

# INDEX

- Ableism, 169–170
- Ableist, 172–173
- Academia, 84–85
- Academic administration
  - departments, 99
- ‘Academic bubble’, 81–82
- Academic career
  - preparation, 37–38
- Academic misconduct, 165
- Academic pathway, 1–2
- Academic socialization of
  - PhD students, 39–40
- Acceptance, 171
- Affiliation, 171
- Anticipatory questions, 24
- Autonomy, 45
  - need and working towards Mid candidature review, 52
- Barriers, 97–100
- Belonging, 170–174
- Belonging in Academia Model (BAM), 169–170, 172
- ‘Bildung’ and creating inclusive learning
  - community, espousing, 131–135
- Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council, 77–78
- Brainstorm potential
  - research questions, 16
- Brainstorming method, 6–7
- Building relationships in co-supervision, 65–66
- ‘Candidates’ voices, 195–196
  - conversations in Margins, 116–119
  - creating conversations with candidates, 112–119
  - developing candidates
    - doctoral voice and confidence, 119–121
  - doctorateness, 107–108
  - elements of feedback, 113–116
  - purpose and practices of feedback, 109–112

- Career progression, 81
- Centres for doctoral training (CDT), 77
- Choice theory, 2–3
- ‘Clock time’, 175
- Co-author, 154, 157, 161
- Co-authorship, 154, 156
  - basics, 153–155
  - challenges in, 160–165
  - choice of co-author, 158–160
  - matter, 155–157
- Co-learning environment, 32
- Co-supervision
  - approaches to supervision at postgraduate level, 63–65
  - building relationships in, 65–66
  - creating flexibility in workload, 70–71
  - management, 147–148
  - managing different ways of working, 69–70
  - reflecting on our experiences of, 66–71
  - setting boundaries, 67–68
- Co(l)laboratory as case study of collaborative research, 83
- Co(l)laboratory Research Hub, 83, 88–89
- Coach, 133–134
- Coaching, 146
- Cohort-based PhD funding programmes, 77
- Collaboration, 76, 79
- Collaborative approach in doctoral research, 76
- Collaborative doctorate schemes, UK
  - examples of, 77–78
- Collaborative PhD project, 86–87
- Collaborative projects, 164–165
- Collaborative research, co(l)laboratory as case study of, 83
- Collaborator, 45–46, 85–86
- Communication skills, 81
- Competence, 8–9, 45
- Complementary supervision, 64–66
- Conferences, 45, 133
- Constrained conditions, addressing supervisory responsibilities under, 126–131
- Contribution to knowledge, 107–108, 118–119
- ‘Conversations in Margins’, 116–119
- ‘Crip time’, 175
- Culture, 97, 99
- Descriptive questions, 24

- Developmental feedback, 109–110
- Dialogic feedback, 111
- Dialogue/ic, 117
- Disability disclosure, 180–181
- Disabled graduate students, 175, 179
  - belonging, 170–174
  - labour, 178–181
  - time, 175–177
- Disablism, 169–170
- Diversified supervision, 64
- Diversity, embracing, 124–126
- Doctoral Academy, The, 148–149
- Doctoral candidate(s), 1, 6–9, 12, 141–144, 190
  - academic socialization of PhD students, 39–40
  - academic *vs.* non-academic career preparation, 37–38
  - approach, 140–141
  - background of doctoral education in India, 29–30
  - benefits to, 81–82
  - effect of funding on supervision, 33–34
  - PhD candidates
    - perspectives, 141–145
  - PhD supervisors
    - perspectives, 145–148
    - quality of supervision, 35–36
- Strathmore university
  - doctoral academy, 148–150
  - supervision in times of newer forms of doctorate programmes, 31–33
  - timely completion of PhD programmes, 38–39
- Doctoral candidature, 46, 48, 53
- Doctoral context, engaged research in, 78–79
- Doctoral education, 29, 132
  - in India, 29–30
- Doctoral graduates, 198
- Doctoral research, collaborative approach in, 76
- Doctoral study, 45–46
- Doctoral supervision/ supervisors, 63, 69, 128
  - fictional candidate archetypes and scenarios, 49–56
  - guiding core values for supervising relationship, 135–136
  - India, 124–126
  - SDT, 44–46
  - supervision framework, 46–48

- United states of America, 131–135
- US Context, 131–132
- Zambia, 126–131
- Doctoral thesis, 3–4
- Doctorate programmes, supervision in times of newer forms of, 31–33
- ‘Doctorateness’, 107–108
- Dyadic supervision, 63
- Early Career Researchers (ECRs), 149
- Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), 78
- Effective supervision, 102–103
- Emancipatory questions, 24
- Emotional labour, 180–181
- ‘Enculturation’, 190
- Engaged research in doctoral context, 78–79
- Epistemic diversity, 169–170
- Equity, 172
- Executive PhD Programme, 31–32
- Experiential diversity, 169–170
- Explanatory questions, 24
- Familiarity, 171
- Feedback
  - elements of, 113–116
  - purpose and practices of, 109–112
- Fictional candidate
  - archetypes and scenarios, 49–56
  - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
    - autonomy need, 53–54
    - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
      - competency need, 50–52
      - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
        - relatedness need, 56
- Finances, 94–96
- Funding
  - agencies, 162
  - effect on supervision, 33–34
- Funnel, 25–26
- Funnelling, 17, 19
  - need for, 17–19
  - reason and aim, 19–22
  - relevance and significance, 22–25
  - research problem, 13–17
  - turning funnel around, 25–26
- Generate-Sort-Connect-Elaborate (GSCE), 56–57
- Graduate, 3–4
  - school, 131
  - students, 170–172
  - study, 4–5
- ‘Hierarchical relationships’, 129–130

- Higher education, 172–173
- Identity, 108, 119–120
- Impact factor (IF), 162
- Inclusive learning  
     community,  
     espousing ‘Bildung’  
     and creating,  
     131–135
- Inclusiveness, embracing,  
     124–126
- India, 124–126  
     background of doctoral  
     education in, 29–30
- Indian doctoral education,  
     126
- Industrial Cooperative  
     Awards in Science,  
     77
- Industry–university  
     partnerships, 77
- Institutions, 91–92
- Interdependent  
     relationships,  
     171–172
- International collaboration,  
     164
- International English  
     Language Testing  
     System (IELTS),  
     100–101
- International postgraduate  
     candidates, 93–94
- International students,  
     93–94, 100  
     barriers and conflicts,  
     97–100
- differences addressed,  
     100–102
- effective supervision,  
     102–103
- finances, 94–96
- new-found  
     independence,  
     92–94
- supervision, 100
- Labour, 178–181
- Leadership collective,  
     160–161
- Learning outcome, 14
- Medical model, 173–174
- Mentor–mentee  
     relationship,  
     123–124
- Methodology, 48, 64,  
     142–143
- Methods for data  
     collection, 25
- Mid-candidature review, 48  
     autonomy need and  
     working towards, 52
- Milestone, 39, 46, 48
- Needs assessment survey of  
     PhD scholars, 30–31
- Neoliberal academic  
     culture, 181–182
- New-found independence,  
     92–94
- Non-academic career  
     preparation, 37–38
- Non-academic  
     collaborators

- benefits to supervisors,
  - doctoral candidates and research, 80–83
- co(l)laboratory as case study of
  - collaborative research, 83
- collaborative approach in doctoral research, 76
- engaged research in doctoral context, 78–79
- recommendations for supporting non-academic collaborations in research, 84–89
- UK examples of collaborative doctorate schemes, 77–78
- Non-academic organizations, 84
- Nottingham Trent University, 83
- Novice supervisors, 127–128, 131
- Open education resources (OER), 20
- Oral examination, 189
- Original(ity), 48, 189
- Ownership, 44–45, 109–110
- Partnership, 85–86, 113
- Path/pathway, 2–4, 10–11, 179
- Patience, 146–147
- Pedagogy of inclusiveness, 125–126
- PhD, 139–140
  - academic socialization of, 39–40
  - perspectives from PhD candidates, 141–145
  - perspectives from PhD supervisors, 145–148
  - programmes, 37
  - students, 44–45
  - timely completion of, 38–39
- Post-viva, 196–198
- Postgraduate level, approaches to supervision at, 63–65
- Power dynamics, 64–65
- Pragmatic outcome, 14
- Presentations, 87–88, 144–145
- ‘Primary’ supervisor, 65–66
- Principal Investigator (PI), 134, 157
- Professional competencies, 37
- Professional development/learning, 26, 45, 56, 88–89
- Professional doctorates, 31
- Professional growth, 81
- Publication, 4, 33

- Queer, Trans, Black, Indigenous people of Colour (QTBIPOC), 173–174
- Question sorts strategy, 51–52
- R & D People and Culture strategy, 76–77
- Rational action theory, 2–3
- Relatedness need
  - and final milestone/viva, 55
  - supervision strategy for, 57
- Relationships, 62, 69
- Research, 160–161
  - benefits to, 82–83
  - career development and contextualisation of research skills, 81–82
  - collaborations, 88–89
  - council, 76–77
  - problem, 13–17
  - process, 139–140, 147
  - questions, 22–25
  - recommendations for supporting non-academic collaborations in, 84–89
  - supervisors, 61–62
- Research assistant (RA), 176
  - RA-ships, 176–177
- Responsibility/ies, 65–66, 134–135, 178
- Self-advocacy, 180
- Self-assessment
  - mechanisms, 5–6
- Self-determination theory (SDT), 43–44, 46
  - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
    - autonomy need, 53–54
    - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
      - competency need, 50–52
      - supervision strategies for supporting SDT
        - relatedness need, 56
- Seminars, 6–7, 45
- Skills, 4–6, 37
- Social institutions, 172–173
- Strathmore university
  - doctoral academy, 148–150
- Strathmore University's Doctoral Academy, 140
- Strengthening Postgraduate Supervision, 67
- Stress, 5–6, 98, 141–142
- Student's autonomy, 54
- Substitutive supervision, 64
- Supervising relationship,
  - guiding core values for, 135–136
- Supervision strategies
  - approaches to
    - supervision at postgraduate level, 63–65

- effect of funding on, 33–34
- for autonomy need, 54
- for competency need, 51
- for relatedness need, 57
- for supporting SDT
  - autonomy need, 53–54
- for supporting SDT
  - competency need, 50–52
- for supporting SDT
  - relatedness need, 56
- framework, 46–48
- of doctoral research
  - students, 43
- process, 67–68
- quality of, 35–36
- Supervisor(s), 14, 34, 37, 39, 45, 50–51, 92, 96–97, 99, 108, 145, 192–196
  - benefits to, 80–81
  - supervisor–superviSee relationship, 123–124
- Supervisory feedback, 112–113
- Supervisory process, 143–144
- Supervisory responsibilities
  - under constrained conditions, addressing, 126–131
- Supervisory teams, 64
- Teaching assistant (TA), 176
- TA-ships, 176–177
- Test of English as a Foreign Language (ToEFL), 100–101
- Theory, 2–3, 44
- Thesis/theses, 4, 8–9, 12, 87
- Three-pronged approach, 107–108
- Time, 175–177
  - management, 144
- Tuition (fees), 94–95, 149
- UK
  - examples of
    - collaborative doctorate schemes, 77–78
    - funding initiatives, 77–78
    - research context, 81
- Undergraduate study, 4–5
- United states
  - of America, 131–135
  - context, 131–132
  - examples of
    - responsibilities, challenges and joys, 132–135
- Universities, 43
  - support systems, 98
- University Grants Commission (UGC), 33
- University of London, 29–30
- Vancouver Protocol, 161–162



- Viva, 48, 188–189
  - arranging, 192–194
  - long game, 190–192
  - post-viva, 196–198
  - short game, 194–196
  - voce* examination, 187–188
- Voice, 108, 118–119
- Wellbeing, 174
- Work-based doctorates, 31
- Workload, creating flexibility in, 70–71
- Writing, 2–3, 107–108, 153
- Zambia, 126–131