurance in Education, 11*(2), 84–91.

Holbrook, A., Bourke, S., Lovat, T., & Fairbairn, H. (2008). Consistency and inconsistency in PhD thesis examination. *Australian Journal of Education, 52*(1), 36–48.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hyland, K. (2002). Directives: Argument and engagement in academic writing. *AppliedLinguistics, 23*(2), 215–239.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing.* NewYork: Longman.

Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill. Praise and criticism in written feedback.
Journal of Second Language in Writing, 10, 185–212.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues.*
New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, S. (1997). Examining the examiners: An analysis of examiners' reports on doctoraltheses. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(3), 333–347.

Joyner, R.W. (2003). The selection of external examiners of research degrees. *Quality Assur-ance in Education, 11*(2), 123–127.

Kumar, V., & Stracke, E. (2007). An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis. *Teachingin Higher Education, 12*(4), 461–470.

Scanlan, J.M., & Chernomas, W.M. (1997). Developing the reflective teacher. *Journal ofAdvanced Nursing, 25*(5), 1138–1143.

Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teachingand learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tinkler, P., & Jackson, C. (2004). *The doctoral examination process.* UK: Society forResearch into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* In
M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scriber, & E. Souberman (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: HarvardUniversity Press.

Walker, G.E., Golde, C.M., Jones, L., Bueschel, A.S., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars. Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century.* San Francisco Jossey-Bass.

Zimmermann, B.J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview and analysis. In B.J. Zimmermann & D.H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learn- ing and academic achievements: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–37). Mahwah, NJ/London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zimmermann, B.J., & Schunk, D.H. (2001). Reflections on theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement. In B.J. Zimmermann & D.H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievements: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed.) (pp. 289–307). Mahwah, NJ/London: Lawrence Erlbaum