The internationalisation of Higher Education: Opportunities and constraints

A case study of the PhD journey in Tourism Studies

Emma Bettinson

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Cardiff Metropolitan University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Declaration

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed .... (candidate)

Date .... 24/7/17 ....

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed .... (candidate)

Date .... 27/4/17 ....

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed .... (candidate)

Date .... 27/4/17 ....

Abstract

This study explores the role of the PhD and internationalisation in expanding and diversifying the canon of knowledge in Tourism Studies. A community of mainly white, middle class, male, Anglophone, western academics, it has been widely argued, has traditionally produced tourism knowledge. However, the large number of international research students in Tourism Studies in the UK appear to provide an opportunity for intercultural knowledge exchange and the creation of body of knowledge which embraces multiple worldviews and perspectives. However, there is little evidence that tourism knowledge is developing in this way and this study explores the PhD journey and the constraints which surround it.

The research took place in two phases. The first consisted in exploratory conversations with supervisors and students in the three UK Higher Education Institutions with the greatest numbers of doctoral students in Tourism. These conversations explored the factors influencing the PhD journey. The second phase of research built upon key themes that had emerged from the first phase and involved in-depth interviews with six students and six supervisors at the same three institutions. Analysis was informed by critical language awareness, in order to identify how language conventions and practices are invested with power relations.

Results showed that the PhD journey and, ultimately, the creation of knowledge is a very personal and passionate process which is influenced by many factors. It is an isolated journey for both home and international students with few opportunities for intercultural exchange. It highlighted the powerful role of gatekeepers, such as supervisors, sponsors, external examiners and journal editors, in the journey and the legitimisation of tourism knowledge. The study showed an increased focus on skills training within the doctorate, limiting opportunities for extending knowledge and meaning the dominant voices will remain entrenched in the canon of tourism knowledge.

Dedication

In memory of my Mum and Dad who always inspired and encouraged me in everything I did.

To my family, Gareth, Kate and James.

Acknowledgments

There are a number of people I would like to thank as, without them, I would not have reached the end of this journey.

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor David Botterill, Professor Eleri Jones, Professor Annette Pritchard and Dr Diane Sedgley for all their help and invaluable guidance in producing this thesis.

Secondly, I would like to thank all those who took part in the research and were kind enough to share their stories and journeys with me.

I would also like to thank my amazing work colleagues for all their support over the years and, in particular, in the past few weeks.

Last but not least, I would like to thank Gareth and my children, Kate and James, for all their love and support over the years and for keeping me sane!

List of figures

List of abbreviations

CLS   Critical language study

MR   Members Resources

QAA   Quality Assurance Agency

UWIC University of Wales Institute Cardiff

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Introduction

This chapter will outline the background to the study and the rationale behind it. It will also attempt to explain my own personal involvement in the research and my motivations and reasons for embarking upon it. I will consider how my own life journey has shaped the research and has influenced my ways of seeing and knowing.   Having outlined the aim and objectives of the study, I will then briefly discuss how I approached the study and the rationale behind my approach, before giving summaries of the chapters that follow.

1.2.   Rationale for the study

It has been suggested that, in order for tourism to continue to emerge as an area of study, a coherent body of knowledge is crucial (Airey 2004). Although, as we move towards a knowledge society, other modes of knowledge creation undoubtedly have a significant role to play in tourism studies (Tribe, 2006; Gibbons et al., 1994), higher education remains the most *'visible sector of systematic knowledge generation, preservation and dissemination'* (Kehm and Teichler, 2007: 260). Within higher education, the PhD has traditionally been at the forefront of that knowledge creation. In fact, at the very core of the doctorate is the key premise that the thesis should make an original contribution to the body of knowledge. Moreover, today's PhD students are likely to be tomorrow's educators, practitioners and policy makers. However, tourism knowledge, it has been widely argued, has traditionally been produced by a community of mainly white, middle class, male, Anglophone, western academics (Botterill & Gale, 2005; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007). With the rapid increase in PhDs being undertaken by international, non-EU, students, it seems that

the community of academics producing knowledge is in a state of flux. In line with UK higher education in general, the Tourism Academy is faced with the internationalisation agenda and its inherent tensions and opportunities.

In the UK, international students comprise 50 per cent of full-time research degree students (UKCISA, 2016). In 2015/16, there were 32,530 international (non EU) research degree students in the UK (HESA 2017). With such large numbers of international students there is potential for challenging the traditional knowledge creation within tourism studies. These international PhD students bring, for some, the hope that we will see a radical reform of the orthodoxy of tourism knowledge by allowing previously silent voices to contribute to creating a 'new' tourism knowledge, which includes a more *'diverse situatedness'* (Botterill & Gale, 2005:5). Indeed Pritchard & Morgan (2007:23) challenge today's academic gatekeepers to *'listen more closely to the voices of the second generation and to those currently marginalized and underrepresented groups'* in the community of tourism studies. They argue that we must be willing to learn from every *'knowledge tradition'* if we are to have a conceptualisation of tourism which *'embraces multiple worldviews and cultural differences'* (2007:23). Harris, Wilson and Ateljevic (2007:44) join in this new, critical movement by highlighting the *'entanglements'* of research, which they describe as the *'forces that influence, constrain and shape the act of reproducing knowledge within academic structures.'* These arguments echo those of scholars of internationalisation, who are calling for a return from the economic discourse surrounding the internationalisation of Higher Education to the academic values on which it was originally based (Ryan, 2012: Sawir, 2013; Urban and Palmer, 2014).

It should be noted at this stage that, with the increased focus on performativity in Higher Education, there are many tensions surrounding the internationalisation agenda, with critics arguing that it is driven by an economic discourse, leading to the 'commodification' of Higher Education. (De Vita & Case, 2003). Indeed, Government policy has encouraged the recruitment of international students at all levels of Higher Education and internationalisation tends to manifest itself most visibly in terms of numbers of international students within UK universities. It is, perhaps, not surprising, then, that there is a growing body of research into the internationalisation of higher education and, in particular, its impact on teaching and learning and the international student experience (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007; De Vita and Case, 2003; Leonard and Pelletier, 2003). Such research has tended to be large-scale studies focussing on the experiences of the undergraduate international student and international student support services (UKCOSA, 2004; Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007). At the same time, extensive research exists on the PhD experience in the UK (Eggleston and Delamont, 1983; Hockey, 1991; Salmon, 1992; Pole, 2000) but little of this research explicitly examines the effect that the increase in numbers of PhD students from outside the EU has had on the PhD experience of students, both domestic and international, and their supervisors.

This same focus on performativity has led some writers to highlight the issue of pressures surrounding completion rates and accountability in the PhD process which, it has been claimed, are leading to a sacrifice of autonomy and, ultimately, creativity. (Pole, 2000). When considering the place of a PhD in the system of tourism knowledge production, we cannot ignore the fact that the rapid increase in numbers of international students at doctoral level coincides with, and is partly accounted for, by the emergence of a knowledge economy. It has been argued that

the growth in postgraduate study of tourism is a reaction to the recognised importance of tourism as global social & economic activity. This has meant that tourism knowledge is regarded by governments and sponsors as a valuable commodity (Botterill & Gale, 2005) and this knowledge economy also brings a new agenda with it. Tourism studies becomes a valuable export which is increasingly politicised and subject to the influences of commercial pressure. Cowan and Foray (1997) argue that knowledge production in universities is increasingly controlled by top-down management, ultimately leading to increased 'productivity' at the expense of creativity and originality.

Existing literature also raises important issues regarding opportunities for creativity within the current British doctoral system, with its quality checks and 'hoops' to jump through (Trotter, 2003). Cowan and Foray (1997:184) talk of the *'bureaucratization of originality'* and argue that the PhD journey is no longer lonely enough and is *'more & more test of self-organisation, of institutional organisation and less and less a test of original critical intellectual power.'* Gundara (1997:143) warns of the danger that total bureaucratization will *'sap the energy & creativeness out of the doctorate'.*

At the same time, debates are raging as to what constitutes legitimate knowledge and questions have been raised as to the importance of the PhD as a vehicle for knowledge creation within the knowledge economy (Denicolo and Park, 2010; Tribe, 2006; Tennant, 2004), where Mode 2 knowledge, produced outside of academia (Gibbons et al, 1994)) or extradisciplinary (Tribe, 2005) knowledge is assuming greater status. In addition, despite the recent moves towards critical reflection mentioned above, it is widely acknowledged that the tourism academy has traditionally been reluctant to reflect upon the factors influencing knowledge

production. As Tribe (2006) points out, Riley & Love's study (2000) & Phillimore & Goodson's update (2004) show that there has been limited engagement with contemporary issues of knowledge production. In fact, Phillimore & Goodson (2004:16) assert that *'explicit examinations of researchers' embodied characteristics continue to be rare in tourism studies.'* Botterill (2001:199) shares the view that *'the assumptions that underlie social science research in tourism are seldom made explicit.'* So, researchers have been reluctant to examine themselves and the philosophic assumptions which underpin tourism research and are thereby producing a body of research which is largely non-reflexive.

In addition to the above-mentioned constraints to creativity and intercultural knowledge exchange, it is acknowledged that the doctoral process is controlled by various sites of power and gatekeepers of knowledge (Hall, 2004; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007; Tribe, 2010), including sponsors, supervisors, external examiners and journal editors. As Salmon (1992) points out, these power dynamics are rarely voiced in discussions regarding academic life. However, their impact on both the student experience and the canon of tourism knowledge being created is evident. For example, as Salmon (1992) notes, in order for creativity to flourish, the supervisor and student must have mutual respect and the supervisor should encourage, rather than direct, the research. Gundara (1997) supports this view and reiterates the importance of a partnership between student and supervisor, particularly in an intercultural context, where a student needs to feel supported but also encouraged to be autonomous.

In this context, it appears that the time is ripe to scrutinise the UK PhD process, both in terms of the forces at play during the journey and its role as a vehicle for tourism

knowledge creation. It is one of the first studies within tourism to go to the heart of the PhD experience and its functions, thereby contributing to our ability to reflect upon how we, as an Academy, are taking advantage of the potential opportunities offered by the internationalisation of doctoral studies. My research aims, through exploratory and in-depth interviews and some self-examination in the form of auto-ethnography, to make explicit the entanglements and embodied characteristics of the researchers involved in the study and to give voice to their own views as co-creators of knowledge. It also engages with the issues surrounding power dynamics, the role of language and other constraints within sites of knowledge creation and questions whether these allow opportunities for orthodoxies to be challenged and knowledge to be shared. In addition, it explores the concept of a multi-system of knowledge validity and attempts to identify and challenge the forces at play in deciding the legitimacy and worth of tourism knowledge. It aims to question how equipped we are to produce a broad scope of knowledge and to encourage free-thinking, reflexive, socially and ethically engaged students who are equipped and able to produce the tourism knowledge needed for today and tomorrow. In so doing, it is hoped that the study illuminates issues that are present within the PhD process but are not fore grounded because they challenge, perhaps, the very essence of the process and the players involved.

1.3. Study aim and objective

1.3.1. Aim

To investigate the opportunities and constraints surrounding the PhD journey and the creation of tourism knowledge at doctoral level in the internationalised environment of contemporary UK Higher Education.

1.3.2. Objectives

- To explore the concept of internationalisation, the role of the PhD and the PhD journey in UK Higher Education through a critical review of the literature;

- To investigate the factors influencing the PhD experience of UK and international students and supervisors in tourism studies in the contemporary internationalised climate of UK Higher Education;

- Through a framework of critical language studies, to explore the constraints surrounding the PhD journey and the provision of spaces for intercultural knowledge exchange.

- To provide recommendations to enhance the doctoral student experience and take advantage of the opportunities provided by internationalisation in doctoral education.

1.3.3. Methodology and rationale

The study is naturalistic and emergent in the sense that it took place in a real-world setting and I had no prior assumptions regarding the outcomes of the research (Patton, 2002). The epistemological stance taken is constructivist and acknowledges the existence of multiple realities and there is no attempt made to generalise the findings in one context to another (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). My commitment to critical tourism research and an unveiling of the 'situated nature' of knowledge led me to reflexivity, auto-ethnography and the use of 'I' throughout my

theses. Indeed, during the primary research, I also attempt to encourage my respondents to be reflexive regarding their own roles and research and seek to capture their lived experiences.

Phase one of the study involved semi-structured interviews or exploratory conversations with a largely opportunistic sample of students and supervisors in three Higher Education Institutions. From this broad view, I was able to move towards a more in-depth study of key issues in Phase two of the study, which involved in-depth interviews with a much smaller sample of respondents. At this stage, I introduced a more critical approach to the power dynamics at play here by introducing the perspective of Critical Language Studies to my analysis, an approach which is further explained in Chapter 5.

1.4. My research journey and my 'entanglements' in this study

Within the 'critical turn' in tourism studies (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson and Collins, 2005) or 'new' tourism research (Tribe 2005), the ideas of reflexivity and positionality of the researcher are key. It is acknowledged that the researcher brings life experiences, attitudes and worldviews to his or her research and these impact upon that research. Indeed, Reinharz (1997:3) describes the self as a '*key research tool*' and points out that we bring a variety of selves to our research. Patton (2002) argues that post-modern critiques of knowledge challenge us to be clear about authorship, to be self-reflective, to acknowledge the biases and limitations of our work and to honour our multiple perspectives within our research. Like Reinharz, Patton (2002) describes the researcher as a human being as being a key instrument in the research.

However, within tourism research, the importance of positionality and the researcher's *'autobiographical ways of knowing'* (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007) have not been widely recognised. Indeed, it is probably more accurate to say that the tourism research has actively resisted the inclusion of the personal narrative and, in doing so, has arguably promoted a lack of reflexivity. However, as Botterill (2001) points out, we need to explore the assumptions underlying our research practices in tourism as knowledge applied unreflexively can lead to truths which are blind, value-laden, partial and overbearing.

Harris, Wilson and Ateljevic (2007) describe the forces that influence, constrain and shape knowledge production within academic structures as the *'entanglements of reflexivity'* (2007:44) and recognise that it is necessary to get entangled in these forces as part of the process of becoming truly reflexive and critical. Within this study, I acknowledge that I bring my own perspective to the inquiry and to the interpretation of the findings. Patton (2015), in fact, argues that the perspective that the researcher brings to the study is part of the context for the findings. He describes a human being as *'the instrument of qualitative methods'* (2015:64), in that he or she is the person that carries out the fieldwork and interprets responses. It is important that the researcher has self-awareness around these processes and reflexivity *'has entered the qualitative lexicon as a way of emphasizing the importance of self-awareness, political/cultural consciousness, and ownership of one's perspective* (Patton 2015:64).

In this section, therefore, I am trying to examine my own position and entanglements in an effort to produce a more open, honest and, I hope, rich form of knowledge. In

this quest to improve self-understanding and self-awareness (Patton, 2015), I will begin by reflecting upon my own path into the PhD 'maze' (Salmon, 1992) and the influences and motivations that have shaped that journey. I will then consider my own position and entanglements within the research process and the multiples selves that I bring to that process. This reflection will continue later in the thesis when I introduce my own experiences and introspection as a form of primary data (Patton, 2015)

1.4.1. My journey

When I really reflected upon my own path in life and motivations to embark upon the PhD journey and, more specifically, this particular PhD journey, I began to realise I made the first steps on what has proven to be a long, and still unfinished, journey many years ago. I have also concluded that these first, tentative, steps were made as a result of my two passions in life: a love of language and a love of skiing.

My love of language began when, as an infant at a Catholic convent school, I was taught largely by Belgian nuns, who slipped between English and French at will. There were a series of school trips and exchanges and my interest in travel, other languages, and perhaps more importantly, other cultures was born. This route eventually led me to a degree in European Community Studies at Cardiff University.

However, it was not by chance that I ended up at Cardiff but, rather, is symptomatic of another aspect my identity or being. I was born in London of Welsh parents and grew up with a strong, if not exaggerated, sense of 'Welshness' and yearning to return to the 'Land of My Fathers' at the earliest opportunity. This degree afforded

me that opportunity but also involved a new leg on my journey when I spent a year studying in France and Germany, again experiencing different cultures and ways of working. However, my recent reflections have led me to believe that there was a significant turning point in my route during this period. One day, towards the end of my degree course, and with the advent of the promised 'Single Market' of 1992 looming, my mother commented that I would be very well equipped to take a job in Brussels or Luxembourg. I, apparently, exhibited total horror at the prospect of moving and working abroad on a semi-permanent basis and declared that I would not even consider it, concluding with 'What about the rugby internationals?' My reaction was, for many years, a family joke but, on reflection, I realise that, at a fairly early stage of my journey, I was very aware that, despite my yearning to travel, I was ultimately a 'homebird'. I, in fact, had no desire to 'inhabit' another culture and language geographically but, instead, had a deep interest in the 'workings' of language and the insights that language offered me in terms of understanding other peoples' windows on the world. I suspect that these feelings have affected the rest of my journey and, without a doubt, my admiration for and interest in those who make the decision to fully embrace other languages and cultures, either temporarily or permanently, has shaped my career and research journey.

My love of languages was certainly the driving force in my career path. On leaving University, rather than Brussels, I chose the French Alps, where I spent six months working in a ski resort. This experience was my first foray into the 'professional' world of tourism and generated my interest in tourism and, more specifically the ski industry, which, unbeknown to me at the time, was to have a profound effect on my life and research journey. On my return to the UK, I combined teaching French at Cardiff University and English to foreign students with various roles within the

tourism industry. Once ensconced in a full-time role offering academic support to international university students at University of Wales Institute Cardiff (UWIC), I finally embarked upon an MA in Leisure and Tourism Management, also at UWIC. It was at this point that my personal research journey accelerated, fuelled largely by my passion for skiing and the mountains. My research for my Masters dissertation in ski tourism took me into an area of academic life I had not previously encountered. Not only did I enjoy the academic challenge but I forged links with the research community, both in tourism studies and more widely, within UWIC (at the time). At the same time, with the increasing numbers of international doctoral students within the institution, my role as Support Tutor was also leading me towards a closer relationship with that body of students. I began to increasingly reflect upon my experience of university life and research within the UK and to draw comparisons with the experiences of our doctoral students. In my role as Academic Support Tutor, I had an insight into both the personal and professional lives of the international students. I was, and still am, fascinated to learn of their motivations for crossing the world to study and the challenges that face them once here. I also had a privileged insight into their cultural perspectives, their attitudes to study and their views of and role within the supervisory relationship, in particular. Through very regular meetings with several of them over long periods of time, I perceived changes in their ways of thinking and their research as it progressed through different phases, seemingly subject to various internal and external influences. I witnessed their personal struggles and the academic frustrations facing them, in terms of expressing their ideas clearly and communicating in both social and academic circles, often leading to isolation and marginalisation.

As I increasingly reflected upon others' research journeys and began to draw comparisons with my own, I began to ask questions of the whole process and experience and, ultimately, the role of the PhD as a vehicle for knowledge creation. Through my own pedagogical research into the internationalisation process, I was aware that little research had been undertaken which highlighted the PhD experience of international students, the potential they offer and the challenges they face. It was some time during these reflections that I began to discuss some of these issues with colleagues, particularly Professor David Botterill, and, with some encouragement, made the decision to take yet another leap forward on my own journey and begin my PhD.

1.4.2. My multiples selves and entanglements within the research

Whilst I acknowledge that being a researcher and an academic is the most important self that I bring to my research (Reinharz, 1997), I am also aware that I am comprised of many other selves, all of which have had an impact of my ways of seeing and knowing and, therefore, on all aspects of my research, from the formulation of research questions, through to the interpretation of data. As Hall (2004) suggests, it is not possible to be totally neutral in the process of giving voice to others and the perspectives that I bring to my work will undoubtedly contribute to this process of 'Othering'. By considering our own positionality within research, we are able to consider how we relate to and give voice to those we are researching or our *'intersectionality with the researched'* (Harris et al., 2007).

During this study, the selves I brought to the research either changed or were brought to the fore over time. At the beginning, I was both a PhD student and

International Student Support Tutor. In terms of my approach to the research, I cannot hide from the fact that I am a linguist by nature and by training and this has undoubtedly influenced my research perspective. As I was researching the PhD process, my role as a PhD student myself has been significant in the way I have viewed my own experience and those of others. As a member of the community I am researching, I have had the unusual experience of undergoing the experience as I research and write about it. However, as International Student Support Tutor, I carried with me attitudes which I had gained from my involvement within the 'power structures' of the International Office and the University. There were also power dynamics at play in my relationship with the research students and the academic staff at UWIC, which were different from those I shared with respondents from other institutions.

Two years into my research project, I changed roles and became a Lecturer in Tourism, still at UWIC (now Cardiff Metropolitan University). Once again, my relationship with those I was researching changed as some became close colleagues. In addition, the external pressures on my own journey increased as something I had begun as something of a hobby now became a job requirement and subject to *'the rules of the academic game'* (Hall, 2004:148). When I consider my relationship with those I was researching, I am also aware that to some, particularly the PhD supervisors, I represented a potential threat to a powerful group of gatekeeping academics and this undoubtedly affected our relationship in terms of openness and honesty. These are all issues which I explore in more depth within the thesis.

Other selves which have affected my research paths are those which are more personal and these autobiographical reflections, while vital to understanding the nature of our research, can be difficult to address as they leave us feeling vulnerable and exposed (Hall, 2004). The first of these selves is myself as a linguist and the paths that has led me down, which I have already discussed above. Another is myself as a Welsh girl living in London and the sense of national identity and belonging which undoubtedly gave me a heightened sense of Other and cultural awareness during my childhood. Other selves which have influenced both my relationship with and perceptions of those I was researching and my attitude towards my own PhD have been related to myself as a family member. Firstly, I have become a divorced mother (of twins!) during my PhD and, like so many part-time students, have had to juggle that responsibility with a full-time job and my PhD. Secondly, the death of my mother, fairly early in the journey, and my father as I was approaching completion of this thesis, have proved considerable hurdles and challenged my position or self as a mother and sister. I consider these personal changes and hurdles to have been extremely influential upon my own motivations and attitudes towards my research. They have also allowed me to empathise with other PhD student and their experiences. and have enabled me to value the effect of seemingly 'external' factors on the experiences of other PhD students.

By examining my own positionality within my research and the multiple selves I bring to my life and my work, I feel I am more aware of the attitudes, experiences and worldviews that impact upon my research. In a study where I am trying to make explicit the impact of embodied characteristics of researchers on the way they experience the PhD journey and on knowledge creation, it seems that reflexivity on my own part is vital and I attempt to maintain a reflexive stance throughout the study.

1.5.   Overview of thesis

Chapter 1 has provided a background and rationale for my study. It has then outlined the aim and objectives of the study before going on to consider my own research journey and my entanglements in this study.

The review of the literature takes place over three chapters. Firstly, chapter 2 will review the existing literature regarding the internationalisation of Higher Education. It outlines the changing conceptualisations of internationalisation and then focuses on the potential opportunities it offers and the factors which appear to be inhibiting the internationalisation of Higher Education.

Chapter 3 reviews the literature surrounding the PhD and its role and purpose. It considers the concept of doctorateness and, goes on to explore the part that the doctorate plays in shaping tourism knowledge. In doing so, it considers the current state of tourism knowledge and other forces at play in creating tourism knowledge. Chapter 4 considers the literature surrounding the PhD journey for students and supervisors. It particularly focuses on the concept of the PhD as a personal rite of passage and goes on to explore the very isolated nature of the journey and the key role that the supervisory relationship plays.

Chapter 5 presents the research approach that I have taken. It presents social constructionism as my epistemology and highlights the emergent design of this study. In this vein, it describes the realisation that critical Language study was an appropriate approach to inform the second phase of my study and outlines the use

of exploratory conversations and in-depth interviews in order to achieve my objectives.

Chapter 6 presents the results of the first phase of research, in which I conducted exploratory conversations in order to explore the factors which influence the PhD journey in tourism studies. In keeping with the emergent design of the study, it highlights factors which appear to merit further exploration in phase 2 of the study.

Chapter 7 presents the results of the second phase of research, in which I conducted in-depth interviews to explore key issues which arose in phase 1. This chapter focuses particularly on the constraints surrounding the PhD experience and intercultural knowledge exchange, particularly issues around isolation, language and sites of power.

Chapter 8 provides some conclusions to the study. It revisits the aim and objectives and presents the key findings of the study. It goes on to highlight the main contributions that the study makes to theory and practice and outlines the implications and recommendations for Higher Education. It then outlines the challenges and limitations of this study and makes suggestions for future research. Finally, in line with the reflexive nature of the study, it gives my final thoughts and reflections on my journey

CHAPTER TWO

THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

IN THE UK

2.1.   Introduction

2.2.   Background

2.3.   Potential opportunities of internationalisation of Higher Education

2.4.   Factors inhibiting internationalisation of Higher Education

2.4.1. Political policy

2.4.2. Institutional approaches

2.4.3. The role of the academic

2.5.   Student experiences of internationalisation of Higher Education

2.6.   Summary

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides a context for the remainder of the study by exploring the concept of internationalisation and the various ways in which it is interpreted and implemented across higher education institutions in the UK. It begins by examining the potential opportunities afforded by the internationalisation of higher education and goes on to explore the factors which are inhibiting the internationalisation of universities. This chapter highlights the lack of understanding of the experiences of all participants engaged in internationalisation and the need to investigate the complexity of internationalisation in order to enhance educational practices (Beck, 2012). It draws attention to the lack of scholarly research into the experiences of international students in the UK (Leonard, Pelletier and Morley, 2003) and the fact that, since 1997 when Walker wrote that '*international study has been seriously undertheorised in Britain.*' (1997:7), very little has changed. In particular, it acknowledges the lack of research into the central role of the academic in facilitating intercultural learning (Sanderson, 2012) and the key part home students play in facilitating internationalisation.

2.2. Background

The internationalisation of higher education has given rise to student mobility *'of industrial proportions'* (Walker, 2014:325). In 2014, the number of international (non EU) students studying in higher education in the UK had risen to over 435,000, making a contribution of £2.3 billion to UK institutions (Marginson, 2015). This meant that British universities had the second highest number of international

students in the world (after the US) and the proportion of international students in the student body was the second highest globally (Walker, 2014). Despite these statistics, until recently, there has been a paucity of research on the internationalisation of higher education in the UK. Much of the early published literature focussed on the socio-academic rationales for internationalisation, such as cultural exchange, but, as student numbers accelerated, the research focus shifted to the economic aspects of recruitment and retention, often based on large quantitative studies (Leonard, Pelletier and Morley, 2003). Interestingly, much of the existing literature emanates from English-speaking countries other than the UK, such as Australia, New Zealand and the USA.

More recently, the ever-increasing number of international students has attracted much greater interest from both academics and policy makers (Bilecen, 2013). Contributions by authors such as Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007); Jones and Brown (2007); Atfield and Kemp (2008; Warwick and Moogan, 2013), reflect the increasing importance being afforded to the internationalisation agenda in the UK and the efforts of educators across the sectors '*in getting to grips with internationalisation in all its guises*' (Sheil, 2008:xi). However, as Sawir (2013) points out, much of the literature still focuses on the economic benefits of international students and the challenges associated with teaching them. Research thus tends to represent a 'cultural-deficit' perspective of international students with little attempt to examine the extent to which the presence of international students on campus offers opportunities for internationalisation of UK education (De Vita and Case, 2003). Other existing literature focuses on defining the concept of internationalisation, the undergraduate international student experience and some

fragmented discussion of institutional perspectives on internationalisation. However, Bilecen (2013) highlights the lack of research into the experiences of international postgraduate research students, despite their importance as high academic achievers, capable of innovation and thereby having an influence at institutional level and, potentially, at national level.

This lack of research into the international postgraduate research student experience is particularly surprising considering that, in the UK, international students comprise 50 per cent of full-time research degree students (UKCISA, 2016). In 2015/16, there were 47,130 non-UK postgraduate research students in the UK, with 32,530 of these being international (non EU) research degree students (HESA 2017). Thus, despite a radical change in the doctoral student cohort, and the intellectual environment, in the UK as these students have brought with them different academic cultures and intellectual traditions (Ryan, 2012), there is still a dearth of research.

Ryan (2012) suggests that the doctoral relationship is an area of research which deserves more attention, as it provides a perfect means for the exchange of cultural intellectual ideas and the creation of new knowledge which can be transformative for higher education. Rizvi (2010) maintains that, in order to encourage and facilitate this exchange, we need an understanding of the complex challenges that doctoral students face whilst negotiating this transnational journey in order to make decisions regarding the new practices in the doctoral education of these globally mobile students. In an increasingly competitive market place, it is imperative that we seek to understand these challenges, in order to both improve the doctoral student

experience and facilitate cultural and knowledge exchange hence this thesis contributes towards this understanding in relation to the doctoral experience in Tourism Studies in the UK.

2.3.   Potential opportunities of internationalisation of Higher Education

There have been many phases in the conceptualisation of internationalisation over the years (Ryan, 2012) and, as we moved through these phases, authors have acknowledged the need for a more holistic, institutional-wide understanding of and response to the internationalisation agenda.   One of the early authors to recognise the academic and socio-cultural benefits of internationalisation was Stier (2002) who recognised that we are living in a world less constrained by national boundaries, meaning that identities are no longer '*territorial*' but '*mobile.*' Hence, he argued that higher education policies need to respond to the needs of the 'global' person by taking a more holistic approach to the concept of internationalisation. Since then, it has been recognised by many authors that the cultural diversity of the modern university potentially provides rich opportunities for intercultural exchange (Trahar & Hyland, 2011) and that view that '*international education is about people, not about rules or* money' (Marginson, 2015:21). Hence, internationalisation should foster an appreciation of ethnic diversity and intercultural differences and, in the words of Tony Blair, '*open a window on the world'* (UKCOSA, 2004:7). Asmar (1999:2) agrees that, rather than having a '*dollar-driven focus on international students'*, universities should be encouraging an understanding of diverse values and learning needs in order to help create 'global citizens of tomorrow.' Ryan (2012) agrees, arguing that a truly transcultural focus could produce truly global students which would render the terms 'international' and 'home' student obsolete. In fact,

Brandenberg and de Wit (2011) have gone as far as to proclaim the death of internationalisation and put forward the suggestion of a post-internationalisation era which would move away back from the market model of internationalisation towards educational and academic goals and values (Beck, 2012).

In this vein, authors such as Jones and Brown (2007), Ryan (2012), Sawir (2013) and Urban and Palmer (2014) have begun to acknowledge the potential academic contributions of this cohort of students in facilitating intercultural exchange. They suggest that universities worldwide need to move towards valuing international students, not only for the revenue they provide, but also for the contribution they make to the learning community. Jones and Brown (2007) agree with other authors, such as Carrol and Ryan (2007) that international students should no longer be placed in a deficit model and instead should be viewed as a source of cultural capital and diversity. They posit that *'good practice for international students is good practice for all students'* (2007:1). They argue that internationalising the curriculum, for example, should not only focus on international students but on the development of all students into active, critical, global citizens who can operate in a globalised world (Sawir, 2013). Shiel (2008) agrees that this holistic approach offers certain strategic benefits, such as addressing the 'internationalisation at home' agenda advocated by Knight (2003) which focuses on enhancing the learning experience of both home and international students through greater interaction. He also suggests that these broader strategies provide a framework within which to place other 'international activities' (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007), such as partnerships, exchanges and research. To this end, Jones and Brown (2007) advocate a university-wide response to internationalisation, with an international ethos embedded strategically in institutional terms as well as in the curricula.

Many authors show an awareness of the relevance of the concept of intercultural learning in internationalising the curriculum (Sawir, 2013). For example, Webb (2005) talks of '*normalising internationalisation of the curriculum*' to move beyond the taught curriculum and encompass the whole student experience. He defines this normalisation as '*turning the ad hoc and uneven efforts of a few enthusiasts into the normal expectations and requirements of the organisation*' (Webb, 2005:117). De Vita (2007) and Taylor (2004) share a vision of internationalisation as an agent of change with De Vita claiming it has the potential to transform '*a culturally diverse student population into a valued resource for activating processes of international connectivity, social cohesion and intercultural learning*' (2007:165) but, at the same time, acknowledging this is an ideal which is very difficult to achieve. De Vita and Case (2003) focus on achieving this goal through the classroom and suggest that genuine internationalisation can be achieved through '*the discovery and transcendence of difference through authentic experiences of cross-cultural interaction that involve real tasks and emotional as well as intellectual participation*' (De Vita and Case, 2003:388).

Indeed, some research has identified that some universities are already taking an institution-wide approach to internationalisation (Shiel, 2008). Such work claims that internationalisation strategies are becoming '*more all-embracing and require the involvement of all the community*' (Fielden, 2008:1) and that a number of universities have tried to take a more holistic approach to internationalisation, often by placing it within the broader strategies of developing global perspectives and global citizenship across the institution. It has been argued that responses to internationalisation have moved from an ethnocentric response, where international students were expected to conform to Western academic norms, to more recent

approaches where global graduates with intercultural skills are seen as desirable (Shiel and Mackenzie, 2008; Jones and Brown, 2007; Lunn, 2006). Leask (2008), writing from an Australian perspective, where research on internationalisation of higher education is considerably more advanced than in the UK, emphasises that it is not enough to make minor changes to the content of the curriculum by, for example, adding a few international examples, as is so often the case in UK universities. She emphasises the need to develop international perspectives in addition to content and asserts that an internationalised curriculum should develop and assess specific international perspectives (knowledge, skills and attributes) through the inclusion of international content and intercultural perspectives on knowledge.

Leask (2003) considers internationalisation 'beyond the numbers' of fee-paying students within an institution and conceptualises it as consisting of different layers of activity. These layers include the policy layer, the programme layer, the course layer, the teacher layer and the student layer and Leask argues that, by turning our attentions back to what internationalisation means for programmes, courses, teachers and students in higher education, we re-focus on the depth, diversity and complexity of internationalisation. Sawir (2013) supports this view, stating that fulfilling the aims of internationalisation depends on the full commitment of all institutional communities.

It is argued that efforts have to be made to '*integrate the cultural input of students, to use cultural background as a source of learning and to make an effort to see students from different backgrounds as resources in themselves*' (Teekens,

2003:110). This notion of intercultural exchange of knowledge is particularly relevant to this study as the doctoral process appears to be an ideal place to encourage students (and staff) of all nationalities to examine their own ways of viewing the world. In fact, the supervisory relationship potentially provides '*an ideal vehicle for the exchange of cultural intellectual ideas and the development of new epistemologies.*' (Ryan, 2012:56).

However, it is recognised by many that this holistic approach does not develop naturally (De Vita, 2007) and cross-cultural learning does not happen just because international students are on the campus (Sawir, 2013). Despite the fact that internationalisation of higher education, theoretically, presents an opportunity for deep critical reflection and potential change across the sector, it has been argued that this opportunity is, in reality, being shunned, largely as a result of the dominant economic rationale and marketing discourse that prevails (Da Vita and Case, 2003). This chapter goes on to examine some of the factors which are inhibiting internationalisation, namely political policy, institutional approaches and the role of the academic in the process.

2.4. Factors inhibiting internationalisation of Higher Education

2.4.1. Political policy

Given the indisputable importance of international HE to the UK economy, some authors have queried the lack of government policy relating to it in recent decades (Walker, 2014). However, in the literature that does exist, there is a consensus that, at a time when UK international education faces larger challenges than ever, the

situation is exacerbated by a hostile immigration debate and by unstable and ambiguous policies and regulations (Marginson, 2015).

It was the introduction of Blair's Prime Minister's Initiative (PMI) in 1999, which heralded the start of government policy regarding international student mobility. This initiative recognised the importance of HE as an export sector and aimed to consolidate the UK's position as a leading player in the global market for international study. It streamlined entry procedures and work rules for overseas students and aimed to attract an additional 50,000 non-EU students into Higher Education by 2005. This target was exceeded ahead of schedule and in 2006, PMI2, the second phase of the policy was launched.

Blair's PMI left a robust legacy but authors such as Howson (2014) and Walker (2014) highlight the radical change in government attitudes towards international students since the warm welcome offered by Blair's Prime Minister's Initiative of 1999. Subsequent Coalition and Conservative governments have delivered a complete turnaround in policy which is already threatening that welcome and affecting student recruitment and retention.

New, much stricter visa regimes were brought in for international students in April 2012 by the then Home Secretary, Theresa May, with fewer opportunities to work in the UK after they have finished their degree. In addition, it has become more difficult for partners of students to work or study and, coupled with the government's stance on immigration, these visa changes are estimated to cut numbers of international students dramatically (Walker, 2014). Not surprisingly, in 2013 we saw a drop in

international students enrolling in UK universities, the first time in 29 years (Howson, 2014). The post-study work route was closed down, despite protests from academic staff who acknowledged that employability was a vital pull factor to attract international students to the UK. This view was borne out by the results of a survey conducted by the National Union of Students (2012) which found that, of 8000 students surveyed, 80% would not choose to study in Britain without the post study work visa opportunity. After the announcement of Teresa May's decision to impose these stricter visa regimes, the academics union, the Union of Colleges and Universities (UCU) said that the government *'had ignored advice from the academic community'* and that the changes would *'damage the United Kingdom's international reputation for education excellence and harm the economy'* (cited in Walker, 2014).

It has been argued that the Coalition government of 2010-2015 and their Conservative successors are rekindling attitudes of the 1960s where international students were viewed as a financial burden, the *'undesirable other'* and a threat to standards (Walker, 2014:340). Whereas they were viewed by the previous Labour government as a cultural asset, at best, and a financial asset at worst, under a right-wing government, which is *'anti-foreigner, anti-immigration and anti-other'* (Scott, 2011), there is increasing scepticism regarding the international student contribution to the UK economy. In fact, the former Conservative Home Office minister Damien Green stated '*there is scope for further examination of whether and to what extent foreign student tuition fees boost the UK economy and, crucially, how UK residents ultimately benefit from that'* (THE, 2012). This appears to support Walker's argument (2014:341) that international students are pawns in political games and are *'fated to be tossed backwards and forwards on the waves of ideological change'.* It is argued that the collateral damage caused by the ongoing immigration debate in

the UK is the worsening of the international student experience and the negative discourse surrounding these students (Marginson, 2015). This was highlighted when Theresa May, the then UK Home Secretary, positioned non-EU students as a direct threat to border security (BBC News, 2014).

Howson (2014), therefore, argues that the UK no longer seems a welcoming destination for many international students. Indeed, it is argued that the situation has worsened with the increased competition for recruitment of international students and the growth of new recruiters, such as Spain, Russia and Korea (Howson, 2014; Marginson, 2015). Thus, countries who traditionally exported students to the UK have become net importers of international students. Marginson (2015:10) points out the contradiction in UK government policy which, whilst imposing stricter migration policies also expresses a desire to lift total revenues from international students by 60 per cent, to £30 billion a year by 2020. However, he emphasises the fact that, with the growing competition in international education, the best students will go to the countries and institutions that *'offer better value in the outcome, better quality in the experience and a warmer welcome.'* It appears to reinforce Rizvi's (2010) view earlier in the chapter that it is increasingly important that institutions understand the challenges facing international students and implement measures to enhance the student experience. This section goes on to explore the approaches which UK institutions have taken and how these have inhibited internationalisation.

2.4.2. Institutional approaches

The emergence of internationalisation in higher education since the 1980s is well documented (Taylor, 2004) but, as Knight (2013) points out, it has undergone fundamental changes in terms of scope, scale and importance. Early conceptualisations of internationalisation centred on concepts such as sharing and exchange of ideas, culture, knowledge and values whereas, nowadays many UK universities appear to be subject to conflicting economic, political, academic or socio-cultural rationales behind the concept of internationalisation (Middlehurst and Woodfield ,2007; Knight, 2013). In fact, it is widely agreed that internationalisation has always been difficult to define and, in the light of the constantly changing landscape of higher education, this continues to be the case. Bartell (2003) stated, over a decade ago, that although internationalisation is a term that has been widely used to describe an international dimension of higher education, it is far from clearly defined and understood and this situation appears not to have changed much a decade later (Knight, 2013). As different higher education institutions adopt different interpretations, internationalisation within higher education and the attendant literature remains a fuzzy construct, leading to much confusion (Kehm and Teichler, 2007).

Against this backdrop, it is suggested that the drivers and goals of individual institutions are vital and have a huge influence on how higher education institutions define internationalisation and which policies and practices they subsequently develop (Schoorinan, 1999; Ozerdem, 2006). However, this again makes an all-encompassing definition of 'internationalisation' in the context of higher education problematic, particularly as the internationalisation agenda, in the UK at least, has

been largely driven by individual institutions, rather than governments (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007).

Internationalisation is, therefore, interpreted differently in different contexts and different institutions (Bartell, 2003; Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007, Knight, 2013). Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007) suggest that the term internationalisation is used loosely to relate to a university's international activities and can be focussed more narrowly to include international student recruitment or can encompass a broad range of international activities including exchanges of students and researchers, knowledge transfer and learning and teaching within a multi-cultural classroom. Bartell (2003) appears to share this opinion and points out that institutional responses to internationalisation vary widely from aspirational goals to the creation of senior management roles with the remit to implement very detailed strategic internationalisation documents:

> *The reality, then, is that internationalization conveys a variety of understandings, interpretations and applications, anywhere from a minimalist, instrumental and static view, such as securing external funding for study abroad programs, through international exchange of students, conducting research internationally, to a view of internationalization as a complex, all encompassing and policy-driven process, integral to and permeating the life, culture, curriculum and instruction as well as the research activities of the university and its members* (Bartell, 2003:46).

Taylor (2004) supports this view, describing institutional response to the internationalisation agenda as an '*outburst of activity*' which is clearly visible in many universities throughout the world (2004:150) and argues that many institutions have not followed conventional planning theory and methodologies in their process of internationalisation. Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007) concur, pointing out that a

truly holistic approach is rare and, indeed, it is not unusual for there to be very different understandings and rationales behind internationalisation within different departments in one university.

Whilst it is widely acknowledged in the literature that universities have a responsibility to prepare graduates as world citizens with international outlooks, higher education institutions are also acutely aware of the economic imperative to provide an internationalised product to sell in the increasingly competitive, globalised marketplace (Leask, 2005). Ryan (2012) shares Knight's (2013) view that, over the past two decades, there has been a change in UK universities' responses to the increase in international student numbers, with a major shift in internationalisation of higher education from the original concept of academic exchange.

Interestingly, Knight (2013:85) argues that the language that has been used to describe the international aspect of higher education over the past 30 years is a *'revealing lens'* through which we can study the changes in priorities and activities relating to internationalisation. For example, terms from the 1960s such as international development projects, student exchanges and cultural agreements, suggesting the academic and socio-cultural drivers were dominant, have been replaced by words such as branding, status-building and global ranking, which relate to economic and political drivers. Leask (2005) also observes that, in the institution she studied, by 2005, the economic discourse of internationalisation was dominant and the socio-cultural discourse had waned, a notion which is seconded by De Vita and Case (2003). Leask (2005) points out that the economic discourse is now

viewed as the defining, or dominant, discourse which influences all others and this discourse and the ideologies embedded within it have become naturalized (Fairclough 1992:87).

Whilst many institutions are claiming to encourage an international outlook (Bennett and Kane, 2011), evidence suggests that the majority of UK institutions are not fully engaged with the internationalisation process (Gillingham, 2006) and this attitude is reflected in much of the literature on the subject. Bennett and Kane (2011) suggest that a survey of the literature indicates a considerable gap between the rhetoric surrounding internationalisation and how most universities operationalise it. In many institutions, internationalisation is seen to be a managerially led activity underpinned purely by an economic rationale (Warwick and Moogan, 2013) and little progress has been made towards creating a truly intercultural learning environment. As far back as 2002, Hannah and Latcham encapsulate this seemingly dominant, economic rationale stating that '*institutions are trying to jump onto the online bandwagon and capitalise on their brand names … and some universities are acting for fear that the gravy train might leave them standing if they do not act immediately*' (2002:128).   De Vita and Case (2003) agree, describing higher education as an export industry and maintaining that any internationalisation of the curriculum was being driven by the commercial agenda and the competitive advantage to be gained by adding an international dimension to their courses when marketing them overseas.

Whilst some authors, such as Taylor (2004), credit institutions with having both altruistic and economic motives, arguing that most institutions are driven towards internationalisation by both their core ideals and philosophies and '*a firm grasp of*

practical and competitive realities in the contemporary world' (2004:153), many others, such as De Vita and Case (2003), are less generous in their views of universities and their motivations to internationalise. They emphasise that the main aim of the internationalisation agenda in higher education should be to develop global citizens with a greater understanding and respect for other cultures. However, they contend that, in reality, this worthy rationale does not prevail in UK higher education, where international students are viewed largely as a source of income. De Vita and Case (2003) further argue that, in line with the economic or marketisation discourse that has dominated UK higher education in recent years, many universities are only paying '*lip service*' to the concept of internationalisation and are, in fact, '*treating education as a commodity to be packaged and sold on open national and international markets by institutions acting as enterprises*' (De Vita and Case, 2003:384). In more recent years, there has been a body of literature which agrees that, although higher education institutions in the UK espouse internationalisation and the development of intercultural skills amongst their graduates as part of their mission (Singh, 2009; Knight, 2013), they are not effectively internationalising and are merely focussed on attracting income through international student recruitment. In fact, it has been suggested that many institutions do not possess the capabilities to deliver a more holistic internationalisation strategy (Warwick and Moogan, 2013). Knight (2013), for example, states that using internationalisation as a branding tool or sign of status is, in fact, confusing an internationalisation strategy with an international marketing plan. She suggests that the drivers and expected outcomes of a global marketing plan are different from those required for academic internationalisation.

 As a consequence, the economic discourse continues to prevail in recent literature with Bilecen (2013:667) stating that higher education institutions are transforming into *'corporate machines with students as their customers.'*   Knight (2013:84) echoes this, describing internationalisation in 2013 as '*big business'* and Haigh (2008) reminds us that, for many institutions, it is a matter of survival and the university is a *'business engaged in education.'*   Haigh (2014) reiterates this in a later article when he states that, for some members of institutions, '*in the struggle for survival, in a world where the accountant's bottom line is king,'* the main internationalisation task is recruiting international students or *'milking the cash cow'* (Haigh, 2014:8).   Marginson (2015:5) supports this, observing that international education should be about mixing people across national borders but that, in reality, *'the conventional institutional horizon is limited. Institutions are focused on their own bottom lines and on keeping it all together.'*

Many authors acknowledge that international education will continue to expand but also recognise the increased competition that the UK faces in attracting international students (Knight, 2013; Marginson, 2015). Yemini (2015) suggests that the huge budget cuts in recent decades have meant that economic drivers have become more prominent, as the survival and profitability of academic institutions has increasingly depended upon their ability to engage in academic activities.   Several authors remind us of the growing importance of university rankings and that internationalisation *is* used as a measure of status in several of the global league tables, leading institutions and countries to invest energy and resources into the process (Knight, 2013; Yemini, 2015). In fact, a Russell Group report (2010) stated that *'attracting high-quality international students is a hallmark of a world-class university.'* Knight further refers to academic mobility as *'a highly competitive multi-*

36

million dollar international recruitment business' (2013:87) and notes that recent national and international surveys of universities such as the International Association of Universities (2010) found that universities prioritise establishing an international profile or global standing above reaching international standards of teaching excellence. Knight (2013) argues that the traditional academic driver of educating students to degree level so they could return home to contribute to the development of their own nation has been forgotten as nations '*compete in the twenty first century brain race'.*

As policymakers have driven changes in the internationalisation process, academic scholarship on the topic has broadened and deepened (Yemini, 2015). Recent literature has highlighted the risks associated with the dominant economic rationale for internationalisation. In particular, scholars who have strongly promoted the benefits of internationalisation have, in recent years, expressed their distress over the economic ideologies which are currently prevalent (Brandenberg and de Wit, 2011). This has involved the emergence of various critiques of the concept's by-products and negative effects (Altbach, 2013).

Knight (2013:54), for example, whose work on internationalisation is seminal, refers to *'the twists and turns along the internationalisation path'* and questions the effects that internationalisation has had on higher education. She acknowledges the positives which still exist, such as collaborative scholarship and cross-border education exchange, but draws attention to the negatives that exist as an '*unintended consequence'* (2013:84) of internationalisation. Knight (2013:85) describes as *'troublesome'* the gap that is evident between the traditional values of

collaboration and cooperation for mutual academic benefits and the realities of competition, commercialisation and self-interest status building which exist in universities today. Knight (2013) questions how this commercialisation is and will change the incentives for institutions to internationalise. Education is now bought and sold across borders and Knight asserts that the traditional academic, social and cultural rationales for internationalisation at institutional level, such as developing interculturally skilled and knowledgeable graduates, will be adversely affected by this commercialisation.

Leask (2013) also argues that this shift over time from socio-cultural to economic discourse, as the defining discourse of internationalisation, presents a threat to institutions, students and academics working within them. Leask (2013) argues that it constructs education as a commodity, students as consumers and academics as engaging in the 'business' of serving the consumers. This positions academic staff in a less powerful role – they are no longer shapers of the internationalisation agenda, but respondents to it. Bailey (2000) warns that this view of the student as customer and, therefore, King, can severely distort the roles within the university, whereby '*student desires drive programmes … Professors become subservient to their customers*' (2000:353). Bailey also points out the inappropriate expectations which arise from this situation, as students become customers who have paid for a commodity and feel they have a right to receive their degrees as quickly and easily as possible. Stromquist (2007) agrees that internationalisation is affecting the balance of power within universities and that '*under the name of internationalisation, university administrators and external firms are emerging as powerful decision-makers shaping academic content and even academic governance*' (2007:81). Haigh (2014) agrees, arguing that times have changed considerably since Becher

and Trowler's (1989) conception of academic tribes based around communities of knowledge and that universities are now complex managerial hierarchies. Within these hierarchies are different layers with different priorities, goals and drivers. Warwick and Moogan (2013) support this view, stating that the managerial layer has accelerated international recruitment but shows less interest in internationalising other aspects of the institutional offering which have, as a result, lagged behind.

Ryan (2012) and Singh (2009) note that attempts at internationalising learning and teaching have been modest, particularly at postgraduate level. They argue that the driving force behind the process is economic and that institutions are missing the opportunity to '*engage in a radical reassessment of higher educational purposes, priorities and processes that student diversity and multicultural interaction provide*' (De Vita and Case, 2003:384). Instead, attempts to internationalise the curriculum in the UK have often resulted in little more than a piecemeal or 'infusion approach' whereby some international material is added to existing curricula, in order to produce a marketable commodity overseas (Ryan, 2012; De Vita and Case, 2003; Tonkin & Edwards, 1981; Cogan, 1998; Leask, 1999). In these cases, the onus is placed on international students, rather than universities, to adapt their ways of learning (Ryan, 2012). Authors raise various problems with this approach, including the fact that this does not promote cross-cultural learning, where students are encouraged to examine their own ways of viewing the world and embrace the 'other'. Also, by using a content-based approach to curriculum internationalisation, rather than encouraging a multicultural world view, it appears we are neglecting to consider issues surrounding knowledge creation and dissemination. There is a risk that UK universities are presenting as fact a very Anglo centric, westernised view of the world (Ryan, 2000). In fact, for some time, there has been a school of thought that

contends that internationalisation as a concept is flawed. It is argued that socio-cultural or academic rationales behind the internationalisation of higher education assume that internationalisation is good per se when this is not, in fact, the case. These rationales are based on the premise that limited access to higher education can contribute towards social inequality in the world and that internationalisation allows '*uncivilised'* people from the '*poor world'* access to new knowledge (Stier 2002:3). However, critics of internationalisation such as Stier (2002) and Stromquist (2007) argue that the above viewpoint is limited and imperialist and that internationalisation should also be used as a vehicle to make students from Western countries aware of the relativity of cultures and ideologies. Ryan (2012) agrees and cautions that, if universities limit themselves to imparting knowledge to international students, with no intercultural exchange, they will become stagnant and lose their appeal to both home and international students in an increasingly competitive marketplace. This is supported by Marginson (2015:8) who reminds us that, despite what our marketing says, the UK curriculum does not have '*all the knowledge and the answers to life'* and that local students have much to gain by learning from international students.

The potential of the mixed population of students to enhance the educational experience of all students (Trahar, 2010) is particularly important in the UK. An important aspect of the internationalisation agenda should be to find ways of broadening the horizons of UK students, without the need for mobility on their part, as there is evidence that travelling for education does not appear an attractive proposition for many of them (Stier, 2002; Caruna and Hanstock, 2005). In fact, it has been argued by academic staff that home students remain unaware of the changing cultural environment in higher education (Sawir, 2013). Indeed, it should

be noted that outward mobility of UK home students is very limited with 11 international students coming to the UK to study for each British student who travels abroad to study (OECD, 2011). Creating ways and spaces to integrate local and international students at home is, therefore, very important but, as Sawir (2013) points out, research findings continue to show that there is segregation between home and international students. Howson (2014) supports this, stating that there is little evidence of the 'inter' in internationalisation with institutions and home students showing little interest in diverse cultures or ways of knowing. Any contact between home and international students tends to be superficial (Daly and Brown, 2004), supporting the ongoing assertion that cross-cultural contact does not happen automatically, just because international students are present on campus (Otten, 2003; Brown, 2009; Sawir, 2013).

There is widespread agreement that the potential of international students as a resource in the classroom is also largely ignored or unexploited by both teachers and home students alike (Tian and Lowe, 2008; Killick, 2006; Ryan, 2012; Urban and Palmer, 2014). They often bring to the classroom knowledge, cultural richness and diversity of experience which could enhance the learning and teaching experience of all concerned but this requires recognition and exploitation by both the teacher and students involved. As Urban and Palmer (2014) point out, in order to engage international students as cultural resources, teachers need to create an environment where both home and international students feel comfortable sharing information about their respective backgrounds.

De Vita and Case suggest the best way to embrace the diverse pedagogical expectations that exist is to facilitate '*exchange between students and tutors about*

41

the cultural values, assumptions, fears and hopes that are being brought to bear on the multicultural learning encounter' (2003:391). The notion of 'exchange' is particularly important here and de Vita and Case suggest that academics should use their power within the classroom to try to facilitate this exchange. Stier (2002) agrees and suggests that students travel an intellectual journey, where they may become more aware of their own frame of reference and are able to critically reflect on their attitudes, prejudices and ethnocentrism. Stier (2002) argues that they should be actively encouraged by academics to reflect on these elements and the process of learning and to understand and respect cultural differences. Urban and Palmer (2014) remind us, however, that '*very little research exists on the manner in which international students are engaged as a valued contributor to the internationalisation of campus communities*' (Urban & Palmer, 2014:309). This thesis seeks to address this lack of research in relation to the role of the PhD supervisor in internationalisation. This chapter goes on, therefore, to explore findings in the literature regarding the role of the academic in the process of internationalisation.

2.4.3. The role of the academic

Trahar and Hyland (2011) point out that, although the academic is a 'core player in the process' (Teekens, 2000:30) of internationalising higher education, their experiences and perceptions are rarely exposed to critical examination. Harman (2005:131) supports this, stating that '*there is almost a complete absence of material on the active involvement of academics in internationalization.*' If we accept the importance of encouraging multi-cultural perspectives in all our students in internationalisation strategies, we are naturally led to recognise the key role of the

teacher as '*the engine which must drive the initiative*' (McNicoll, Burney and Luff, 2008:3) by not only developing these inclusive pedagogies, but also in implementing or facilitating them in the classroom. In fact, as far back as 1995, Rudzki asserted that higher education is a people intensive industry and, therefore, university staff are vital to the successful implementation of internationalisation. In fact, Volet and Ang (1998:21) suggest that it is the '*social responsibility*' of tertiary institutions to '*design learning environments which foster students' developments on intercultural adaptability*'. This view is shared by Zepke and Leach (2005) who argue that staff have a moral duty to adapt in order to reflect their student cohorts or else risk setting their students up to fail.

Other authors agree that university lecturers need to challenge their own assumptions as a necessary step towards developing an inclusive pedagogy. Leask (2007) states that the international university classroom is increasingly diverse and complex, reflecting the world in which we live and thus requires teachers to both manage their students' intercultural learning and be intercultural learners themselves. It is a '*third space*' (Lo Bianco *et al*., 1999:13) where different cultures meet and may or may not have any shared values or beliefs. Teachers, therefore, need to be highly self-critical of their methods and interactions, so as to be able to:

> *develop their understandings of how the languages and cultures of their students influence their thoughts, values, actions and feelings as well as their understanding of the ways in which their own language and culture influence their actions, reactions, values and beliefs* (Leask, 2007:87).

Teachers should also reflect upon how what they are teaching is culturally constructed and framed and be willing to engage with opportunities to look through an '*alternative cultural lens*' (Shiel, 2008:viii).

The challenges which are brought into the classroom by an increasingly diverse student population are recognised within the literature and De Vita and Case (2003:383) argue that, within the UK, *'extant pedagogical models'* are struggling to cope with attitudes, needs and expectations that have not previously been encountered. Lunn (2008) and Turner and Robson (2008) agree and found that there was a disjuncture between the espoused values and the reality of what internationalisation actually meant for academic staff. Somewhat controversially, De Vita and Case (2003) suggest that the lack of culturally inclusive pedagogy in the UK can only be partially blamed on the dominance of the marketing discourse and pressure from policy makers to standardise our 'products' or courses. They claim that a portion of the blame lies at the door of the academics in UK universities who are, they claim, predominantly white, male, middle class and UK born, a fact which is borne out by more recent analysis in tourism studies by Pritchard and Morgan (2017). De Vita and Case (2003) posit that this body of lecturers does not reflect the increasingly culturally diverse student population and has failed to challenge *'in any systematic, self-reflexive and critical way its own established norms and pedagogic practices'* (2003:394). They agree with Otten (2003) that educators can be resistant to change and continue to pursue a route of *'unchallenged ethnocentric western didacticism'* (2003:391). De Vita and Case (2003) suggest, therefore, that in order for effective internationalisation of the curriculum to take place, internationalisation of the faculty is essential to begin a process of change in what Faulkner (2001:475) describes as *'the inflexible academic teaching and learning environment.'* Interestingly, Howson (2014) points out that there are 18,510 professors in the UK and only 85 of these are black and suggests that this lack of diversification is due to the fact that international staff in higher education feel there is a lack of welcome in UK Higher Education Institutions.

Jones and Brown (2007) assert that many in the academy have viewed the recruitment of international students as a 'cash cow' and this diverse student body are often problematized and viewed as needy of support. Little seems to have changed as Kelly and Moogan (2012) confirm that many academics still consider international students to be problematic. Haigh (2014) supports this and suggests that staff are inflexible and argues that the deficit perception that is prevalent regarding international students is largely caused by the ethnocentricity that manifests itself in the 'hidden curriculum.' He describes learning and teaching discourses, academic style and assessment practices as *'cultural artefacts'* (2014:9). Cortazzi and Jin (1997) conducted wide research into learning and teaching techniques around the world and echoed the views of Leask, Shiel and others when they concluded that people remain blind to their own academic culture whilst they are in it and need to step consciously outside. This view is borne out by Trahar (2011) who found that many academics are either unwilling or unconvinced of the need to adapt and view their role as educating students in Western values. Studies show that academic staff believe that it is the job of the international 'incomer' to adapt and learn to fit in. They are, therefore, *'placed in a game where only local learners understand the rules and, until they overcome this obstacle, their grades suffer and many fail'* (Haigh, 2002:51).

It is acknowledged that doctoral supervisory relationships, in particular, offer opportunities for intellectual exchange but, it is further acknowledged that there are considerable power imbalances within the supervisory relationship. Perhaps as a consequence of this, these relationships, to date, are characterised by 'one-way' learning where the student is expected to conform to Western concepts of scholarship and learning (Ryan, 2012:56) and supervisors fail to use their power to facilitate intellectual exchange (De Vita and Case, 2003). Ryan (2012) argues that

supervision practices not only fail to take advantage of the potential for mutual learning, but that supervisors often misinterpret the behaviours of international students. She suggests that language difficulties can be misinterpreted as a lack of intelligence and modesty as a lack of criticality. She states that supervisors need to learn new approaches and unlearn old ones and appears to agree with Rizvi (2010) who suggests that supervisors need to develop both their own and their students' awareness of transnationality in order to better understand the conditions in which they are expected to produce new knowledge and develop their professional identity. As Halliday (1999:108) observed, despite the exposure to multiculturalism which is offered to us by developments in modern technology:

> *never has university culture in the Anglo-Saxon world been less multicultural, less open to the other in this cultural and linguistic sense, and, I would argue, as a result less critical of the household gods*.

The *'household gods'* referred to here are the dominant white, male voices within UK academics (Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan, 2007) and my study explores Halliday's views and, at the risk of criticising the household gods, considers whether, at doctoral level, where opportunities to embrace worldviews and cultures of the other abound, universities are seizing these opportunities or whether, in fact, dominant tribes (Becher and Trowler, 1989) and views are prevailing.

It is recognised that some academics are interested in genuine internationalisation of higher education but that, even if staff are willing, they may not possess the necessary expertise to develop intercultural learning (Warwick and Moogan, 2013). De Vita and Case (2003) acknowledge the difficulties faced by these academics,

particularly that of embracing the diverse pedagogical expectations that a diverse group of students have. De Vita and Case (2003) argue that more open-ended forms of teaching that would allow for diverse cultural perspectives to be heard and explored are still largely absent in UK universities. Barnett et al. (2001:447) support this view, adding that traditional forms of teaching in higher education, particularly lectures, allow *'relatively little space for students to inject their own offerings and so construct their own voice.'*

Several authors have suggested that a heavier student focus may help some universities to reconceptualise internationalisation. For example, Fielden (2008) identifies the need to respond to the challenges posed by the increased number of international students and to up our game in terms of enhancing the student experience in order to remain competitive. Warwick and Moogan (2013) support this view, suggesting that, if internationalisation strategies were to centre on graduate attributes and the student experience, it would herald a move away from the economic rationale which has dominated internationalisation in the UK and may convince some less enthusiastic academics of the merits of internationalisation. However, Luker (2008:12) argues that these efforts to enhance the students experience will only be successful as '*an integral part of a broader strategy for internationalisation that is not motivated by profit*', seemingly suggesting a role for academic and social drivers.

2.5. Student experiences of internationalisation of Higher Education

It is recognised that many universities have begun the internationalisation process by focussing on evaluating and enhancing the international student experience, albeit in order to maintain recruitment and retention levels and the reputation of the institution in a highly competitive market (Shiel, 2008). This approach is wholly understandable when one considers that international student fees have made a huge contribution to UK higher education. Indeed, as early as 2008, it was claimed in the Times Higher Education Supplement (2008) that seven UK universities would go into deficit if their overseas income dropped by a mere ten percent.

For many years, there has been discussion regarding the discourses surrounding international students. For example, in Leask's (2005) study of internationalisation at the University of South Australia, she discovered three complementary and competing discourses of internationalisation – academic, economic and socio-cultural. She states that the relationships between these discourses are complex as, on the one hand, they complement each other and portray internationalisation within the institution as multi-faceted, driven by and driving economic, academic and socio-cultural agendas within the university. However, on the other hand, the discourses also compete with each other ideologically and Leask argues that the discourse that a person selects when talking about internationalisation positions him or her ideologically. She suggests that economic discourses of internationalisation, which appear to dominate, construct the roles of academics and students quite differently from academic discourses of internationalisation. For example, rather than positioning international students as powerful drivers and agents of

internationalisation, economic discourses position them as products and indicators of internationalisation.

As has been mentioned earlier in the chapter, as competition in international education increases, the welcome that international students experience will be crucial in their choice of country and university (Marginson, 2015). This is supported by Brown and Holloway (2008) who suggest that an awareness of the painful adjustment journey taken by international students will help inform the provision of institutional support and, thereby, enhance their experience. As Howson (2014) cautions, *'most importantly, international students need to be treated as people and learners, not numbers on a balance sheet.'* As will be seen below, there is little research which specifically explores the journey of international doctoral students which this thesis aims to do.

There have been two types of research into the international student experience: unpublished research and published research (Leonard, Pelletier and Morley, 2003). Both types of research have been based on a narrow cohort with the unpublished research generally being conducted by PhD students and focussing on a cohort from their home country. Much published research is conducted by academic staff and often focuses on students from their home institutions (Leonard et al, 2003). This means that there is little opportunity to question whether the findings are specific to a certain institution or nationality. Large scale statistical surveys have also been published by the United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA) but they lack any depth of findings. As far as the overall international student experience in the UK is concerned, the most comprehensive recent research has been conducted by Middlehurst and Woodfield on behalf of the

Higher Education Academy (2007). They found that findings from various sources (UKCISA, National Student Survey, International Graduate Insight Group and the UNITE International Student Report) were remarkably consistent. They all suggest that international students are generally happy with their experience and with the course content and delivery. However, there is less satisfaction with perceptions of value for money, some administrative and social aspects and levels of personal and academic support. Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007) maintain, however, that there is not enough evidence to identify the importance attached to each of these factors by students and, therefore, which of the factors plays the greatest role in their choice of university or their perception of satisfaction with their choice.

These large-scale surveys appear to be intended to help institutions with their recruitment and retention strategies, rather than focusing on knowledge creation and exchange (Leonard et al., 2003). Indeed, Haigh (2014) reminds us that managers are aware that increased attention needs to be paid to international student satisfaction as international student revenue may cease if too many fail or go home unhappy. Marginson (2015) highlights the tension between the institution-centred commercial approach to higher education and the cultural–learning approach which is recognised by many academics. He claims that many of us feel pulled between the two perspectives and attempt to justify our piecemeal approach to internationalisation by using quality assurance and customer satisfaction instruments. However, Marginson (2015) claims that, in fact, these instruments reflect the commercial approach and do not have the students' experience at heart at all. They are framed by the institution and do not reflect the reality of each student's experience. Paradoxically, as De Vita & Case (2003) point out, this student-as-consumer discourse entrenched in the market model of education

actually clashes with the expectations of many international students. Within many of their education systems, teachers are viewed as both facilitators and providers of moral guidance and inspiration and they are often confused by the consumerist view of education.

From existing literature, it is clear that the student experience is affected by more than just the academic experience but involves other factors such as accommodation provision, student support, social integration and so on. Stier (2002) takes these factors and incorporates them into his description of intercultural education as parallel but interconnected journeys and these factors will be examined in the following chapter in the context of the PhD journey.

2.6. Summary

With UK international higher education facing larger challenges than it has ever faced (Marginson, 2015), the recent focus of universities on the economic benefits of international students is being critiqued and there is a growing recognition that we need to move internationalisation away from 'edu-business' (Luke, 2010) towards more educational, life-serving practices (Beck, 2012). Knight (2013) argues that serious debate is needed about the direction that internationalisation is taking. Whilst other academics, such as Yemini (2015), are calling for new definitions of the term, Knight feels that the values and purposes driving internationalisation need to be re-examined. She refers to the recent debate regarding the future of internationalisation (Brandenburg and De Wit, 2011) and questions whether economic, political and status-driven rationales have

overwhelmed the original academic and social values which drove the early internationalisation agenda. Yemini (2015) agrees and calls for a debate leading to a more focused definition of internationalisation which distinguishes between the academic and educational meaning of the term and the separate economic and political issues. This definition should focus on the learner and their education and knowledge. Knight concludes that, whilst there will never be one uniform way to internationalise, *'the discourse and practice of internationalisation needs to be reoriented to values – especially academic values'* (Knight, 2013:90). It is clear, therefore, that there is a wide range of drivers behind institutions' moves towards internationalisation and, as Hanna and Latcham concluded: '*the jury is still out on whether altruism or commercialisation will prevail in internationalisation*' (2002:128).

However, it appears that Urban and Palmer (2014) summarise the situation when they state that higher education is not taking advantage of the opportunities for internationalisation provided by the diverse cohorts of students. Knowledge is recognised as an increasingly critical resource and higher education plays a vital role in facilitating the flow of both knowledge and people across borders and, therefore, has a social responsibility to develop global graduates (Becket and Brookes, 2008). However, it has been suggested that we risk being complacent about the superiority of Western academic ways, rather than recognising the potential opportunities for knowledge exchange being presented by the knowledge and academic values that international doctoral students bring (Ryan, 2012).

This chapter has explored the concept of internationalisation when applied to higher education. It has revealed that drivers of and approaches to internationalisation are inextricably linked and are reflected in the dominant economic discourse of internationalisation in the literature and texts. Intercultural education is not a new

concept as people have crossed borders in the name of education for thousands of years and, historically, it is suggested that this was driven by socio-cultural goals (Stier, 2002). However, in more recent years, financial motivations have predominated in UK universities and, although it is recognised that institutions tend to have individual responses to the internationalisation agenda (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007) this economic driver has been reflected in the majority of UK institutions' approaches to internationalising and in the discourses surrounding the notion.

However, it seems that the mood is changing, in theory at least, and some educators are recognising that, in order to fulfil the internationalisation at home agenda and maintain student satisfaction for home and international students, a more holistic approach needs to be taken. It is also recognised that this holistic interpretation is not easily achieved and is unlikely to result from a top-down approach. Rather, staff and students need to be willing to step outside their comfort zones and embrace multi-cultural worldviews, thereby giving voice to all viewpoints. The internationalisation agenda needs to permeate all layers of the institution, which is reflected in Knight's definition of internationalisation as '*the process of integrating an international perspective into the teaching/learning, research and service functions' of a higher education institution'* (2003:2). Whilst this chapter has explored the evolution of drivers of internationalisation, it has also acknowledged that Knight's definition of 2003 has rarely been challenged. It is therefore time, as Knight herself (2013) has acknowledged for the definitions of internationalisation to evolve in recognition of the changes that have taken place in the last decade.

Shiel (2008) puts the onus firmly on institutions and the academics within them when he claims that universities cannot purport to be delivering an educational experience '*fit for purpose in the 21*st *century'* unless we develop a more inclusive pedagogy. He concludes that continuing with '*business as usual'* is not an option and would amount to '*short-changing all our students*' (Shiel, 2008:v). This is echoed by a growing recognition in the literature that internationalisation should involve an exchange of ideas and knowledge between home students, international students and academics. However, it appears that academics within UK higher education are wasting a key opportunity to internationalise by not engaging with international students as cultural resources.

The chapter highlights the emphasis that has thus far been placed on enhancing the international student experience, with the home student experience receiving scant attention in the literature. However, it appears that we should be cautious in distinguishing too much between issues facing international students and those facing all students. It seems that international students are the '*canaries in the mine'* (Ryan and Carroll, 2007:27) who should '*act as a trigger to inform the enhancement of practice across the board*' (Sheil, 2008:xii). It is argued that fulfilling the internationalisation agenda depends upon the commitment of all institutional communities, including home students and academics and that the heavy focus on research into the international student experience has created a gap in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education. In order to fully understand the processes of internationalisation, further research needs to be carried out, such as this thesis, with home students and academics as participants (Trahar & Hyland, 2011; Sanderson, 2011; Sawir, 2013).

Hence, as Warwick and Moogan (2013:119) conclude, there is still no blueprint for internationalising UK universities and, therefore, '*the search for best practice continues*'. This is supported by Knight (2013) who calls for more careful monitoring of internationalisation and a serious debate regarding its values and purposes. This thesis aims to add to the body of research into internationalisation by including the experiences of both supervisors and home and international students at doctoral level.

Having reviewed the internationalised environment in which doctoral education in the UK is taking place, the following chapter will explore the literature surrounding experiences of both home and international students on the PhD journey. This will be followed by a chapter which reviews existing literature on the PhD and its role in shaping knowledge.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PHD JOURNEY

3.1.   Introduction

3.2.   Background

3.3.   Factors affecting the PhD journey

3.3.1. Identity/rite of passage

3.3.2. Isolation

3.4.   Role of the supervisory relationship

3.4.1. Centrality of relationship

3.4.2. Tensions in traditional relationship

3.4.3. A need for change

3.4.4. The way forward

3.5.   Summary

3.1. Introduction

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Higher Education is increasingly driven by economic factors. This transformation in the higher education environment with its increasingly managerial approach and focus on efficiency imperatives and quality assurance has arguably changed the nature of doctoral education and the work of doctoral supervisors (Halse and Malfroy, 2010).

The previous chapter looked at the internationalised environment in which doctoral education in the UK is taking place and began to examine the student experience within that environment. This chapter moves on to focus on the literature which explores the experiences of those who are undertaking a PhD journey within this environment. It firstly examines the scope of existing literature and then goes on to consider the PhD as a journey and look at the factors that affect the PhD journey, namely the concept of a personal transition or rite of passage, the isolated nature of the journey and the role of the supervisory relationship.

3.2. Background

John and Denicolo (2013) remind us that, until the 1990s, research into Higher Education focussed mainly on undergraduate education and little was published about the doctoral student experience. However, by the mid-1990s, with the massification of higher education, governments were paying attention to postgraduate researchers and there were several funded studies, reports and policy documents published between 1985 and 1995 (for example Burgess, 1994 and Becher, 1994). Since 1995, Leonard et al (2006) observe that there has been little

funded research on the doctoral experience. Many reports, such as Smith *et al.* (2010), appear to be marketing driven as they report on career and earnings benefits, estimating that, over a lifetime, those with a PhD earn, on average, 23% more than those with a first degree. Vitae (2013) confirms that, three years after graduating, those with a doctorate earn more than those with undergraduate or Masters qualifications. In fact, the study describes those with doctoral qualifications as more '*recession-proof*' than their peers with undergraduate or masters degrees. Again, the lack of attention to the student experience is highlighted in the research of Kemp, Archer, Gilligan and Humfrey (2008) who, despite making fifteen recommendations regarding the recruitment of international postgraduate research students to the UK, do not, until the fifteenth recommendation make any reference to the importance of the student experience. In this final recommendation, they suggest that guidelines should be established regarding minimum levels of supervision which should then be conveyed to prospective students.

In addition, Leonard et al (2006) note that the majority of studies in to the doctoral experience are not based on any apparent theoretical framework and focus on supervision and the viva, with very little research carried out on the students' views of the doctoral experience. John and Denicolo (2013), in their review of literature, observe that the main emphasis is on research training, methods, transferable skills, supervision and timely completion of thesis, with very little focus on the students' or supervisors' perspective of the doctoral experience or the concept of the PhD as a vehicle for the creation of new knowledge.

Whilst the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES) clearly focuses on the student experience, many other official reports concentrate on postgraduate

student recruitment in an increasingly competitive marketplace and give low priority to the student experience. This is particularly surprising given the increasing emphasis in the Higher Education Sector on surveys such as the National Student Survey in measuring undergraduate student satisfaction. Smith *et al*, (2010) recommend that, as the surveys are currently optional for Higher Education Institutions, the Higher Education Academy should work with Universities UK to extend the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey to more institutions and to improve the student response rate. In this way, we would have more reliable and extensive data regarding the postgraduate student experience in the UK.

It seems that rather than being concerned with individuals' daily experiences of the PhD journey, growing interest in the PhD experience stems from an effort to understand how the experience contributes to completion and retention rates (Owler, 2010; Gardner and Gopaul, 2012). PhD students are often framed as a problem to be managed, which risks ignoring the personally demanding nature of the journey which, for many, is central to the research process. Whilst reflection is widely acknowledged as being crucial as part of the learning and researching process, little meaningful research has been done into the emotional and intellectual experiences of the journey (Amran and Ibrahim, 2011).

Although Smith *et al*. (2010:35) recognise the value that postgraduate research education brings to the UK, they also confirm that it is '*under-researched and under-appreciated*'. With increased global competition for postgraduate research students (St George, 2006) and quality service provision regarded as a key performance indicator for universities internationally (Manathunga, 2005), it is recognised that, whilst the experience of the postgraduate research student is difficult to measure, it

is important that information regarding that experience is gathered in order to inform practice within Higher Education Institutions (Smith *et al,* 2010). This is echoed by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA, 2011b) who comment that, although it is increasingly the case that a doctoral candidate is part of a cohort, doctoral education is, by nature, an individual experience. A range of factors, both personal and institutional, affect this experience. Institutional factors might include the field in which the candidate is studying, the department and university in which the candidate is enrolled, and whether he or she is part of a graduate school, the candidate's mode of study (full-time, part-time, campus based or distance learning). More personal factors may include the individual's academic and life experience before enrolling on the doctorate and during the doctoral journey, his or her relationship with her supervisor or supervisory team and his or her relationship with peers. It is therefore argued that, whilst every discipline has clear expectations of their doctoral candidates it is inadvisable to generalise about the doctoral experience as, although there will be similarities, each student's PhD journey will be different (Brydon and Fleming, 2011; QAA, 2015).

However, certain elements are acknowledged as key to successful doctoral programmes in general. These include a high-quality and vibrant research environment, effective supervision, access to resources and development opportunities, peer support and the need for the candidate to take responsibility for his/her own learning and research output. (QAA, 2015). This is supported by the QAA *Code of Practice, Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes*, which concludes that the quality of the research environment and contact with other researchers is vital to the doctoral experience for students and, ultimately, their successful completion.

At the moment, the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES), conducted by the Higher Education Academy, is the main source of information about students' motivations, experiences and journey as a researcher. However, although useful, it is important that the limitations of this survey are acknowledged. Firstly, Higher Education Institutions participate voluntarily and not all choose to do so, therefore, the findings do not represent the whole sector. Having said this, the number of institutions taking part rose from 82 in 2009 to 123 in 2015. However, the response rates within institutions are low (41% in 2015) and results from individual institutions are kept confidential and rarely circulated amongst supervisors.

Emery and Metcalfe (2009) recommend that more research, such as this thesis, should be conducted into the motivations and experiences of doctoral students in order to improve the student experience and encourage more people to embark upon doctoral research. Ryan (2012) shares the view that more research needs to be carried out when she suggests that, in order to encourage and facilitate the exchange of cultural intellectual ideas, we need an understanding of the complex challenges that doctoral students face on their transnational journey and this thesis aims to address this call.

3.3. Factors affecting the PhD journey

Many authors have conceptualised the PhD as a journey with heavy baggage (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010) with some arguing that the milestones upon this journey can be described as stages in a rite of passage from a junior position to a senior academic (Delamont, Atkinson and Parry, 1997). It is recognised that this journey is marked by milestones which bring varying challenges. For example, Brydon and

Fleming (2011:996) describe the PhD as *'a long journey fraught with twists and turns, with few defined signposts and the need to constantly adapt to unexpected events'* and Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014:553) as *'the emotional and multi-faceted journey of becoming a scholar.'* Brydon and Fleming (2011) also point out that the PhD journey is about more than the actual project. It involves developing knowledge and understanding of the research process and the range of methodological approaches available and attitudes towards the thesis change along the journey.

Despite the acknowledged challenges, it should be noted that the feedback available from postgraduates in general shows that they are generally highly satisfied with their experience and with the knowledge and skills they have gained whilst studying at postgraduate level. (Smith et al, 2010). In fact, 82% of respondents to PRES stated that the overall experience of their research programme met or exceeded their expectations (PRES, 2015). However, it is widely acknowledged in extant literature that various factors affect the PhD experience of students. These factors do not appear to have altered much over the past two decades and have been found to include both internal external factors. Factors which are considered external to the research include illness, employment opportunities, personal relationships, finance and family commitments (Hockey, 1991; PRES, 2015: QAA, 2011) and evidence shows that the longer the student's journey to completion of the thesis, the more likely it is that these external factors will impinge upon the research and hinder completion (Hockey, 1991). Perhaps not surprisingly, the factors which have been found to have the most impact on the social science student's experience are the formation of an identity whilst undertaking the isolated journey of PhD research and the centrality of the

supervisory relationship. It is suggested that these factors are closely linked and this chapter now explores them in further depth.

3.3.1. Identity/rite of passage

This notion of a personal journey and formation or transition of an identity is prevalent in extant literature. Delamont *et al* (1997:327) describe the research experience as *'an individual, personal conversion process'* which is *'experienced and celebrated as a personal rite of passage'*. Hockey (1991:324) describes the research process as being about *'the formation of a particular identity, an identity which will be influenced by both the PhD process and the aspirations which accompany it'*.

Several authors have described the challenges of travelling the PhD journey and making multiple transitions in their social identity, from teacher to student, from native speaker to second language speaker (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014), from practitioner to student (Brydon and Fleming, 2011) or student to academic (Owler, 2010). Owler (2010:298) describes the PhD process as *'an intense oscillation between excitement and fear'* during which students experience periods of self-doubt where they question their motivations for pursuing a PhD and the knowledge they have gained. Amran and Ibrahim (2011:531) echo this view, stating that many students experience moments of *'fear, inferiority, darkness and invisibility'.* They have to deal with these emotional challenges at the same time as juggling personal and professional responsibilities with often conflicting demands from families, institutions and sponsors. Alongside all these challenges, they are struggling to develop their skills and identities as researchers (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010).

Brydon and Fleming (2011) contend that there is little literature which, from a student perspective, considers the challenges on this transitional journey.

Owler (2010) argues that, in the current higher education climate, there is little recognition of the passionate process involved in knowledge production. However, there are existing accounts of the process which suggest that the personal journey involved in the process are as important to candidates as obtaining their doctorate. Owler (2010) suggests that pre-1990s, there were 2 major elements to the PhD. Firstly, it made practical demands of the student as an apprentice researcher who had to meet the formal demands with regard to entry requirements, presentation of the thesis, the examination process etc. However, the PhD also demanded originality from the students which cannot be taught. It became a '*mysterious rite of passage'* whereby a student was making the transition or journey from student to academic. Owler (2010) argues that this personal struggle has been *'an unwritten requirement of the doctorate'* which has not been formally recognised by universities but was nevertheless traditionally accepted by the academy as part of the rite of passage to the status of academic. However, under managerialism, this previous *'badge of honour'* has become regarded as a sign of mismanagement and, in order to overcome the difficulties in the doctoral process, students and supervisors are now being trained to handle their emotions more appropriately, leaving less scope for reflexivity regarding our identity and recognition of the impact of our embodied characteristics and personal journey on our research (Hall, 2004).

Deem and Brehony (2000) find that research student identities are influenced by a range of factors internal and external to the academic environment. They also state that identities are fluid and are likely to change during a candidate's period of

registration, echoing Delamont *et al*'s (1997) notion of a personal conversion process. Smith and Guarnizo (1998:21, cited in Rizvi, 2010) echo this, arguing that international students' professional identities are in a state of *'becoming'* rather than *'arrival'*. Several authors suggest that the purpose or motivation for pursuing the PhD will affect attitudes to the process and, therefore, the speed and ease with which people make the transition and assume the identity of a research student (Deem and Brehony, 2000; Owler, 2010; Fotovatian & Miller, 2014). This is particularly true of international students who may have temporarily left their employment and part-time students who still have a range of family and work responsibilities, both of whom will occupy several identities. In addition to the fact that they have more than one identity, they may find it difficult to adjust to the loss of status (Deem and Brehony, 2000). Rizvi (2005:4) supports this, arguing that the identities of international students are '*clearly shaped not only by their personal histories, cultural traditions and professional aspirations but are also continually reshaped by new cultural experiences, but in ways that are neither uniform nor predictable'*.

It is widely recognised that forming a social identity, particularly in a second language, involves gaining access to powerful academic and social networks (McAlpine and Norton, 2006). This can be particularly difficult for international students who are often grouped together as the Other, implying displacement (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014) or are portrayed as a 'nobody' who is in the UK to embrace the opportunities offered by Western universities to become 'somebody' (Kettle, 2005, cited in Fotovatian and Miller, 2014). Bilecen (2013) supports this, observing that, although the UK and, in particular UK Higher Education, is deemed to be a multicultural, multilingual society, international doctoral students were still

made 'the Other' based on language and argues that this point is often neglected in the literature. This lack of recognition of the diversity of backgrounds of this group of international students can be problematic in many ways. It overlooks the varied motivations and expectations of international doctoral students (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014) and can lead to the suppression of the voice of international students as a minority group. This *'lack of access to privileged positions'* can lead to *'an intense loss of self-esteem and identity'* (Ryan and Viete, 2009:307). Fotovatian and Miller (2014) suggest that international students in western institutions are a 'nobody' who struggle to overcome language and cultural barriers to gain access to academic networks and create a legitimate institutional identity. This appears to endorse the view that *'language is not only a symbolic system but also a system to symbolise'* (Bilecen, 2013:677) and can be used to *'claim and reject identities, to signal relationships and to display memberships'* (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet, 1999:50).

In addition, by imposing the 'international student' and 'home student' administrative labels, institutions are creating two distinct identity groups and magnifying the social, cultural and physical space between the two groups (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014). Fotovatian and Miller (2014) further found that home PhD students engaged with similar stereotyping of international students, using a discourse of 'we' and 'you' which indicates that they perceive them as the Other and have feelings of dominance and power within the group. Koehne (2005) cautions against considering international students as an homogenous 'Other' in opposition to local students and reminds us that they have their own multiple subjectivities. Trahar (2010:146) goes further and advocates reflexivity on the part of all involved in the

PhD process by suggesting that intercultural understanding includes knowing your *'self'*, thinking outside your *'tribe'* and empathising with *'others'.*

Students' interactions can also be impaired by their perceptions of the hierarchy between students and academics (Fotovatian & Miller, 2014). Culturally, many of them believe that their interactions with academics should be limited to formal academic conversations. In other words, they position themselves with an institutional identity of a student, rather than an aspiring/future academic, causing a social distance with the academics in the faculty and potentially limiting their ability to establish academic networks. Fotovatian & Miller (2014) conclude that Higher Education Institutions need to move beyond the international/home student dichotomy and look for strategies which encourage formal and informal interactions between all students to encourage a sense of belonging and, thereby, the development of institutional identities for all students. This chapter now explores the literature surrounding the challenges involved in countering the feelings of isolation and lack of belonging experienced by PhD students.

3.3.2. Isolation

Research shows that doctoral students experience both social and academic isolation during their PhD journey and that postgraduate research is commonly perceived as rather a '*lone venture*' (Wisker, Robinson and Shacham, 2007) or '*lonely journey'* (Matthiesen and Binder, 2009). This *'long and lonely business … is probably the toughest test anyone can face in academic life'* (Percy, 2014:1). Amran and Ibrahim (2011) acknowledge the feelings of loneliness, isolation and confusion encountered on the PhD journey. Miller and Brimicombe (2010:408-409)

encapsulate this, stating *'The PhD journey, like foreign travel, involves the exploration of unknown territories and encounters with unfamiliar cultures … For many PhD travellers, the journey is aided (and sometimes hampered) by the guidebooks they consult and by those fellow travellers and people they meet along the way.'* Owler (2010) found that the fact that the PhD is defined by the requirement for the student to produce independent original research leads to the lone or lonely experience. This can sometimes be enjoyed as an experience of autonomy but, on other occasions, lead to a difficult experience of loneliness. Moments of intimacy with one's books can rapidly become moments of confusion and insecurity.

Despite the widespread recognition of the issue, Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014) contend that relatively little research has been done into the factors that contribute to feelings of isolation and the measures taken by both students and institutions to overcome them. The research that does exist tends to focus on the experience of international students, mainly at Masters level, with little focus on doctoral students or home students. Research that has been conducted finds evidence that doctoral students continue to experience intense isolation (Deem and Brehony, 2000; McCallin and Nayar, 2011). Students undertaking a conventional PhD with a long thesis have, traditionally, rarely been part of a team and the traditional individualised relationship with one supervisor, which is explored later in this chapter, is, without doubt a contributory factor in the feelings of isolation (Deem and Brehony, 2000). Chiang (2003) reminds us that in the social sciences, students do not work on the same projects as their supervisors and are regarded as learners, rather than full members of the research group. This highly personalised nature of the doctoral journey, can lead to a very solitary experience for students (Delamont *et al.,* 1997).

In addition, as international doctoral students are navigating this complex and challenging academic and cultural journey, they face other challenges. Whilst it is widely claimed that supervisors are vital in the PhD journey (Lee, 2008), the assumed centrality of the supervisory relationship has been questioned as research has found that even if students have a satisfactory relationship with their supervisor, a lack of social interaction with family and friends will make them unhappy (Jazvac-Martek *et al.,*2011; Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014). This has been found to be a particular issue for part-time and international students for whom there can be a significant personal cost of pursuing a PhD. Family time is severely restricted and you can become estranged from family, who try to support what you are doing but do not really understand the journey and, although the PhD is a *'solo swim event'*, you still need the people around you as fans (Brydon and Fleming, 2011:1008). Pressures from family and friends at home are more prevalent than ever with the availability of cheaper telephone and Internet, which has become the *'social glue of transnationalism'* (Vertovec, 2009:54 in Rizvi, 2010). In addition, pressure may be exerted upon students who have been awarded government sponsorships to pursue research and, ultimately, a career which has been approved by the government of their home country (Rizvi ,2010). Sponsors will often dictate the subject area and the approach required towards the research and Rizvi (2010) argues that the production of knowledge in social sciences is inherently political and some international PhD students face the dilemma of whether to produce critical scholarship, which would be encouraged in the UK but frowned upon in his home country.

The role of peer interaction in doctoral students' experience has been widely acknowledged (Gardner, 2007; Hadjioannau et al., 2007) and Janta, Lugosi and

Brown (2014) support these findings, stating that both domestic and international students experience social isolation and may struggle to engage in meaningful relationships with fellow students. It is suggested that this social and intellectual isolation occurs at different stages along the doctoral journey. This lack of social interaction can lead to self-doubts (Matthiesen and Binder, 2009) and may have a detrimental effect upon both academic performance and timely completion (Hockey, 1991; Ali and Kohun, 2007). The isolated nature of the journey impairs the ability to think creatively and share knowledge (Hockey, 1991) and contributes to the challenge in sustaining passion for the project (Brydon and Fleming, 2011). However, Brydon and Fleming (2011) suggest that literature rarely confronts the reality that an idea which initially filled a researcher with passion and enthusiasm can quickly become *'overly familiar and downright boring'* and a challenge for a doctoral student is to find ways to share ideas concerning their topics.

Many authors, such as Deem and Brehony (2000) and Wisker *et al.* (2007) suggest that these feelings of isolation can be exacerbated for both international students, who are unused to the cultures and practices of UK Higher Education and part-time students, who are rare visitors to their department. It is widely recognised that many PhD students experience feelings of extreme isolation and 'intense loneliness' (Brown & Holloway, 2008:242) during their studies. Stier (2002) refers to this as the emotional journey of a student in intercultural education. Feeling, at best, a newcomer and, at worst, an alien, can bring about strong emotions of uncertainty, frustration, anxiety or even depression (Stier, 2002; Brown & Holloway, 2008) and international education has the capacity to make students aware of these feelings and to teach them coping strategies for the future. Unfortunately, the PhD experience is generally considered to be significantly more isolated than the

undergraduate experience and one questions whether the multicultural yet isolated environment in which PhD students find themselves in the UK exacerbates these strong, and often negative, emotions, thereby making opportunities for intercultural exchange between students more difficult to achieve. If supervisors are unable or unwilling to create spaces in which students are able to discuss these feelings and unveil their cultural and linguistic embodiedness, these emotions may well be heightened. Rizvi (2010) is one of the few authors to have conducted research into the international research student experience and highlights the feelings of marginalisation that international doctoral students experience in the Western academy. He also reveals that, despite years of prior learning and experience in their home countries, some doctoral students were treated by academic staff in the same way as international undergraduate students. He further argues that doctoral students are more self-reflexive than undergraduates and aware of the role higher education plays in forming professional identities and developing academic careers. However, he also acknowledges that there is no homogeneity and they negotiate their experiences abroad in different ways. Rizvi (2010) recognises that international doctoral students face a range of dilemmas during their studies, some of which are common to all doctoral students. However, international students face additional challenges as they negotiate a '*transnational space'* which involves their aspirations and expectations and different forms of knowledge to which they are exposed and have to make sense of. They find themselves negotiating the structures and power relations of the Western academy.

Evidence shows that isolation has always been a key concern for international students and worries about homesickness and isolation and difficulties in mixing with UK students remain high during many students' whole experience (UKCISA,

2011).   This evidence is reinforced by the data regularly gathered by the International Student Barometer which highlights the difficulties experienced by international students in mixing with UK students and other existing literature which suggests that the lack of contact between home and international students can leave international students feeling excluded and lonely (Marginson, Nyland, Sawir and Forbes-Mewett, 2010). In fact, Urban and Palmer (2014) go as far as to state that international students create strong communities on campus which contribute to their personal development, whereas their interactions with home students tend to be superficial and short-lived and do not contribute to their international perspectives.   International doctoral students' feelings of marginality can be exacerbated by language and cultural differences, for example the physical attire of Muslim females (Amran and Ibrahim ,2011; Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014) and postgraduate international students can feel *'excluded, ignored, isolated, marginalized or simply distanced'* (Ryan and Viete, 2009:309). Percy (2014:3) supports this, suggesting that *'imposter syndrome'* or fear of being a fraud often prevents doctoral students being honest with themselves and seeking out honest and supportive relationships with other researchers.

Shiel (2008) highlights this sense of isolation experienced by international students and suggests that socialisation does not happen by chance. It is widely recognised that this socialisation is one of the most difficult issues for universities to address and none appear to have found a real solution. UK student culture tends to focus heavily around pub and club culture and many international students have no experience of this in their own cultures. Indeed, their religion may well preclude them from entering establishments serving alcohol or, for females, mixing with men in public. Amran and Ibrahim (2011) add that events and venues have to be appropriate to both home and international students to avoid the risk of

marginalising certain groups and reinforcing feelings of isolation. Fotovatian and Miller (2014:291) recognise the importance of informal relationships and 'tea-room interactions' for research students but accept that these interactions are often culturally loaded and linguistically challenging for international students and found that international students avoided social interactions for fear of *'saying something culturally or socially inappropriate'* (2014:287). The cultural journey (Stier, 2002) remains, for many, therefore, a difficult one.

With regard to this cultural journey, Deem and Brehony (2000) suggest that there are three cultures which are relevant to social science research students: the peer cultures of research students; the cultures of research student training and the cultures of academic disciplines. They define academic research cultures as including disciplinary values, expert knowledge and knowledge production, cultural practices and narrative, intellectual networks and learned societies. They suggest that the ability for research students to access these cultures depends largely on chance and their supervisors. Becher and Trowler (1989), however, outline other ways students may access these cultures, such as research training, giving seminars, publishing and establishing academic networks. Deem and Brehony (2000) found that full-time students who were aspiring academics were most likely to gain access to these cultures. Both international and part-time students expressed concern that they were excluded because of factors such as lack of information and lack of confidence to join in and express themselves in English in a group situation. These findings are supported by the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES, 2011) which highlights the feelings of isolation that postgraduate research students experience, with only 54% of them stating that they felt integrated into their department's community. Less than a third felt that their

department provided opportunities for social contact with other research students, to become involved in the wider research culture or a good seminar programme for research students. This is borne out by Howson (2014) who suggests that international students are often under-supported and excluded from opportunities such as placements, leaving them feeling that they pay more but are treated worse than home students. She argues that this is reflected in lower international student satisfaction scores and this is reflected in PRES (2015) which finds that international students are a 'potentially vulnerable' group who are less likely to engage with research culture initiatives such as research training, conferences and placements. However, Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014) point out that it can be challenging for universities with a less-developed research culture to support such initiatives. This is borne out by research conducted by Kemp *et al* (2008) into 68 UK HE Institutions' policies in regard to international postgraduate research students. He found that only one university had a strategy which included in-course support for research students or mentioned improving the research students' experience. This is a concern for managers in higher education institutions as, if students' expectations of becoming part of a sociable, active research community are not met, they feel very disappointed and possibly misled (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014).

Sawir (2013) points out that both international and home students play an equal role in facilitating internationalisation and, therefore, a deeper understanding is required of how home students' experience the internationalised higher education environment. Interestingly, Leask (2005) asserts that, whereas international students are viewed by some as valuable resources, which merit quality services and support, domestic students are constructed as primarily mono-lingual and insular and in need of becoming more outward-looking and cross-cultural. She

points out that, in some texts, international students are positioned as an important source of revenue and measures of the success of internationalisation strategies. However, in these same texts, domestic students gain no mention and are constructed as having no part in the internationalisation agenda. This is supported by other authors who note that, in the past, the literature on internationalisation has shown an imbalance, pointing out that the main focus has been on the international student experience with the 'internationalisation at home' agenda and the home student experience of internationalisation being largely neglected. (Sawir, 2013). This focus may well reflect the international activities of many UK higher education institutions but some authors are now beginning to question this concentration on the international student community (Sawir, 2013). In the past, the fact that international students paid such high fees appeared to justify this bias but, in the current climate, where many students pay fees, it is being asked whether our attention should now turn to the learning experience of **all** students, thereby promoting equality and inclusivity. As Luker suggests '*true internationalisation requires looking at the student body as a whole, not as several distinct populations*' (Luker, 2008:13), bringing us back to the holistic approach advocated by much of the literature. This view is supported by Kandiko (2013: online) who reminds us that '*many of the challenges of teaching and learning that traditionally arise in the context of international students are significant issues for many home students as well*' and Carroll and Ryan (2005) who describes international students as *'canaries in the mine'* for the entire student body.

Sawir (2013) also argues that internationalisation involves the commitment of all institutional communities, which includes home students. He argues that the heavy focus on international students in existing research has created a gap in the

literature on the internationalisation of higher education and that, in order to fully understand the processes of internationalisation, more research, such as this thesis, needs to be conducted with domestic students as participants. The home student experience is perhaps increasingly significant in the current internationalised climate of doctoral studies where many cohorts of doctoral students are dominated by international students with very few full-time UK students present. It is possible, then, that this minority of home students are experiencing some of the exacerbated feelings of isolation and 'otherness' usually attributed to international students in the literature. In the light of these reflections, this study considers the PhD experience of both home and international students.

The research that does exist shows that the 'internationalisation at home' agenda is proving difficult to fulfil. UK students often do not recognise the advantages to their learning provided by the multi-cultural student body and, instead, become frustrated by the presence of international students in the classroom, focussing on their cultural differences and communication issues, rather than the learning resource they provide (Weaver, Vickerstaff and Sullivan, 2008; Marginson, 2015). Harrison and Peacock (2007) conducted research into the perceptions of UK students towards international students in their institutions, which endorsed findings that many have negative perceptions and regard them as an academic threat. This issue is not restricted to the classroom and it is also evident that home students fail to make the most of the diversity of the student body more generally on campus and that they are less positive than international students towards the social climate too (Zimitat, 2008).

In an increasingly competitive market, it is important that both international and home students at all levels report a positive experience of their internationalised experience and some argue that this means that universities should '*strive to find better ways to integrate international and domestic students'* (Leask, 2009:207). Middlehurst and Woodfield (2007) recommend that emphasis in the future is based on improving the quality of the international student experience by focussing on aspects such as academic support, cultural experiences and social integration. However, they are unable to give any real practical recommendations for action to bring about improved social integration and make somewhat vague suggestions for a '*social strategy'* (2007:54) and '*the need to give attention to issues of integration between groups of students both socially and academically'* (2007:56). Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014) also conclude that social isolation is an issue which needs to be recognised at both institutional and departmental levels as a stressful element of the doctoral experience. There should be support structures in place within the university that tackle social isolation. It has been suggested that these might include training for supervisors to recognise signs of isolation. However, their findings suggest that students do not always expect emotional support from their supervisor and that, if supervisors become too emotionally involved, it can have negative consequences for the relationship (Hockey, 1995). Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014) suggest that this calls into question the role of the supervisor and warrants further research into the expectations of doctoral students with regard to emotional and pastoral care. As stated earlier, the traditional individualised relationship with one supervisor is, without doubt a contributory factor in the feelings of isolation (Deem and Brehony, 2000) and this chapter now examines representations in the literature of this traditional relationship and then goes on to explore the changing nature of supervision in the context of contemporary Higher Education.

3.4.   Role of the supervisory relationship

3.4.1. Centrality of relationship

It is widely acknowledged that the supervision process and, more specifically, the supervisory relationship which evolves are a key influence in the student's PhD experience and, ultimately, in their success or failure in gaining a PhD (Hockey, 1991; Gill and Burnard, 2008).   It is, as described by Wisker (2012:5), *'the primary relationship for all stages of the research student's journey, from ideas to successful completed thesis and beyond'.*   Doctoral research in the social sciences typically involves two main parties, the student and the supervisor or, more recently, the supervisory team (Brydon and Fleming, 2011). Despite the widespread recognition that good supervision is vital in producing a positive outcome from the doctoral journey, there is evidence that the area of supervision is under-researched and under-theorised (Wisker,2012; Halse and Malfroy, 2010).   The need for a better understanding of the experiences of students and supervisors is supported by PRES (2015) which states that supervision is rated by respondents as the most important area of the PhD experience. It adds that it is the area rated as the most positive, with 91% of respondents stating that their supervisor had the skills and subject knowledge to adequately support their research. However, an earlier PRES report (2011) which yielded similar findings, also concludes that, whereas statistics regarding the supervisory experience initially appear encouraging, institutions should use them as a benchmark to explore the experiences of their own doctoral students. They should question whether their students are in fact as positive about supervision as the national survey portrays. Even if they are, the report suggests

that institutions need to further research the experiences of the small but significant percentage whose experiences were below their expectations.

Much of the literature which does exist regarding the supervisory process emanates, in the main, from supervisors themselves and focuses largely on the supervisors' perspective, with little attention being paid to the students' view of the relationship (Lee, 2008). Leonard et al (2006) point out that their review of relevant literature highlighted the fact that the student voice is seldom heard in research regarding the doctoral experience. They argue that, instead, much of the work based on what doctoral students allegedly feel and think is, in fact, based on interviews with or anecdotal evidence from those who work with them, such as supervisors, employers and sponsors. Bishop (2008) supports this, arguing that the student voice is becoming increasingly audible in research but continues to be presented from an outsider's perspective.

It is argued that, traditionally, the underlying processes involved in supervision have been implicit and unexamined (Pearson & Brew, 2002), with the existing literature focussing on identifying the functions that make a supervisor effective with little exploration of a conceptual approach to supervision (Lee, 2008). As mentioned above, those studies that do exist are largely based on research from the supervisors' perspectives rather than those of students themselves. However, research that has been undertaken on the supervisory relationship has highlighted a number of tensions which have, by some, been identified as a reason for non-completion (Wisker, 2001; Brew 2001; Mullins and Kiley, 2002).

3.4.2. Tensions in traditional relationship

As previously mentioned, there has been much written regarding the importance of the relationship between the supervisor and the student, particularly in social sciences where the student-supervisor relationship has traditionally relied heavily on individuals, rather than supervisory teams. (Leonard *et al*, 2006). As Hockey (1991:327) points out *'the supervision process is, to state the obvious, a relationship'*. However, it is the highly individualised, complex and dynamic nature of that relationship which is highlighted in much of the early literature (Hockey, 1991; Delamont *et al.*, 1997). Delamont *et al.*, (1997:325) point out that social science lacks the *'pedagogic continuity'* associated with laboratory research and relies instead on a succession of individualised supervisory relationships between supervisors and their students.   They, in turn, argue that this experience fosters intense loyalty and is a powerful tool in academic enculturation. It is also, however, a strong contributory factor in the isolation felt by many PhD students in social sciences.

Hockey (1991) points out that early research into supervisory styles adopted by supervisors highlighted the need for the supervisor to create a supportive environment and to share in a personal relationship with the student (Wilson, 1980; Diamond and Zuber-Skerritt, 1986).   However, more recent studies, whilst confirming students' appreciation for a supportive environment, have shown that both students and supervisors are less comfortable with a personal relationship (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014) but instead prefer *'an academically close, but not dependent relationship …'* (Wright & Lodwick, 1989:50). Despite this, many authors appear to construct the personal and intimate nature of the supervisory relationship

as positive, such as Delamont *et al*. (1997: 320) who claim that students *'get to be autonomous, independent scholars and can feel themselves intimate intellectual heirs of the supervisors'.* There is not, however, universal agreement that this highly individualised student-supervisor pedagogy is desirable. Tennant (2004), for example, questions how tenable this approach is in the current knowledge economy and Deem and Brehony (2000:163) call for a *'less individualised and more inclusive environment.'* They claim that, in order for the social science research student's experience to be less isolated, *'research supervision needs to be recognised as a form of teaching, not as a private activity between two consenting adults'* (2000:163). Delamont, *et al*. (1997), despite highlighting some positive aspects of the relationship, share the opinion that the highly individualised nature of the social science doctoral process, with its reliance on one-to-one relationships with supervisors is a strong contributory factor to the isolation felt by students during their doctoral journey. Deuchar's (2008) research found evidence that some students have feelings of isolation and marginalisation throughout their doctorate and that supervisors did not always understand which type of support was required at which stage of the process in order to alleviate these feelings. Some research has suggested that innovations such as research training programmes have gone some way towards creating research student cultures, lessening the feelings of reliance on this individualised relationship and reducing feelings of isolation. (Deem & Brehony, 2000). This chapter examines these arguments in more depth in a later section.

McCormack (2004) argues that universities have constructed their conceptions of postgraduate research around the implicit assumptions of the traditional master/apprentice model. In this model *'the established "master" inducts the new*

apprentice into the *"mysteries" of the craft*' (McCormack, 2004:319). She further argues that this dominant narrative, which is inherent in institutional policies, constructs postgraduate research as an '*independent, solitary activity, which, through discovery of new facts, leads to the production of original knowledge*' (2004:320). Delamont et al. (1997) concur that research in social science disciplines is characterised by individualised relations with few intermediaries, meaning that the '*apostolic succession passes directly from the most senior to the most junior members of the academic discipline*' (1997:329). This appears to suggest that the senior academics are in a powerful position in as much as they are able to select and nurture their intellectual heirs. In addition, Green and Usher (2003:45) state that, historically, supervisors were only accountable to themselves and their responsibility was to induct the students in to their discipline and ensure that students produced a thesis which conformed with '*norms of the discipline and as defined by disciplinary gatekeepers*'.

It is widely acknowledged, then, that supervisors have a major role to play as gatekeepers to the academic community. This gatekeeper role will be explored in more depth in the following chapter but is corroborated by Deuchar (2008) who claims that the supervisory relationship is complicated by many hidden agendas. He cites Grant (1999:8) in stating that there is a profoundly unequal power structure within the relationship which can affect the quality of communication between the student and supervisor. Grant (1999:8) refers to the '*shadow figures and relationships*' which may be hidden behind both the student and supervisor, causing them to react to each other in certain ways. Lee (2008:305) supports this, noting that some colleagues question the whole supervisory relationship, identifying the issue of power and a '*master and slave*' interaction.

Lee (2008), in her research based on interviews with supervisors, puts forward five main approaches to supervision, one of which is *'enculturation'*. In this approach, achieving a PhD is about becoming a member of an academic discipline. She suggests that supervisors may see themselves as *'the family doctor'* (272), with specific expertise but also as gatekeeper to other resources and networks. In other words, they are able to provide contacts to doctoral students in terms of conferences, teaching opportunities and developing professional networks, which will both enhance their potential success in academia and help decrease isolation (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014). The supervisor is able to decide which gates to open, exemplifying the *'power of the supervisor in its widest sense'* (Lee, 2008: 272). The supervisor is not only gatekeeper to the discipline but also to the final qualification and ownership, or even suppression, of the final piece of work. As Lee (2008) points out, *'original research can be dangerous in that it can undermine previously clearly held beliefs and careers'* (272). When it comes to international students, the power may be even greater, as the supervisor is also gatekeeper to the cultural context in which the PhD is being taken and is able to influence perceptions over who owns the research and any subsequent publications. Delamont *et al.* (1997:329) share the view that doctoral students are *'intimate intellectual heirs of their supervisors',* earning a rite of passage to an academic discipline and they note that there are rarely any intermediaries between senior academics and the novice doctoral research student, meaning that the *'apostolic succession passes directly from the most senior to the most junior of members of the academic discipline'* (329).

Whilst it is acknowledged that there is increased accountability in Higher Education in recent years, as will be explored further in the following chapter, some argue that

the examination process is shrouded in mystery (Johnston, 1997) and that there is little research regarding the examination and assessment of postgraduate theses (Mullins and Kiley, 2002). This is supported by the experiences of Brydon and Fleming (2011:1006) who state that, for their own theses, the criteria for markers' decisions were not explicit but their supervisors referred to *'what the markers like'*.

As has been seen, much of the literature highlights the tensions between independence and direction in the traditional supervisor-student relationship. Hockey (1991) suggests that, as students progress through their PhD journey, this dynamic relationship changes from one of dependence and guidance to autonomy and colleagueship. Phillips and Pugh (2010) concur and maintain that, as students become more involved with their work and more self-confident, they no longer rely to such an extent on the external approval and advice of their supervisors. Interestingly, as Cox highlights (1988), despite the recognition that the path between autonomy and dependence is a difficult one to tread, there have been few in-depth studies of this critical relationship. Deuchar's research (2008) found that students valued the presence of a critical friend, who was flexible, responsive to a student's needs and encouraged open communication with a frank exchange of views.

It has been argued that in this traditional relationship, the supervisor's role as researcher has taken precedence and that pedagogy has been the *'absent presence'* in the process (Evans & Green, 1995:2, cited in Pearson & Brew, 2002). Lee's (2008) research found that supervisors' own experiences as a doctoral student had a major impact on how they now supervise. This view is echoed by many authors who recognise that supervision should be regarded as a specialist

and sophisticated form of high-level teaching, complete with its own institutional roles and responsibilities (Emilsson and Johnson, 2007; Firth and Martens, 2008).

A further tension which is discussed in the literature is the possibility of a mismatch in expectations of the research process between institutional or supervisors' conceptions and those of the research students. It is argued that this mismatch in conceptions could be a reason for non-completion of the doctorate (McCormack, 2004; Lee, 2008). Burns *et al* (1999) highlight the importance of discussions regarding roles and expectations in order that the relationship can be reassessed at various stages of the process. Deuchar (2008) supports this by highlighting the tensions which arise between students and supervisors, particularly when supervisors were expecting students to be independent at the point in the PhD journey when students felt a need for increased support and guidance. Green and Usher (2003) concur that it is important to avoid mismatches in expectations, stating that, in a climate of increased accountability in higher education, students must also commit to certain obligations from the outset. By doing this and in view of the increased monitoring of progress, it is hoped that there will be an improved understanding of both supervisor and student needs.

Having explored the traditional supervisory relationship in social sciences, this chapter now explores the changing role of the supervisor in the modern climate of performativity and accountability in higher education.

3.4.3 A need for change

As McCallin and Nayar (2011) acknowledge, the political and economic factors that influence research in the twenty first century are very different from the professional and epistemological issues which traditionally shaped doctoral research, across both Europe and Australia. With Higher Education being increasingly driven by market forces and a consumerist service ethic (Deuchar, 2008), the focus is increasingly on employment outcomes and skills formation of graduates and quality of the experience – including areas such as timely completion, student satisfaction, resources and effectiveness of supervision.

This has led to more recent studies acknowledging the changing nature of the doctorate within the Higher Education climate and the impact of this on the style of research supervision that academics adopt in the face of the new knowledge economy. (Deuchar, 2008). In fact, in parallel with the doctorate itself, the role of supervisor has also come under more scrutiny than ever before. Indeed, many now recognise that professional development and training is required for supervisors and some universities even give awards for excellent supervision or consider supervisory achievements in applications for promotion (QAA, 2011). However, it should be noted that there is no single model for either supervisor development or 'reward'. In addition, supervisory achievements are not defined consistently and may, therefore, constitute completions, rather than considering the experience of the PhD candidate during the supervisory process.

Although doctoral level qualifications in the UK fall under the auspices of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), which may suggest a standardised approach to supervision across UK institutions, research suggests that supervision procedures,

in reality, vary widely within institutions, let alone nationally (Kemp *et al.,* 2008).

Thus, whilst the QAA Code of Practice on postgraduate research degree programmes outlines detailed expectations for research degree programmes, including more formal supervision procedures and requirements for skills development, only a minority of UK Higher Education institutions have policies regarding PhD supervision (Kemp *et al.*, 2008). Interestingly, this reinforces Delamont *et al*'s (1997) prediction that any code of practice would not change social realities. The issue of quality management and standardisation is made more difficult in a climate where staff shortages, an ageing workforce and inexperienced faculty are involved. Thus, whilst the average level of supervisory contact is about 30 hours per year, many supervisors report 'over-stretch' (Minnick *et al.,* 2010).

This new Higher Education climate has led to inevitable changes in supervisory practices, culminating in what Green and Usher (2003:44) refer to as '*fast supervision for fast times'*, where emphasis is placed firmly on successful, timely completion. Supervisory styles have become more interventionist (Halse and Malfroy, 2010) and supervisors need to be readily available, give timely feedback, adhere to timelines and be *'resistant to intellectual meanderings'* (Green & Usher, 2003:44), thereby reducing opportunities of intellectual exchange or creativity. Green and Usher (2003) suggest that current pressures only allow opportunity for a focussed dialogue between supervisors and students where supervisors direct and structure students' work in what Gatfield (2005) would describe as a dictatorial supervisory style. This is in contrast to either a laissez-faire style which involves low structure and low support, offering students responsibility and freedom or a pastoral style, which involves high support and low structure, where the supervisor is understanding, friendly and helpful. In this scenario, Lee (2008) argues that a

tension can arise between the professional requirement for completion and the personal desire for quality which can translate into a tension between the supervisor's own career advancement and that of the student. Green and Usher (2003:44) suggest that, in this context of close scrutiny and judgement, both supervisors and students need to be *'clearer than ever before about the nature of the journey on which are they are embarking.'*

Debates in literature have emerged regarding the pedagogy of supervision and whether supervision should be viewed as a form of coaching or apprenticeship (Lee and Green, 2009). It is acknowledged that students and supervisors often have different expectations of where the responsibility for learning lies (Brown, 2008). Brydon and Fleming (2011) contend that valuable supervision is brought about by forming an effective working relationship. As mentioned above, this involves the supervisor outlining their expectations and the student then having an input into the terms of the relationship. However, they also recognise that this requires a student to feel sufficiently empowered to undertake these negotiations. In a situation where the supervisor is likely to be a senior academic, the student will have constructed him or her as being superior in terms of both knowledge and academic standing.

McCallin and Nayar (2011) argue that, despite the recognition that the new consumerist world of higher education calls for a change in supervisory styles, the majority of supervision takes place following the traditional model with '*numerous academics teaching individual students the same thing in separate situations'* (70) which is not tenable in the long term. When we consider the growing number of doctoral students and the challenges facing doctoral education, it is imperative that universities review their approach to managing doctoral students and this chapter will now consider new approaches outlined in the literature.

3.4.3. The way forward

Deuchar (2008) suggests that the issue of supervision styles needs to be openly discussed and that supervisors need to be flexible in moving between a range of supervisions styles in order to meet the needs of today's diverse body of research students. This is a view that reflects the belief that each student is an individual and working practices need to vary in order to get the best from the relationship. In essence, the notion that *'one size of supervision fits all'* is no longer tenable (McCallin and Nayar, 2012:64). Indeed, several studies have recognised that the supervisory relationship is a dynamic one and different students benefit from different supervisory styles. This is not a new concept as can be seen by Rudd's (1975) observation 40 years ago that it is essential that we realise that there cannot be one single model for effective supervision. However, it appears that Higher Education Institutions and supervisors themselves have been reluctant to acknowledge this need for flexibility. Lee (2008) acknowledges that, whilst external pressures may push supervisors towards a functional approach, a deeper understanding of the conceptions of research supervision would enable supervisors to develop a wider range of approaches.

Indeed, in Australia, the pressures to produce the *'complete postgraduate'* (Cryer, 1998), with a range of skills which extend beyond the subject specialist skills of a PhD, have already meant that the role of the supervisor has moved from that of master with the apprentice learning at his or her feet to that of mentor, guide or teacher, helping students to *'navigate a viable pathway suited to their individual learning needs and career goals'* (Pearson & Brew, 2002:138). Thus, supervisors have become both teachers of research and responsible for the pastoral

management of students (McCallin and Nayar, 2012), meaning that the supervisory role has expanded and now includes an advisory role, a quality control role, a supporting role and a guiding role (De Beer and Mason, 2009).

In order to succeed in the current climate of socio-economic change, it is acknowledged that universities need to implement strategies to develop their postgraduate research provision. McCallin and Nayar (2011) argue that two strategies which are worthy of serious consideration are both supervisor training and research student training. In order to maintain research supervision quality in the changing environment described above, it has been suggested that supervisors need formal training to ensure that they are aware of changes in government and institutional policies, supervision pedagogy and alterative models of supervision (McCallin and Nayar, 2011). Green and Usher (2003), however, point out that the move towards supervisor development and training is regarded by some as highly contentious. Those who hold this view are of the opinion that disciplinary expertise is sufficient to carry out a supervisory role and no professional development is needed. Green and Usher (2003) argue, however, that, as supervisors are accountable to the university and students, it is the responsibility of the university to provide the training and development opportunities to equip academics to supervise doctoral students.

It has been argued that the traditional doctoral journey from dependence to independence is no longer suitable in the modern academic world, where there are increasing calls for collaborative knowledge creation and intercultural learning. It has been suggested that supervisors would be better to support students in forging relationships and networks to enhance their careers and co-create knowledge,

rather than encouraging total independence (Jazvac-Martek *et al.,* 2011). This view is supported by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) who encourage the introduction of supervisory teams in their QAA *Code of Practice*, which recognises the key role of supervisors in maintaining consistency of standards across doctoral programmes. It recognises that the supervisor is fundamental in the PhD experience, in terms of support and development of the candidate (QAA, 2011) and notes that this has always been the case in the more traditional 'apprenticeship' approach and continues to be true in the more recent development of supervisory teams. In fact, QAA highlights the opportunity to use supervisory teams as a framework within which new supervisors can learn from more experienced supervisors.

Another model of PhD supervision to emerge in recent years is that of a community learning approach, whereby supervisors arrange workshops and writing groups, forming a research community for the exchange of ideas (Parker, 2009). It is argued that the group supervision model complements supervisory input and can improve the supervisory process (Buttery, Richter and Filho, 2005). This is not a new approach and was encapsulated in the concept of *'pedagogic continuity'* by Delamont *et al* (1997). They argued that doctoral supervision and the production of doctoral research were key in the transmission of knowledge. To this end, pedagogic continuity does not involve instruction and training courses but, rather, a process of *'enculturation, experienced over a lengthy period of academic socialisation'* (Delamont *et al*., 1997:325). Although they acknowledge that the group model only works when there is a sufficient number of students at different stages of their research, they suggest that this academic socialisation inspires a high degree of group loyalty and identification with a discipline. They further note,

however, that, at the time of their research (1997), this pedagogic continuity was restricted to laboratory-based research and did not exist in the social sciences.

As discussed above, for various reasons, not least the growing numbers of research students, traditional models of one-to-one or team supervision are increasingly difficult to maintain. It has been suggested that students should be offered formal training and courses on areas such as research design, literature reviews and data analysis techniques. As with Parker's (2009) community learning approach, university-wide seminars would enable learning from the wider academic community (De Valero, 2001) and has the potential to develop '*a strong, supportive student research community that fosters collegiality, commitment to research and student success'* (McCallin and Nayar, 2011: 70). McCallin and Nayar, whilst advocating this group approach to supervision, point out that quieter students or those with English as a second language may find it challenging and would need clear parameters and guidelines from supervisors. Deem and Brehony (2000) find that, although research training can provide access to more social contacts, these may be limited. For example, both part-time and international students reported that they had found it difficult to identify and integrate with full-time UK students. They further suggest that, whilst international students recognised the benefits of research training courses in terms of both social and academic benefits, many home full-time students found them to be *'an unwelcome interruption of their research'* (Deem and Brehony, 2000:157). Green and Usher (2003) suggest that these feelings could be overcome by making research training programmes an integral, assessed part of the doctoral programme. They further argue that doctoral students need to graduate as experts in their field, but also possessing a broader set of 'soft skills', which should be developed as part of the research training offered to students

but also embedded into supervisory practices. They suggest, however, that many supervisors are not equipped with these broader skills themselves and will need to be trained accordingly.

Another supervisory model, in response to changes in Higher Education, is a blended learning approach. Here, individual sessions between supervisor and student are complemented by a virtual classroom offering teleconferences and discussion groups (Morrison, 2003), thereby creating communities of practice (Wisker, Robinson and Shacham, 2007). Expansion of virtual learning environments across universities mean that online fora could be used by both departments and institutions to impart information and emotional support, thereby enhancing the learning experience (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014).

3.5. Summary

This chapter has highlighted the importance of further research into the doctoral student experience in the current climate of performativity and accountability. It has drawn attention to the fact that '*although some progress has been made, the doctoral experience still holds mysteries to be solved and dark corners to be explored'* (John and Denicolo, 2013:47). It has uncovered the fact that, despite the changing landscape of higher education, the factors affecting the doctoral experience appear to have changed very little. It remains a very isolated journey for many and a journey upon which identities form and develop. The chapter has given particular consideration to the literature surrounding the social and academic isolation experienced by many students and the role that the supervisory relationship plays in alleviating that isolation and providing opportunities (or not) for intercultural exchange and for previously marginalised voices to be heard.

Owler (2010) suggests that academics and universities can learn a lot about the ways knowledge is produced by developing an understanding of the complexities of the PhD experience. Many academics feel that academic freedom and innovation is being threatened by increased external accountability (Deuchar, 2008) and universities need to acknowledge and create space for the creative and passionate process of knowledge production by doctoral students (Owler, 2010). John and Denicolo (2013) suggest that further research is needed into the extent to which intercultural research and knowledge exchange is being achieved and which methods of achieving this are proving most effective. Despite Lee (2008:269) suggesting that the supervisory relationship for many is a *'private act between consenting adults'* and that exploration of this relationship will '*raise hackles amongst a powerful group',* this research will explore the notion of the supervisory relationship as a '*learning conversation or dialogue'* (Wisker, 2005:5) from both student and supervisor perspectives.

Having explored the issues surrounding the PhD journey in the internationalised environment of UK Higher Education, the following chapter will review the literature on the purpose of the PhD. It will also consider the nature of tourism knowledge and the role that the PhD plays in shaping that canon of knowledge.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PHD AS A VEHICLE FOR TOURISM KNOWLEDGE CREATION

4.1.   Introduction

4.2.   Background

4.3.   Education vs Training debate

4.4.   The purpose of the doctorate

4.5.   What is doctorateness?

4.6.   The current shape of tourism knowledge

4.7.   Constraints surrounding the PhD as a vehicle for tourism knowledge creation

4.7.1.   Sites of power in tourism studies

4.7.2.   Gatekeepers within academia

4.7.3.   Discourses and regimes of truth

4.8.   Summary

4.1. Introduction

Chapter 2 considered the internationalisation of Higher Education and the opportunities it offers for the exchange of cultural intellectual ideas. With the UK being recognised as a global leader in the provision of quality higher education (Kemp *et* al.,2008), UK governments have begun to recognise the value of the doctorate as an exportable commodity. International (non-EU) students form a large proportion of the full-time postgraduate researcher population in the UK and, in 2015/16, there were 32,530 international research degree students in the UK (HESA 2017). With this large number of international students and the PhD traditionally being based on making an original contribution to knowledge, doctoral education offers much potential for knowledge exchange to take place and existing orthodoxies to be challenged.

This chapter begins by examining the debates surrounding the changing nature and purpose of the PhD in the UK. It goes on to explore the shape of tourism knowledge and the constraints around the role that the PhD plays in moulding tourism knowledge. It particularly emphasises the role that discourse and power play in the knowledge production process, thereby justifying the critical language approach which informs the second stage of this study.

4.2. Background

The Doctor of Philosophy (PhD or DPhil) remains the most common form of doctorate in the UK (HESA, 2017). The candidate undertakes a supervised independent research project over a period of three to four years of full-time study or around six to eight years part-time study. Candidates are required to make an

original contribution to knowledge and this is assessed through their thesis and an oral viva. There is a minimum of two examiners and the viva is chaired by an independent chair to ensure fairness and consistency of practice, as well as compliance with assessment regulations (QAA, 2011).

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2015:3) describes a doctoral degree as *'the highest academic qualification that an institution can award following an agreed programme of study'*. It adds that a candidate must produce an output which demonstrates the research question, critically evaluates the extent to which it has been addressed and makes an original contribution to knowledge. The QAA (2011:26) adds that the PhD is an internationally recognised research qualification *'with academic institutions having a common global understanding of how the possession of a PhD represents an individual's preparedness for academic practice and/or advanced research in his/her subject specialism.'* Johnston (1997:337) highlights the global currency of the PhD, stating that *'the PhD is an important award, recognised internationally to signify high level intellectual endeavours in a specialised field of study.'*

The social and cultural benefits of having a strong postgraduate sector have been highlighted in the literature. As Smith *et al* (2010) recognise, a culture of open and intelligent debate is promoted through encouraging people to question established knowledge. This then stimulates innovation and new approaches to tackling difficult challenges. In addition, *'the international diversity of postgraduate education in the UK generates a vibrant and stimulating environment which brings together a variety of cultural knowledge, experience and insights'* (Smith et al, 2010:14*)*. Emery and Metcalfe (2009) identify one of the benefits to universities of having international

doctoral students is the contribution they make to the wider research community and the activity of the department.   In July 2014, this view was supported by Professor Alistair McEwan, head of graduate school at the University of Queensland. Speaking at the European University Associations annual meeting on doctoral education, he said that the benefits international doctoral students bring to institutions '*cannot be overestimated'*. He added that their presence offers students a '*breadth of knowledge about other cultures'* which *'is an important transferable skill that should be part of a student's employability development'* (Else, 2014).

However, having, since its inception, been regarded as an award which was mainly of value within academic life, the doctorate is increasingly recognised as a qualification which prepares people for a variety of other careers (QAA, 2015) and, with the growing national and international attention on research training, focus has once again turned to the purpose of a doctorate (Turner and McAlpine, 2011). In fact, Park (2005) states that a process of reflection regarding assumptions and expectations regarding the traditional PhD has been underway for some time.   As far back as 1998, Collinson noted that the doctorate was being reconceptualised as a training period for future researchers, rather than a piece of work which changes the course of human knowledge (Collinson, 1998 in Park, 2005). Since then, the fitness for purpose of the doctorate has been widely questioned in the UK by both students, employers, government, funding bodies and higher education institutions.

Traditionally, the PhD has been regarded as a vehicle for knowledge production and the traditional doctorate has always been regarded as evidence of having made a significant and original contribution to knowledge (Kemp *et al.,* 2009). However, as Leonard et al (2006) point out, with the increasing recognition of the importance of

research and knowledge production to a country's international economic competitiveness, the British (and Australian and New Zealand) government have made attempts to move the doctorate towards being a training for future researchers, rather than having as its main focus the production of new knowledge or individual education. With the emergence of a knowledge economy, doctoral research is, it is claimed, no longer solely the concern of universities. Government and industry are showing an increasing interest in university research and its vital role in innovation and national economic growth (Pearson and Brew, 2002). This increase in external attention has led to changing political pressures within the doctoral process, leading to policy changes over the past 20 years, such as the Harris Report of 1996 and the Roberts Review of 2002. With Higher Education being increasingly driven by market forces and a consumerist service ethic (Deuchar, 2008), the focus within the PhD is increasingly on employment outcomes and skills formation of graduates and quality of the experience – including areas such as timely completion, student satisfaction, resources and effectiveness of supervision. This is not restricted to the UK and Pearson and Brew (2002) point out that, in Australia, research education has taken on increased significance to both government and industry as research has become increasingly recognised as vital to innovation and economic growth.

Although the traditional PhD still remains the doctorate of choice for many in the UK, the external environment within which it exists is changing and Higher Education Institutions are having to adapt to these changes (Park, 2005). Interest in quality, standards and skills surrounding the doctorate deepened after the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) commissioned the Harris report in 1996. This report examined the funding methods for the postgraduate sector and reached a

variety of conclusions. However, one recommendation which can be regarded as highly relevant to the subsequent development of the UK doctorate (QAA, 2011) states: '*Institutions, in determining the nature of the courses which they provide, and the level of entry to these, need to pay particular regard to the employment opportunities that follow postgraduate study, as part of assuring the quality and standards of the provision'*. This was an early recognition of the need to prepare doctoral candidates for employment by providing them with both core research skills and personal and professional skills training. This was a demand which was further recognised and developed in the Roberts report 'SET for Success' in 2002, which concluded that more needed to be done to prepare doctoral students for careers in academia and business (Roberts, 2002). This led to the introduction of 'Roberts' funding by Research Councils UK, which was ring-fenced until 2011 to provide skills development training for doctoral candidates and early career researchers. Between 2003 and 2011-12, an estimated £20 million pounds per year was invested with the aim of providing more structured research degree programmes and greater consistency in personal and professional skills development across doctoral programmes (QAA, 2011).

4.3.   Education vs training debate

However, despite the assertions above that this increased emphasis on skills training and personal development planning in the PhD process has been effective and enhanced the student experience, there has been a long-running and ongoing debate in the UK as to whether the doctoral degree should be viewed as education or training (Hockey, 1991). Some reports evaluating the impacts of the Roberts funding in preparing doctoral candidates for future careers show that the skills they

gained during their doctoral studies helped them not only to secure jobs but to settle quickly and to begin to make valuable contributions to their employers (Vitae, 2009; Haynes, Metcalfe and Videler 2009). Emery & Metcalfe (2009) support this in asserting that universities should be pro-active in supporting personal development and training for postgraduate research students. They suggest that institutions that are providing an analysis of individual training needs, personal development planning, formal accredited courses and workshops are very effective, with this having a positive impact on the student experience.

Smith *et* al (2010) support the above findings and suggest that Higher Education Institutions need to expand on this development and ensure that transferable skills training is embedded as standard in the design of all postgraduate research programmes. The QAA (2015) however states that, whilst professional skills development programmes are core in some institutions, in the majority they are optional but strongly recommended. However, the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (2011) shows that, whilst students rate the development of research skills as important, they regard the opportunities to develop transferable skills as less important.

Whilst UK universities were already increasingly under pressure to improve completion times and supervisory processes and to provide approved research methods training for students, the increased insistence by the government that students should have training in employment related skills means the doctorate is now seen as a form of training and recognition of competence in a wider set of skills and draws attention to the changing nature of the doctorate and how the new forms of doctoral qualifications , such as Professional Doctorates, call into question the

means of demonstrating a contribution to knowledge (Kemp *et al.,* 2008). This emphasis on employment skills training appears to limit opportunities for creativity and for internationalisation and intercultural knowledge sharing to take place.

As early as 1997, Delamont *et al.* recognised the then recent policies regarding increased research training as '*part of that broader transformation in the culture of higher education in the UK'* (Delamont *et al*., 1997:320), including an emphasis on the rise of a discourse of performativity within the context of the neo-liberal and consumerist agendas (Deuchar, 2008). The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and its successor the Research Excellence Framework (REF), for example, have put increasing pressure upon academics to evidence successful PhD completions and has turned research success into a competitive sport (Tight, 2000). This research performance regime regards the production of knowledge as a competitive system which needs to be consciously managed (Green and Usher, 2003). Indeed, the pressure for timely completions has led to doubts over the body of work that can be completed within a PhD. In addition, with growing pressure over timely completion rates, it may be that some supervisors are tempted to over-direct doctoral students (Holligan, 2005). The current discussion concerning the purpose of the doctorate appears to reflect the ongoing debate regarding the PhD as education or training in that it hinges on whether the focus of the doctorate should be on the product (the thesis/contribution to knowledge) or the person (producing a highly skilled, independent researcher) (Turner and McAlpine, 2011).

4.4. The purpose of the doctorate

As noted above, recent trends have moved towards developing the person, which gives rise to another debate about the purpose of the doctorate, namely whether it's purpose is to prepare future academics, future researchers or future knowledge workers in other employment (Turner and McAlpine, 2011). As Green and Usher (2003: 48) observe, '*no longer is the creation of new knowledge the very purpose of the research process*' meaning that postgraduate education is now in the middle of a fierce contestation '*which pits the traditional values of the academy against the new values of the knowledge economy*' and presents a threat to opportunities for intercultural exchange.

In defining the term 'knowledge economy', Green and Usher (2003) state that knowledge is seen as a key input to the economy and also an increasingly significant output. Rather than defining knowledge from an epistemological stance, it is defined from an economic one. This means that knowledge production forms part of a system where it can be efficiently and effectively managed. Universities, as significant producers of knowledge, take on a new role as '*agents of economic growth*' (Green and Usher, 2003:38) or, as Tribe (2007:32) describes them, '*socially sanctioned sites of knowledge production*'.

There are clashes between the way knowledge itself has been redefined in the knowledge economy and how the academy traditionally understands knowledge (Green and Usher, 2003). Knowledge is now measured and legitimised by its performativity, recognising the significance of the different contexts in which it is produced. Gibbons *et al* (1994) suggest that there are two different modes of

knowledge – Mode 1 and Mode 2. Mode 1 knowledge production is the pure research which has been traditionally been carried out by disciplinary communities at universities and disseminated largely through the vehicle of the PhD thesis. If Mode 1 knowledge is applied, it is applied by different people from those who produced it and in a different location. Mode 2 knowledge, however, is mobile and applied to solving problems in the contemporary moment. There is no distinction between discovery and application and it is inevitably performative. Mode 2 knowledge is seen as more appropriate for the knowledge economy which, in itself, is contributing towards the change in ethos in universities towards a research performance regime. However, it is observed that Mode 2 knowledge producers need first to be trained as Mode 1 researchers, strengthening perhaps the argument for increased research training within universities (Green and Usher, 2003).

There are arguments that the traditional PhD, with a thesis as the output, is too embedded in Mode 1 and is not flexible enough for the needs of the knowledge economy. It does not produce flexible knowledge workers and is, therefore, not the best way to generate the knowledge needed for the knowledge economy or to train knowledge workers (Green and Usher, 2003). Having traditionally been an apprenticeship for a career in academia, some consider it as too narrow and specialised, with a lack of training in broad, soft skills which is one of the factors in the rise of variant forms of doctorates in recent years. Since the early 1990s, UK doctorates have diversified in response to various factors including the needs of a diverse student population, their sponsors and employers (QAA, 2015) and, in particular, the move from content to competence (Park, 2005). These 'variant' doctorates (Park, 2005), such as professional doctorates and practice-based doctorates are more structured than the PhD has traditionally been. In the past, the

PhD was acquired through independent enquiry by the candidate and based on the apprenticeship model (QAA, 2015). The newer, professional doctorates, on the other hand, have always taken a more structured approach with the inclusion of lectures and seminars. They also respond to the criticisms above and offer a form of doctoral education which brings together the academy and the workplace (Green and Usher, 2003). It should also be noted that, in recent years, in response particularly to the demand for skills training, the traditional PhD has also become more structured, particularly in the earlier years of study (QAA, 2015), with research training programmes in place. However, whichever doctoral route a candidate pursues, the underlying principle remains that a candidate's work should contribute to knowledge in the field, either through original research or through the original application of original knowledge or understanding. In addition, the intellectual achievement expected of a doctoral graduate is required to be comparable, regardless of the form of doctorate they have undertaken (QAA, 2011).

However, concerns have arisen about the academic standing of the new doctorates and a dilution of academic freedom and university autonomy with the increasingly structured approach to doctoral education. With the heavy focus on managing the production of knowledge, there are fears that creativity and originality will be quashed as there will be little place for curiosity-driven research where outcomes are not known in advance. Many academics are concerned about the effect that the increased concentration on external accountability is having on university autonomy and innovation (Deuchar, 2008).

4.5.   What is doctorateness?

Within this environment of performativity, several authors have attempted to define 'doctorateness' (Denicolo and Park, 2010:2) or the attributes that all doctoral awards and doctoral candidates should have in common. Cryer (1998) conceptualised the 'complete postgraduate' as somebody who possessed four skill sets, namely specialist skills, generalist skills, self-reliant skills and group/team skills. This approach promotes the integration of education and training as part of the PhD process, an approach echoed by Phillips and Pugh (2010:20) in their description of the attributes of the 'professional researcher'. Hockey (1991) argues that the PhD process is about more than just mastering technical research skills. He contends that the process results in the formation of a particular identity, which will be influenced by the PhD process itself but also by the aspirations which accompany it. The UK Council for Graduate Education (1997) described doctorateness as involving *'mastery of the subject; mastery of analytical breadth (where methods, techniques, contexts and data are concerned) and mastery of depth (the contribution itself, judged to be competent and original and of high quality).'*

The Researcher Development Framework, established by VITAE, a non-profit organisation which supports the professional development of researchers, contributes to the definition of doctorateness. It is endorsed by Research Councils UK, Universities UK and is a tool for planning, promoting and supporting the personal, professional and career development of researchers. It articulates the knowledge, behaviours and attitudes of researchers and encourages them to aspire to excellence through achieving higher levels of professional development. (Vitae, 2012). This framework provides a guide to the attributes expected in doctoral

students, which include knowledge, intellectual qualities and research techniques as well as personal qualities required to be an effective researcher.

Green and Usher (2003) argue that a knowledge economy requires knowledge workers. These knowledge workers require certain attributes and capabilities, known as 'human capital', which enables them to be productive within the knowledge economy. They need to be flexible and multi-skilled and open to learning. They should possess soft skills such as problem solving, leadership, team work and knowledge application. They suggest that business and government are both of the opinion that universities are not traditionally very successful at producing these skills.

Denicolo and Park (2010:2) suggest doctorateness is a *'rather elusive concept … which is a quality rather than a state or a tangible thing'*. They argue that achieving a doctoral award is not exactly the same thing as having or demonstrating doctorateness. They comment that, due to the requirement of having to create and extend knowledge, achieving a doctorate is not a simple progression from a Master's qualification. They suggest that the difficulty in defining doctorateness stems from the mix of qualities that are required of a person who possesses doctorateness. They describe these as *'intellectual quality and confidence, independence of thinking, enthusiasm and commitment, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances and opportunities'* (2010:2).

There have been various publications which have included threshold standards for research degree programmes and have been used by Higher Education institutions

as guidance and a regulatory framework. Most recently, *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* (2014) include doctoral qualification descriptors. The aim of these descriptors is to summarise the key attributes expected of a doctoral graduate and, thereby, to achieve consistency of academic standards across doctoral awards at Higher Education Institutions across the UK (QAA, 2015). This guidance is regarded as important as both universities, as research degree awarding bodies, and external examiners are given a large amount of autonomy.

Furthermore, it is argued (QAA, 2015) that the fact that all UK doctorates are assessed by a similar process (by way of thesis and viva) is evidence of equivalent standards across variant UK doctorates, as all candidates face similar intellectual challenges. It is further argued that external examining is a key feature of UK quality assurance processes. Indeed, Tinkler and Jackson (2004:104) state that '*the examination process serves as an explicit gate-keeping function and is a marker of standards'*. Examiners are chosen for their expertise in the field and their experience of the type of doctorate to be awarded (QAA, 2015). QAA (2015:6) highlights the gate keeping role held by external examiners when it states that awards are made on the basis of an output which constitutes original research '*as defined by the academic community into which the candidate wishes to be admitted.'* However, despite the acknowledgment that they serve as gatekeepers, there is little written about who chooses these examiners and how they are selected. In fact, Denicolo (2004) argues that it is not surprising that it is difficult to define explicit assessment criteria for a doctorate, as individual examiners have a different concept of what constitutes 'doctorateness'. She argues that each examiner develops his or her own list of criteria and that some of them are explicit and shared with students

and colleagues, whereas others remain implicit. This appears to suggest that examiners hold a great deal of power in the doctoral assessment process. A fact highlighted by the QAA (2011) is that a supervisor has no role in the examination of the doctoral award that he/she has supervised.

Jackson and Tinkler (2001) suggest that there are concerns over inconsistencies in the examination process across universities in the UK. With the increased focus in the UK on research skills training, there is a move away from assessing the product to assessing the process and seeking evidence of the development of an autonomous academic researcher (Park, 2005). Denicolo (2004) supports this, stating that one of the challenges facing doctoral education is the inconsistency in the way in which external examiners interpret the concept of doctorateness and, therefore, the personalised criteria against which they judge the quality of the doctoral candidate. Traditionally, doctoral assessment has focussed on the output and not the doctoral process or doctorateness that gave rise to that output. For example, Vitae (2012) list personal attributes such as enthusiasm and integrity as key to doctorateness which Denicolo and Park (2010) argue are the kinds of skills which are difficult to evidence or assess. They further argue that the challenge is to create a form of assessment which allows examiners to evaluate whether a candidate possesses an adequate level of doctorateness.

Denicolo and Park (2010) suggest that future discussions regarding quality and standards in doctoral awards must address the challenge of achieving consistency in how doctoral-level work is assessed across disciplines and institutions. At present, they suggest that *'individual examiners from different disciplines are likely to put dissimilar weight on singular elements of doctorateness in making their*

judgements and drawing their conclusions' (2010:2). This lack of consensus on what constitutes a PhD or doctorateness is challenging for home students but is even more difficult for international students who are having to adapt to a different educational system with no clear guidelines as to what they are trying to achieve. The lack of consistency also results in examiners wielding a great deal of power in deciding the type of knowledge that is considered as legitimate and the significant impact this has on the shape of the canon of knowledge is explored below.

4.6. The current shape of tourism knowledge

It appears, then, that the increased focus on performativity in Higher Education has potential implications for the role and purpose of the PhD and, in turn, international postgraduate research students. It is important to note that there are other constraints surrounding the role of the doctorate in shaping tourism knowledge and facilitating intercultural knowledge exchange. In order to explore these, it seems appropriate, at this stage, to investigate the shape of tourism knowledge at the present time. Undoubtedly, Tribe's (2006) claim that universities remain important sites of knowledge creation remains true. However, as Tribe himself points out (2007:32), universities are '*socially sanctioned sites of knowledge production'* within which existing power brokers have their power reaffirmed. In this way, it can be argued that alternative voices are marginalised, echoing Barnett's view (2003) that universities can no longer be regarded as sites of academic freedom. In order to consider these issues, it is necessary to reflect upon the factors influencing knowledge production and the influence of academic gatekeepers on the shape of tourism knowledge. In recent years, several authors have suggested that the tourism academy has been particularly reluctant to consider these issues (Riley and

Love, 2000; Hall, 2004; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Tribe, 2006; Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). Those who have reflected upon these factors have, as a precursor, made attempts to chart the expansion of tourism studies and then made observations regarding the current state of tourism knowledge (Xiao and Smith, 2006; Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan, 2007; Tribe, 2007; Ballantyne, Packer and Axelsen, 2009).

In 2000, Riley and Love noted the dominance of positivism in tourism research and, in following the growth of tourism studies, authors such as Phillimore and Goodson (2004), Pritchard and Morgan (2007) and Tribe (2007) note that positivist and quantitative research continue to dominate in tourism studies. In doing so, Pritchard and Morgan (2007) challenge the views of McKercher (2005) that the expansion of tourism studies is, in itself, evidence of a healthy, democratic research base. Instead, they describe much of the research in tourism studies as '*confirmatory and reproductive*' (2007:12). Hall, Williams and Lew (2014) note that tourism research is still governed by instrumental, business-facing research and the economic dominates the cultural. The key areas of research are, therefore, management, strategy, economy, marketing and economics. Tribe (2010:21)) highlights under-researched areas in tourism studies which he describes as 'four key silences.' The first is 'other knowledges' which he claims are overlooked as a result of a culture of ethnocentrism. The second silence is under-empowered groups, such as females, disabled and ethnic minorities. The third silence relates to power and politics within the tourism industry and the fourth silence is the more spiritual, humanistic side of tourism. These findings seem to demonstrate that previously marginalised voices remain marginalised to a large extent.

In addition, Phillimore and Goodson (2004) comment that, although within social sciences qualitative research is becoming increasingly valued, tourism scholars are more reluctant to accept it and are hesitant '*in their understanding of the philosophical and theoretical process that underpins knowledge production and practices'* (2004:4). This corroborates Botterill's view (2001) that many tourism texts do not explicitly voice their epistemology but are, in fact, heavily influenced by positivism. Botterill goes on to suggest that acceptance of positivism as the norm in tourism research is impeding the development of the field. Phillimore and Goodson (2004) appear to echo this view when they state that tourism researchers need to view qualitative research as a way of thinking and enquiring, rather than a simple set of methods and, in this way, they can '*begin to consider new ways of thinking about, and undertaking, research, and take a new look at the ways in which knowledge is produced in the field*' (2004:5).

It is acknowledged that research approaches have become more diverse (Ballantyne *et al.*, 2009) and Phillimore and Goodson (2004) build on Riley and Love's work (2000) in detailing emerging trends in qualitative tourism research. Indeed, it is argued that there has been a steady move towards a 'critical turn' in tourism studies (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson and Collins, 2005), within which attempts are being made to deconstruct the cultural politics of tourism research and '*the dominant processes involved in the so-called making of knowledge*' (Harris, Wilson, Ateljevic, 2007:41)

However, despite the recent moves towards critical reflection mentioned above, Tribe (2006) points out that Riley and Love's study (2000) and Phillimore and Goodson's update (2004) show that there has been limited engagement with

112

contemporary issues of knowledge production. In fact, in their examination of post-1996 journal articles, Phillimore and Goodson (2004:16) found that, although there is some evidence of a greater degree of reflexivity in tourism research, '*explicit examinations of researcher's embodied characteristics continue to be rare in tourism studies*'. Botterill (2001:199) shares the view that '*the assumptions that underlie social science research in tourism are seldom made explicit.*'

Hall (2004) is emphatic in his view that our embodied characteristics are vital in our research choices and findings. He claims that '*the personal subjectivities of our experiences are vital to our choice of research paths, yet typically go unacknowledged*' (2004:149). However, he also acknowledges that the personal is almost completely ignored in discussions of tourism research, a view which is supported by Tribe (2006) when he notes the importance of self in the knowledge force-field and observes that, although reflexivity is increasingly common in interpretivist research, '*the self is generally ignored (or often banished) in tourism research*' (2006:364). So, we can conclude that researchers have been reluctant to examine themselves and the philosophic assumptions which underpin tourism research and are, arguably, therefore producing a body of research which is largely non-reflexive. This presents a particular issue for international doctoral students who have the potential to bring their alternative worldviews into tourism knowledge, but may not be encouraged to be reflexive about their own experiences.

4.7. Constraints surrounding the role of the PhD as a vehicle for knowledge creation and intercultural exchange.

4.7.1. Sites of power in tourism studies

Some researchers, most notably those involved in the 'critical turn' mentioned above, have responded to Hall's (2004) accusations of a lack of reflexivity within tourism research. Authors such as Pritchard and Morgan (2007) have done so by attempting to identify factors influencing the current shape of tourism research. In this way, they, and others, have identified sites of power and gatekeepers of knowledge within tourism studies. These sites of power can be divided into external forces and power structures within universities and the tourism academy itself.

The first external influence appears to be research assessment processes and funding which are linked to the increased focus on performativity in Higher Education which was mentioned earlier. Pritchard and Morgan (2007) draw our attention to Page's (2005) suggestion that these processes curb creativity in tourism research as academics are encouraged to produce formulaic papers in order to be accepted into the process. Pritchard and Morgan (2007) expand on this suggestion by pointing out that, in the UK, tourism scholarship is generally submitted to units of research assessment in sports-related or business and management studies. This funding process has major implications for the nature of the research undertaken in tourism as both these other areas are largely dominated by positivist approaches. Indeed, the authors also note that tourism studies is often located within Schools of Business or Management within the UK, again largely dominated by positivist approaches. Tribe (2003) refers to this as the '*RAE-ification*' of tourism research and corroborates Pritchard and Morgan's view that the structure supplied by the

RAE '*exerts power on the type of tourism research carried out*' and '*performs a selector role in generating research that fits with its own structuring of knowledge*' (Tribe, 2006:374). Indeed, Hall himself raises this issue, stating that '*universities and individuals have altered their behaviours in order to attempt to maximised returns from such programmes*' (2004:147).

Another powerful influence on the shape of tourism research is the attitude of funding bodies towards the study of tourism. Tourism as a field of study is often regarded by those bodies, as well as by the media, politicians and, indeed, other academics as intellectually lightweight and therefore unworthy of support (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). Coles, Hall and Duval (2006) emphasise this point when they highlight the juxtaposition of tourism as a recognised economic activity, central to contemporary patterns of production and consumption, yet a subject which '*struggles to obtain greater institutional legitimacy in higher* education' (2006:293). Tribe (2006:372) also refers to the power of funding bodies when he asserts that '*the purpose of knowledge also exerts an important influence on what truths researchers seek*'. He suggests that the increasingly apparent commercialisation agendas of universities will lead to the commodification of research, where it is packaged to respond to the needs of the market and obtain the highest exchange value possible. He asserts that, following Habermas' (1978) theory of knowledge, research funded by the tourism industry serves a technical interest and, by necessity, concentrates on a small part of the phenomenon, usually consumer satisfaction or the planning and management of resources. In this way, it could be argued, that funded tourism research lacks the capacity to be creative or, indeed, reflexive. It is, instead, influenced by disciplines such as economics, business and

management, and, in order to be taken seriously, appears to be required to underpinned by the positivist approaches generally associated with these fields.

4.7.2. Gatekeepers within academia

In addition to these external power structures, there are significant sites of power within universities and academia itself. Tribe (2006:360) describes universities and the structures surrounding academia as '*an expensive knowledge system*' and suggests that academics, many of whom believe themselves to be '*lions in the jungle*' are, in fact, '*lions in the circus*'. Hall (2004:147) supports this view and that of Barnett (2003) when he states that '*academic freedom is a mirage*'. He further argues that *'the field of tourism studies is partly influenced by the relationships that exist within the research community, rather than depending solely on so-called objective academic merit'* (Hall 2004:143).

It appears, in fact, that universities and, therefore, disciplines such as tourism studies, are inhabited by academic cultures or '*tribes*' and these cultures and disciplinary epistemology are '*inseparably intertwined*' (Becher and Trowler, 2001:23). As far as tourism studies is concerned, it is commonly acknowledged that the dominant tribe has traditionally been comprised of mainly white, middle-class, Anglophone, male, western academics (Botterill and Gale, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). Within this tribe, there are elder statesmen who occupy positions such as professorships, membership of journal editorial boards, research committees and PhD supervisors. For example, 87.5% of tourism professors in the UK are male (Figueroa-Domecq, Pritchard, Segovia-Perez, Morgan and Villace-Molinero, 2015) and no black academics have worked in senior management in any

British university for the last three years (The Guardian, 2017). It is these largely white, middle-class, Anglophone, male, gatekeepers who make ultimate decisions about what constitutes acceptable tourism knowledge. As Pritchard and Morgan (2007) point out, within the sociology of knowledge (Spender, 1981), the importance of these gatekeepers in shaping and determining knowledge production and academic discourse has long been recognised. In effect, according to Spender (1981:186), these gatekeepers are responsible for setting the '*parameters in which individuals are encouraged to work if they wish to be at the centre of issues in their discipline*'. Becher and Trowler (2001) underline this point when they describe a gatekeeper as someone who decides whether someone is welcomed into or excluded from a particular academic community. They, therefore, suggest that the role of gatekeeper '*is a significant one in terms of the development of knowledge fields*' (2001:85).

Despite the recognition of the existence and significance of gatekeepers within other disciplines, tourism scholars have been reluctant to examine these internal power structures. Although there have been moves towards critiquing the power relations at play in the production of new tourism knowledge, they remain limited, supporting Hall's view (2004) that the tourism academy has been reluctant to examine the role that academic gatekeepers play and the influence they have on the shape of tourism knowledge. This same criticism appears to apply to the doctoral experience in tourism studies, where little attention has been focussed on the balance of power within the PhD process and this thesis will go some way towards addressing these issues.

Again, those researchers involved in the so-called 'Critical Turn' lead the limited enquiry into these issues of power relating to gatekeepers in tourism studies. Pritchard and Morgan (2007, 2017) take a detailed look at the composition of editorial boards of leading tourism journals and the tourism professoriate. They focus mainly on the issue of gender and conclude that these boards have a patriarchal structure which resembles the priesthood. They go on to reveal the exclusivity and self-selecting nature of the gatekeeper community on editorial boards and suggest that this is a characteristic which penetrates the tourism academic community as a whole. Tribe (2006) identifies gatekeepers as, amongst others, those who hold chairs, editorships, seats on research assessment and grant bodies and positions on the executives of learned and professional associations He describes them as elders '*whose headdresses are adorned with feathers of esteem*' (2006:372). Coles *et al* (2006:304) employ another metaphor, depicting journal editors and referees as *'sentinels demarcating and watching over the proper extent of disciplinary boundaries'*.

In their examination of journal editorial boards, Pritchard and Morgan (2007) go on to describe the dominance of Western Anglocentric epistemic research traditions within the academy's gatekeepers. They draw our attention to the work of authors such as Pechlander *et al.* (2004) and Jogaratnam *et al.* (2005), who have demonstrated that journal output continues to be dominated by English-speaking scholars in the UK, USA, Canada and Australia. Pritchard and Morgan bring to light the fact that, in contrast to the gender imbalance, attention has been drawn to this imbalance in the geographical distribution of journal gatekeepers. However, they also note that few have questioned what it means for tourism scholarship, with the exception of Hall *et al.* (2014:10) who say of tourism research '*unless [its] …voice*

can be spoken in English, it is likely not to be heard.' It is, perhaps, particularly significant that researchers such as those above should be addressing Hall's (2004) accusation that tourism scholars are reluctant to examine the power wielded by gatekeepers in the legitimisation of tourism knowledge as many of the researchers mentioned are, themselves, on editorial boards of leading journals. Does this self-examination and recognition of exclusivity suggest that the tide is slowly beginning to turn? Is it a true foray into reflexivity or just a momentary diversion?

Whereas much of the existing literature within tourism studies focuses on the power held by the gatekeepers of journals and research funding bodies, little has been written about the gatekeeping role of PhD supervisors and the influence they have in shaping the research decisions made by doctoral students who, arguably, offer a great deal of hope to those who are calling for a re-shaping of the academy, whereby it would welcome previously marginalised voices and, more importantly, allow them to be heard. In highlighting signs of academic renewal within tourism studies, Pritchard and Morgan (2007) suggest that tourism has matured as a field of enquiry and has moved, to some extent, away from being an applied business field towards more critical and interpretive modes of enquiry. However, they maintain that there is still some distance to travel before groups who are foregrounding these alternative modes of enquiry are able to '*truly decentre the tourism academy and secure a paradigmatic shift in tourism scholarship and theory'* (2007:11).

With the doctoral student community dominated by international, non-EU students, it seems that it offers potential for foregrounding alternative modes of enquiry and challenging the traditional knowledge creation within tourism studies. As stated above, these international PhD students bring, for some, the hope that we will see

a radical reform of the orthodoxy of tourism knowledge by allowing previously silent voices to contribute to creating a 'new' tourism knowledge, which includes a more *'diverse situatedness'* (Botterill & Gale, 2005:5). Indeed Pritchard & Morgan (2007:23) challenge today's academic gatekeepers to *'listen more closely to the voices of the second generation and to those currently marginalized and underrepresented groups'* in the community of tourism studies. They argue that we must be willing to learn from every *'knowledge tradition'* if we are to have a conceptualisation of tourism which *'embraces multiple worldviews and cultural differences'*. Harris, Wilson and Ateljevic (2007:44) join in this new, critical movement by highlighting the *'entanglements'* of research, which they describe as the *'forces that influence, constrain and shape the act of reproducing knowledge within academic structures.'* However, despite claims that '*academic decolonization is a necessity and a responsibility'* (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007:22), there is little evidence in the literature of any real shifts in doctoral work in terms of subjects, epistemologies or methodologies chosen or the extent to which doctoral students are encouraged to be reflexive and explicit about their embodied characteristics and the extent to which they influence their research approaches (Hall, 2004).

4.7.3. Discourses and regimes of truth

Following Foucault (1971, 1980) it can be argued that this lack of development in doctoral work is a consequence of the discourses and regimes of truth which dominate the tourism academy. Consequently, the tourism academy works within certain regimes of truth or discursive practices which determine which behaviours are regarded as acceptable. These regimes of truth are self-perpetuating and are overseen and monitored by the gatekeepers. It is argued that only by examining

them can we change them (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007; Tribe, 2007). Hall has begun this examination and draws our attention to the existence of powerful barriers to reflexivity, alternative approaches and, ultimately, creativity:

> *I also wish the graduate students I supervise and advise to be more reflexive in their own work, as I think it is a very important and valuable part of the research process. Yet taking such positions or making personal value statements in their dissertations may also upset some examiners if they do not support the inclusions of reflexive statements. This therefore affects not only the choice of examiners but also the final composition of the student work' (Hall 2004:148)*

There is a considerable body of extant literature which recognises the role of discourse in knowledge creation (Foucault, 1980; Burr, 2015). There is then a smaller but significant body of literature which applies these poststructuralist theories regarding language to the academic world. Koehne (2005), for example, writes about discourse and the construction of knowledge within western academies. Barron and Zeegers (2006) reflect upon discursive practices in western postgraduate studies and, in particular, in interactions with international students. Several authors, such as Koehne (2004) and Ryan & Carroll (2005), explore the discourse of deficit which appears to surround international students in UK higher education. As was seen in Chapter 2, there is also a consensus in the literature that the prevailing discourse surrounding the internationalisation of higher education is an economic one (Leask, 2005) and there is much discussion regarding the negative effects of this dominant discourse on the student and staff experience.

Authors such as Koehne (2004), Leask (2005) and Barron and Zeegers (2006) frame their discussion within poststructuralist theories and, following Foucault (1973, 1980), introduce into the discussion of international education such concepts as discursive practice, subjectivities, silences and resistance (Barron and Zeegers

2006). Foucault (1980) suggests that there are 'regimes of truth', or discourses, that a society accept as true and allow it to function. These discourses '*organise our perceptions, our ways of knowing, making some things visible and others invisible, some things true and others false*' (Barron and Zeegers 2006:78). The relationship between discourses and power is, consequently, very strong and discourses play a key role in legitimising knowledge.

Koehne (2004) examines international students and international education through this framework of discourse and discursive practices and focuses in particular on the discourse of power and knowledge inside western academies. She examines power relations within ways of constructing knowledge and attempts to deconstruct concepts regarding internationalisation that are taken for granted. Her discussion is based upon the postmodernist view that it is possible to analyse complex human interactions by examining the discourses in which the interaction is located. Many aspects of western education are taken for granted, such as teaching, assessment packages and the cultural imperialism of the English language (Marginson, 2002) and, as Koehne (2004:3) argues:

> *When ways of acting, of constructing and assessing knowledge are taken for granted then alternative ways of constructing knowledge are viewed as of less value, somehow deficient, perhaps even subversive, and persons speaking this alternative knowledge may not be heard or given a voice.*

It can be argued, then, that alternative voices are often marginalised in the academic world (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007) because they are regarded as 'other' and international students have often been positioned within a discourse of deficiency (Koehne, 2004; Ryan and Carroll, 2005), where they need help to adjust, adapt and

be assimilated and they are, therefore, positioned as Other and suffer from a loss of voice. Koehne (2004) argues that, by positioning academic students within this discourse of deficiency, stereotypes are constantly *'invented and reinvented'* in academic literature and western universities are able to maintain a discourse of power, exclusion and dominance.

A more optimistic view of the discourses surrounding international students is taken by authors such as Barron and Zeegers (2006), who suggest that the discourses of research degrees have central players, including educational policy makers, and those who are marginal, including international research degree students. They examine the normalising processes that arise during the PhD process and argue that these normalised discursive practices have the power to sustain the social world but, also, that there is an opportunity for students to bring about change by challenging and resisting these hegemonic discourses and allowing the emergence of new, hitherto marginalised, discourses. This follows Foucault's view of knowledge which sees power as an effect of discourse. Burr (2015) supports Barron and Zeegers (2006), arguing that there are a number of discourses surrounding every event and, therefore, a number of different courses of action are available. This means that the dominant discourse is always subject to resistance and can be contested. Theoretically, this means that a PhD student with a different discourse to the dominant one (of UK academia or his supervisor) is able to challenge or resist the prevailing discourse. This view of power as a productive force of knowledge (Burr, 2015) appears, to some extent, to echo the views of some scholars of tourism studies (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2004) that previously marginalised voices in tourism, such as international doctoral students, now have an opportunity to be heard. If one follows the more ideological interpretations of internationalisation and

focuses on the positive aspects such as exchange of ideas and broadening of horizons of all students, international students begin to be positioned in a much more positive way, as *'individuals who have something to contribute to the university'* (Koehne, 2004:13). However, as we saw earlier in the discussion of the literature surrounding internationalisation, the key to this happening is the degree to which it is facilitated by the university and the supervisor, again underlining the power of the current hierarchies in UK Higher Education.

Furthermore, Foucault's (1971) concept of disciplinary power is particularly interesting when applied to international students. Foucault (1971) argues that individuals are products of the powerful discourses or knowledges that prevail within society. If we apply this theory to international doctoral students, we begin to understand the complexities of their situation as students and, importantly, as producers of knowledge. Are they more influenced by the prevailing discourses of the society in which they were born, raised and thus far educated or are they influenced by the more immediate dominant discourse of the UK Higher Education system in which they are now embroiled? If they acknowledge their embodied characteristics, or members' resources (MR), as they are described in critical language study, they would inevitably have a different view of their research from that of their supervisors or examiners. Following Foucault, by challenging the views of their supervisors (the prevailing discourse), they would be able to produce new knowledge. However, this research questions whether they would feel able to do that for various reasons, notably their position with their academic tribe, their language ability and their awareness of the rules of the game. Becher's notion of tribes resonates with Foucault's concept of disciplinary power *'in which people are disciplined and controlled by freely subjecting themselves to the scrutiny of others*

(especially 'experts') and to their own self-scrutiny' (Burr, 2015:68). This process of disciplinary power appears to pertain to the university system, where doctoral students are continually subjected to the scrutiny of, firstly, their supervisors, who may well encourage them to scrutinise themselves, but always within the framework of the dominant discourse, and then to the scrutiny of internal and external examiners. Later, they are likely to freely subject themselves to the scrutiny of other gatekeepers (or 'experts') in tourism studies, such as journal editors, research assessment panellists and funding bodies.

However, Foucault's thesis of power and resistance (1971) appears bleak regarding the reality of these challenges of the hegemonic discourses taking place or being successful. Applied to doctoral students, he would seem to suggest that the normalising process would bring about a situation where their perceptions of what is possible are limited and they would be unlikely to challenge the status quo. This study explores the ability of international PhD students to resist existing hegemonic discourses and give voice to their own alternative methodologies and worldviews. It examines the difficulties inherent in escaping the power of these dominant discourses when the priority of the student is to obtain a PhD within a specified timeframe. It also considers the willingness or capacity of supervisors and institutions to provide a supportive environment to allow space for dominant discourses in knowledge creation to be challenged.

As far as tourism studies is concerned, there have been few attempts to apply understandings of discourses and discursive practices to tourism higher education. Ayikoru *et al* (2009) have applied poststructuralist discourse theory in the field, but their study focussed on the ideological influences present in tourism higher

education in England, through an examination of written texts. Tribe (2006), in an earlier article, emphasised the important role of critical theory in exposing the power of ideology present in tourism research. However, he also highlighted the fact that little tourism research actually foregrounds ideology and asserted that the existing body of tourism knowledge depends on the power of *'those who speak for tourism'*. He also suggested that *'permission to narrate may be denied to peripheral groups and there are many gaps and silences in research'* (Tribe, 2006:376). His final recommendation was that tourism researchers should '*seek to speak truth of power and facilitate the speech of the powerless.*' Hall *et al's (*2014) review of tourism research hot spots suggests that this is not yet happening and that there is still a very narrow focus of study and little philosophical advancement. This thesis seeks to respond to Tribe's call to speak truth of power within UK academia and to give voice to the powerless.

Foucault's concept of archaeology of knowledge encourages us to trace the origins of current ways of understanding ourselves and to begin to question their legitimacy and resist them (Burr, 2015). Like critical tourism scholars (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007; Ateljevic *et al.*, 2007), he aimed, in this way, to foreground discourses which had previously been marginalised. This call to examine our ways of seeing also reflects best practice in teaching international students (Carroll and Ryan, 2007). However, as Hall (2004) has acknowledged, tourism academics are traditionally reluctant to engage in reflexivity and self-examination in terms of their research practices and I will investigate whether this is also the case in relation to their supervision practices. This reluctance may be partially explained by Foucault's (1976:86) claim that *'power is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms.'*

Foucault argues that statements can only be examined within their historical context and this constitutes discursive formation. The meaning of a statement, therefore, depends upon the general rules which characterise the discursive formation to which it belongs. This brings us to the concepts of normalisation and marginalisation. Discursive formations are governed by a system of rules and, therefore, dominant discursive formations become accepted as the norm and determine individuals' boundaries of thought in a given domain within a given time period – as discursive formations only exist in their own epoch. Barron and Zeegers (2006) argue that individuals learn the discursive practices of a society and, then, consciously or unconsciously, position themselves within those practices in multiple ways, thereby constructing themselves within the discourses available to them. They also suggest though that, as meaning is always in flux, the positions available to individuals are always changing too. An international student, for example, may occupy multiple positions within society at any one time and adopt various discursive practices available in those positions.

Foucault observes that a central element of our society is the normalising judgement and states that:

> *The judges of normality are everywhere. We are in the society of the teacher-judge, the doctor-judge, the educator-judge, the social worker-judge; it is on them that the universal reign of the normative is based; and each individual, wherever he may find himself, subjects to it his body, his gestures, his behaviour, his aptitudes, his achievements.*
> [Quoted in Owen,1994:181].

Barron & Zeegers (2006:79) argue that normalisation is a technique which leads to marginalised groups taking up hegemonic discourses and that these discourses are

not only imposed upon us by restrictions but that they '*seduce, manipulate and encourage normalisation*.' In the same way, gatekeepers of tourism knowledge, such as journal editors, have rigid practices and demands which are not conducive to giving voice to these previously marginalised groups. Hall (2004:142) refers to these partially hidden mechanisms of power in tourism studies when he states that:

> *Under the rubric of convention and style, academic institutions and the culture of academia have therefore greatly influenced what is acceptable or unacceptable in being represented as tourism knowledge.*

It could be argued that (international) PhD students constitute a marginal group who, in an attempt to gain validation from their supervisors, examiners or journal editors, draw upon suitable discourses, rather than discourses which may be more familiar or comfortable for them. Potter and Wetherell (1987) suggest that full understanding of a piece of text or speech requires an understanding of the social and political context in which it is constructed. They also argue that people in linguistic communities have certain linguistic devices or '*toolkit of resources*' (Burr, 2015:117) at their disposal, to use for their own purposes. Interestingly, Burr (2015:118) emphasises that these repertoires do not belong to individual people but are, instead a social resource which are available to '*all who share a language and culture, and are seen as a tool-kit from which people can assemble accounts for their own purposes'*. What is of interest in this concept in regard to this study is that it is arguable that international PhD students in particular, do not share a language and culture with their supervisors and have had to learn the language and culture of the PhD from this dominant tribe. They are, therefore, doubly disadvantaged and have at their disposal only the linguistic tool kit that has been taught to them by the

prevailing tribe. I would suggest that this, in turn, could lead to a lack of creativity and frustration on the part of the student.

It appears, then, that little attempt has been made to examine the discursive practices and the role of language and power surrounding the PhD process in tourism studies. This is somewhat surprising when one considers the number of international PhD students in tourism for whom English is not a mother tongue and who often use overseas case studies and create knowledge which needs to be transported, translated and interpreted overseas, in addition to being favourably received by their examiners in the UK. All of these factors seem to indicate that language is overtly significant in the PhD experience, before one considers issues of hidden power relations within academic tribes and accusations of a lack of reflexivity and acknowledgement of personal subjectivities in tourism research (Hall, 2004). In response to Tribe's (2006) emphasis on the important role of critical theory in exposing the power of ideology present in tourism research, this study is informed by a critical language approach. This perspective is further explained in Chapter 5 but draws on other significant social theories and assumes a social constructionist view of knowledge as *'a particular construction or version of a phenomenon that has received the stamp of 'truth' in our society'* (Burr, 2015:64).

4.8.   Summary

This chapter has considered the role of the PhD in shaping tourism knowledge. It began by exploring the changing nature of the PhD in UK Higher Education, with the increased focus on performativity and training for future researchers. It explored the debate in the literature regarding the purpose of the PhD as education or

training. In other words, whether it is a training ground for future researchers or the production of a piece of work which changes the course of human knowledge (Collinson, 1998 in Park, 2005). Having investigated the impact that this debate has on the role of the PhD in shaping tourism knowledge and facilitating intercultural knowledge exchange, it went on to explore other factors such as external sites of power, gatekeepers within academia and the role of language and discourse in shaping both knowledge creation and, in particular, the PhD process. Having examined the role of the PhD, the following chapter will discuss the research approach taken within my study.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE RESEARCH APPROACH

The research approach

5.1.   Introduction

5.2.   Theoretical position of the study

5.3.   Naturalistic inquiry and emergent design

5.4.   A critical approach

5.5.   Autoethnography

5.6.   Positionality, reflexivity and writer voice

Methods

5.7.   A bricolage approach

5.8.   Sampling

5.9.   Exploratory interviews (Phase One)

5.10.   In-depth interviews (Phase Two)

5.11.   Quality and credibility

5.12.   Ethical responsibility

5.13.   Summary

5.1. Introduction

This thesis considers in part how and what we know about the PhD process, a critical intervention in the augmentation of tourism's knowledge canon. Equally, our understandings of tourism knowledge are framed by the research approaches that govern and dictate our individual practices. This chapter considers the epistemological and methodological perspectives or the 'net' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:13) which frames my research. It explains how social constructionism has informed my approach and how, as the research developed, the appropriateness of the perspective of critical language study became apparent. The chapter outlines how my theoretical perspective has influenced the choice of methods and the recognition of my own position within the study. It justifies the use of semi-structured interviews and provides detail of the sample involved in both phases of interviews. The latter part of the chapter considers issues of quality, credibility and ethical responsibility within my research.

5.2. Theoretical position of the study

Reference has been made in previous chapters to the fact that the international postgraduate research student experience is underrepresented in existing literature. In addition, much of the existing research is based on large-scale, quantitative studies, usually focussing on the economic aspects of recruitment and retention (Leonard *et al*., 2003). It has also been noted there have been very few qualitative studies that give voice to postgraduate research students, both home and international, regarding perceptions of internationalisation (Bilecen, 2013). In addition, positivist discourses continue to be the authoritative voice in much tourism

research (Ateljevic *et al.*,2007) and, as Phillimore and Goodson (2004:193) remind us, the focus in tourism research tends to be on the research outcome, rather than the process. They argue that we should share knowledge about *'the kind of struggles'* that arise during the research process and my research approach was intended to highlight both my own struggles and those of my fellow PhD students.

Unlike many previous studies in which students have been the subject of the study and the research has been carried out on them, this thesis aims to carry out the research with them. It acknowledges issues of power within academic sites and processes which are rarely subjected to scrutiny and recognises the opportunities provided by critical tourism research to use qualitative techniques to provide deeper understandings of the subjective, individualised experiences of PhD students, both home and international and, indeed, their supervisors. Indeed, following the work of Aitchison (2001), Hollinshead (2007) and Morgan and Prichard (2007), my study demonstrates a strong critical influence. It recognises the power held by knowledge power brokers and probes *'the deeply entrenched and systematised privileging of knowledge that can benefit some groups at the expense of others'* (Tribe, 2007:32). The study takes the view that each student is on an individual journey and that there is no 'truth' waiting to be discovered. Unlike reality oriented enquiry, it is based on the belief that multiple realties exist in a world which is socially constructed.

Both Tribe (2006) and Hall (2004) note that the personal is almost completely ignored in discussions of tourism research. However, in taking the view that the world is socially constructed, I feel it is important to explain the lens through which I, the researcher, view the world, as *'an open mind is good but an empty head is impossible'* (Fleming, 2017, personal communication). In Chapter One, I reflected

upon my own multiples selves and the entanglements that influence the way I view the world and this particular piece of research. I acknowledge that *'making knowledge claims is not a neutral activity, conducted by a disinterested researcher, for all such claims require justification, a task that falls under epistemology'* (Jamal and Everett, 2007:58). I, therefore, bring my own perspective to the enquiry and to the interpretation of the findings and *'all of what I am affects the problems I see and the power dynamics I experience as a researcher'* (Swain, 2004:102). Following Denzin and Lincoln (2003:18), I acknowledge that I approach the world with a set of ideas and a framework (theory or ontology) which leads to a set of questions (epistemology) which I have examined in specific ways (methodology, analysis).

The epistemological stance taken by this study, therefore, is that of social constructionism where '*epistemology cannot be distinguished from ontology since what is to be known and how it is known is a social construction'* (Small, 2004:256). It rests on the belief that meaning is constructed and not discovered (Gray, 2014) and that human beings interpret and construct reality, meaning that the world of human perception is not real in an absolute sense, but is shaped by cultural and linguistic constructs of humans (Patton, 2015). In other words, *'society is to be seen as socially constructed on the basis of how its members make sense of it and not seen as an object'* (Walsh, 2001:218). In this way, people have different perceptions of the same process and each of these perceptions is experienced as real and worthy of study. This also has implications for how we 'measure' what is found, challenging positivist discourses of objectivity, truth, transferability and generalisability. Hence, this study attempts to encapsulate the multiple realities of students and supervisors in the PhD process and examine the implications of these different perceptions on the process, without judging which is more 'true' or 'real'.

(Patton, 2015:98). As is discussed later in the chapter, a critical perspective is embedded in the work, by giving added weight to the perspectives of doctoral students and thereby attempting to give voice to those who appear less empowered within the process (Weiss and Greene, 1992:145).

Social constructionists contend that context is essential to the understanding of phenomena and that findings from one context cannot be generalised to another (Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Hence, this study takes a holistic approach to exploring the PhD process and does not attempt to generalise its findings. Postmodernist thinking asserts that language plays a vital role in constructing meaning and reality in that daily interactions between people is where our shared versions of knowledge are constructed. Therefore, *'social interactions of all kinds, and particularly language, is of great interest to social constructionists'* (Burr, 2015:4). Language is inevitably based upon and embedded in the culture and worldviews of the social group which developed, or constructed, it and, therefore, does not *'provide a direct window through which one can view reality'* (Patton, 2015:100). It is from this standpoint that this study explores the importance of language in the construction of tourism knowledge and, draws upon the perspective of critical language study which is further considered in later in this chapter.

Social constructionists argue that language is constantly changing and varied in its meanings. As perceptions of reality are socially constructed and embedded within cultures, those in power at any time and in any place, will exercise their control over the language to put forward dominant views which best serve their interests (Burr, 2015). Language, therefore, privileges some at the expense of others, including or excluding groups quite dramatically at times. In deconstructing the language of

texts, we can identify the inherent assumptions and interests being served. This study does not take the radical position of *'absolutely no reality ever'* but rather the milder position of capturing and honouring *'different perspectives about reality'* (Patton 2015:101).

This study follows the basic tenets of social constructionism and the contribution it can make to qualitative research, as stated by Patton (2015:102):

> *The emphasis on capturing and honoring multiple perspectives; attending to the ways in which language as a social and cultural construction shapes, distorts, and structures understandings; how methods determine findings; and the importance of thinking about the relationship between the investigator and the investigated, especially the effects of inequitable power dynamics – and how that relationship affects what is found.*

As stated above, rather than adopting a positivist approach and attempting in any way to measure some kind of external 'truth', this study acknowledged that *'all research is interpretive; it is guided by the researcher's set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied'* (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005:22). I, therefore, adopted an interpretivist approach, where the *'central endeavour is … to understand the subjective world of human experience'* (Cohen, Manion and Robinson, 1994:36). The theoretical perspective of interpretivism *sees the world as 'too complex to be reduced to a set of observable 'laws'* (Gray, 2004:31) and attempts to understand naturally occurring phenomena in their naturally occurring states (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Using qualitative approaches, I attempted to look for *'culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world'* (Crotty, 1998:67) of the students and supervisors involved. Acknowledging that '*the complex social world can be*

understood only from the point of view of those who operate within it' (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004:35), the study sought to see the world from the point of view of the researched and placed a reliance on the people being observed to explain their behaviour (Veal, 2011). I have accepted that human experience is complex and have not tried to impose any kind of order by apply '*one size fits all'* theories (Somekh and Lewin, 2011:3). To this end, I have allowed the *'voice of the participant to be heard with the least interference to portray his/her experiences of reality'* (Pernecky, 2007:223).

5.3.   Naturalistic Inquiry & emergent design

This study draws upon naturalistic or *'discovery-oriented'* (Guba, 1978) inquiry, in the sense that it took place in a real-world setting and without the researcher placing any prior constraints on what the outcomes of the research would be (Patton, 2015). The naturalistic paradigm acknowledges that there are multiple constructed realities, meaning that outcomes cannot be predicted or controlled but that a certain level of understanding can be achieved (Guba, 1985). Rather than drawing generalisations, this study aims to develop a body of knowledge which describes individual cases, from which some inferences can be made (Gray, 2013). It is based on the premise that, in our complex and diverse world, phenomena can only be understood within their own environment (Lincoln 1985), as *'all participants, including the researcher, are steeped in their cultural and social context and this context influences their beliefs and behaviours'* (Holloway and Brown, 2016:19). For that reason, it was important that all interviews took place in locations and under conditions that respondents were comfortable with (Patton 2015).

The belief that there are multiple, constructed realities means that research designs are not pre-specified but *'emerge, unroll, cascade, or unfold during the research process'* (Lincoln 1985:142). An inductive approach allows issues to emerge from the cases under study *'without presupposing in advance what the important dimensions will be'* (Patton, 2015:56). In line with this way of thinking, while the research design had an initial focus and guiding questions for the interviews, it was an inductive process, with the design emerging as the fieldwork unfolded. This allowed me to understand the multiple interrelationships among issues which emerged from the data collection, without making any prior assumptions regarding these. For example, during phase one of the fieldwork, themes emerged in interviews which had not been anticipated prior to the process commencing and these themes were then incorporated into later interviews. In addition, having completed phase one of semi-structured interviews, it emerged that other perspectives, such as critical language study and discourse analysis would be a more insightful approach to the second phase of research. Perhaps, most importantly, at the end of the study, I was able to confirm that *'inquiry into the multiple constructed realities that exist raises more questions than it answers'* (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:143).

Tourism scholars in general have been *'hesitant in their adoption and acceptance of qualitative research'* (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004:4). This study, however, aims to '*make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them'* (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011:3) and, therefore, adopts a qualitative approach which, according to Patton (2015:27) provides the researcher with an opportunity to *'map experiences'*, not only those of others but also our own. A qualitative approach allows us to collect a great deal of 'rich' meaningful information

about a relatively small number of people (Veal, 2011) and relies on studying things *'in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them'* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005:3)

Qualitative research is based on the belief that the people who are involved in a situation are '*best placed to describe and explain their experiences of feelings in their own words that they should be allowed to speak without the intermediary of the researcher*' (Veal, 2011:193). Patton (2015:28) agrees, stressing that the nature of qualitative inquiry is '*fundamentally people-oriented*'. Qualitative data '*capture and communicate someone else's experience of the world in his or her own words*' (Patton, 2015:47) and enable the reader to understand what it was like to have been in a certain place at a certain time. Qualitative research, then, seemed the obvious choice to make '*visible the multiple voices*' of students and supervisors (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004:10) in this study.

5.4. A Critical approach

Whilst a naturalistic approach was taken within this study in order to portray participants' lived experiences, this study also seeks, in line with *'hopeful tourism'* to *'disrupt the hegemony of the field's intellectually western research traditions and emphasise multiple relations, ways of being and traditions of seeing and doing'* (Ateljevic, Morgan and Pritchard, 2013:6). The intention of the research was to understand the factors influencing the PhD journey and the role of doctoral students in contributing to the body of tourism knowledge and challenging the existing orthodoxies which exist within that body of knowledge. The review of the literature demonstrated that international students are subjected to a discourse of deficit and

that various factors are inhibiting the exchange and acceptance of multiple worldviews and cultural difference within tourism studies and that *'those in powerful and privileged positions rarely give up power and privilege voluntarily'* (Aitchison, 2001:17). This study, therefore, adopts a critical perspective, which includes an effort to change the discourse of tourism and to challenge mainstream approaches (Mair, 2013). This form of critical thinking calls for *'an unrelenting examination of any form of knowledge and the knowledge creation process to recognise the existence (or non-existence) of the use and power that supports it' (*Sheldon *et al.,* 2013:83). Humberstone (2004:122) states that tourism research needs to '*engage with issues around the nature of knowledge and its production'* and, through a critical approach, this study sought to do this.

As highlighted earlier in this chapter, language has a key role in social constructionism with the belief that our selves are constructed through our linguistic exchanges with others (Burr, 2015). This poststructuralist view of language concludes that talk, writing and social encounters are *'sites of struggle and conflict where power relations are acted out and contested'* (Burr, 2015:41). As issues of power and language emerged during Phase One of my research, in line with the naturalistic, emergent design of the study, it seemed apt to use critical language study or awareness (Fairclough, 2014) to inform Phase Two of my research.

Critical language study or awareness is an approach to language or an *'alternative orientation to language study'* put forward by Norman Fairclough (2001:10). The approach builds on work in critical linguistics and French discourse analysis (Foucault, 1976) and focuses on an awareness of discourse as part of a wider

process of social change. Rather than being a branch of language study, it is an orientation towards language (Fairclough, 2014). It places the social study of language at the core of language study and thereby seeks to increase consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of certain people by others, in the belief that consciousness is the first step towards emancipation (Fairclough, 2001). Critical language study differs from traditional linguistics and sociolinguistics in that, whereas they attempt to *describe* prevailing sociolinguistic conventions in terms of how they distribute power unequally, critical language study sets out to *explain* existing conventions as the outcome of power relations and struggles for power (Fairclough, 2001). Critical language awareness focuses upon the linguistic elements of a social interaction and aims to show up connections between, for example, language power and ideology, which may be hidden from people. In doing so, critical language study focuses on the common-sense assumptions, or ideologies, which are implicit in linguistic conventions but which people are very often not aware of. Fairclough argues that language is the most common form of social behaviour and an area where we rely heavily on ideologies. Despite this, he points out that *'the concept of 'ideology' has very rarely figured in discussions of language and power within linguistics which is itself symptomatic of their limitations'* (Fairclough, 2001:2). Tribe (2006) also identified the limitations of tourism studies in this regard when he noted that Botterill et al's (2002) survey of doctoral theses suggests that ideology is rarely foregrounded in tourism research. As Fairclough (2001) points out, social theorists such as Bordieu, Foucault and Habermas recognised the fact that we live in a linguistic epoch, which is reflected in the importance they accorded to language in their social theories. Foucault (1980), for example, argues that society and institutions have discourses and regimes of truth that give rise to discursive practices that determine which behaviours are

regarded as acceptable. These discourses organise our ways of knowing (Barron and Zeegers, 2006), meaning that the relationship between language and power is strong and these discourses play a major role in validating knowledge. We regularly see these discursive practices within academia, yet as a tourism collective we have been reluctant to discuss or challenge the conventions by which we live our academic lives and the discursive knowledge frameworks which shape them. Fairclough (2001) also argues that, if one accepts the existence of ideology or accepted conventions in language, the ideological nature of language should be one of the major themes of modern social science. In fact, he goes further and adds that *'nobody who has an interest in relationships of power in modern society can afford to ignore language'* (Fairclough, 2001:3). As mentioned above, there have been many significant contributions to social theory which emphasise the role of language and power in contemporary society and, as we shall see below, critical language study draws on many of these. However, crucially, their limitation in comparison to critical language study is that they remain theoretical and are rarely operationalised in the analysis of discourse.

Critical language study, then, offers possibilities in terms of increasing awareness of how language can contribute to the domination of some people by others. In the case of my research, through maintaining a critical awareness of language, it is possible to expose, and help people to recognise, the extent to which their language is based upon common-sense assumptions and, in turn, how these common-sense assumptions may be shaped by relations of power. In this regard, critical language study offers an alternative framework for encouraging the self-reflection and explicitness which has been called for in the literature surrounding both tourism knowledge creation and the teaching of international students (Hall, 2004; Carroll

and Ryan, 2005). It offers a new insight into issues raised in extant literature regarding the mismatch in expectations, communication difficulties and the powerful role of supervisors and gatekeepers in the PhD process.

Critical language study is an approach to language which analyses social interactions by focusing on their linguistic elements but, unlike mainstream linguistics, seeks to highlight their hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, in addition to any hidden effects they may have on that system. It draws from sociolinguistics to the extent that it is based on the premise that language practice is socially constituted and, therefore, beset with inequalities of power. Fairclough (2001) acknowledges the similarities between discourse or conversation analysis and critical language study, in that both focus on formal aspects of a text or conversation. However, he points that a distinction exists between critical language study and discourse analysis, namely that there has been a resistance by conversation analysts, for example, to make the connections between the micro-structures of conversation and the macro-structures of social institutions and societies. My research acknowledges that conversations between, for example, students and their supervisors do not take place in a social vacuum. Rather, they are part of a much wider social phenomenon, namely academia and its discursive knowledge frameworks, practices, process and tribes and UK, if not western, society. Another important feature of critical language study is the assertion that discourse is comprised of three parts: the process of production of a text, the text itself and the process of interpretation of the text. Fairclough (2001) argues that the process of interpretation is crucial and is an active process which is not uniform but is influenced by what he refers to as 'members' resources' or MR. These MR are representations which are stored in the long-term memory, some are

linguistic and some are not, but they are all sociologically determined and ideologically shaped. This, he suggests, is often hidden by the fact that they appear to some as common-sense assumptions, which are routinely resorted to in discourse, thereby acting as a powerful mechanism for sustaining prevailing relations of power which underlie them. He further argues that comprehension is a combination of the words being spoken or written and MR of both the producer and the interpreter of the words.

This study is, therefore, founded on the principles of critical language study and discursive analysis, utilising the underlying premises to explore the interactions which shape the PhD process for PhD students and supervisors alike. It does not, however, undertake a linguistic analysis as would be found in a thesis based in the discipline of sociolinguistics. Rather, it demonstrates a critical awareness of discourse and recognises the role of language in establishing and maintaining power relations and uses this theoretical perspective to inform the second phase of research and analysis.

5.5.   Autoethnography

As mentioned previously, within my study, there was an underlying awareness of how my values and worldviews were affecting my approach to the research. In fact, at the very heart of the work were questions which explored the influence of my participants' values and cultural backgrounds on their work. If I go back to my own position within my research, although I sit between two cultures – the research student culture and the 'lecturer' culture – my dominant self during the research process was the 'PhD student self'. Therefore, far from exploring the

culture of an 'other', when interviewing other doctoral students, I was, in fact, very much studying the culture of my own group or people like me. It, thus, seemed appropriate, particularly during the second, more in-depth phase of the study, to adopt an autoethnographic style, in which I considered my own experiences in the same way I had asked my participants to consider theirs. Ellis and Bochner (2000:740) term this as 'reflexive ethnography' and Goodall (2000:9) describes this 'new ethnography' as *creative narratives shaped out of a writer's personal experiences within a culture and addressed to academic and public audiences.'* Having included a fairly lengthy narrative in Chapter One, which locates me within the study and describes some of my entanglements along my own PhD journey, I allowed my voice to be heard and made observations regarding my own position where appropriate during the analysis of my Phase 2 findings.

Such personal writing is not without controversy, however, and has, inevitably, come under criticism from qualitative writers such as Crotty for its '*rampant subjectivism'* (1998:48). I acknowledge that this is a risk with this style of writing and have, therefore, attempted to adhere to the four criteria laid down by Richardson (2000), namely substantive contribution, aesthetic merit, reflexivity and impact. These rest on the belief that science is one lens and creative arts is another and that we see more deeply using two lenses (Richardson, 2000). Substantive contribution questions whether the work contributes to our understanding of social life and gives a credible account. Aesthetic merit refers to whether the text is satisfying, complex and not boring. Reflexivity queries whether there is adequate self-awareness and self-exposure for the reader to make judgements about the point of view and impact concerns the extent to which the reader is affected emotionally or intellectually. As this work is not attempting

to prove any hypotheses or uncover a single truth, I was also guided by Eiser (1997:269) who asserted that the contribution of qualitative work should be assessed by the *'number and quality of the questions that the work raises'* as much as by any conclusions offered.

However, in attempting auto-ethnographic writing, I soon came to share the opinion of Ellis (Ellis and Bochner, 2000) that it is incredibly difficult to do, for several reasons. Firstly, it requires a high standard of writing, combined with a high level of introspection, often about things which do not portray you in a good light. In this way, it can be emotionally painful and generate a lot of fears and doubts. In addition, I felt acutely vulnerable, particularly with my position between two cultures, as a research student but also as an academic who, I felt, should know what I am doing without large amounts of self-doubt. Any introspection regarding my own experience of my relationship with my supervisors, also close colleagues and peers, was fraught with ethical dilemmas. As Ellis and Bochner (2000:738) state:

> *Then there's the vulnerability of revealing yourself, not being able to take back what you've written or having any control over how readers interpret it. It's hard not to feel your life is being critiqued as well as your work. It can be humiliating. And the ethical issues. Just wait until you've written about family members and loved ones who are part of your story.*

However, despite being a type of ethnography that *'breaks your heart'* (Behar, 1996), I persisted with it in the latter stages of my work as it offered an additional lens to my work and offered the possibility of *'supplying innovative perspectives on the underlying assumptions of various academic disciplines'* (Noy, 2007:352).

5.6.   Positionality, reflexivity and writer voice

In Chapter One, I have acknowledged that I bring my own perspective to the inquiry and to the interpretation of the findings, necessitating high levels of self-awareness or reflexivity, which, as explained above, I express in places in the form of auto-ethnography. Denzin and Lincoln (2005:21) remind us that, behind different labels in the qualitative research process, such as theory, epistemology, methodology, *'stands the personal biography of the researcher, who speaks form a particular class, gender racial, cultural and ethnic community perspective.'* I am aware that *'knowledge bears the mark of its producer'* (Lennon and Whitford, 1994:2) and that I, too, am a product of the regimes of truth in my own world. I agree with Stanley and Wise (1993) that, by acknowledging the standpoint from which knowledge is produced, the knowledge is less distorted, more visible and revisable than knowledge that is produced from a supposed position of impartiality. Qualitative inquiry rejects the notion that social science research requires detachment in order to maintain objectivity and, instead, finds this detachment to be limiting in terms of understanding the nature of the phenomenon under study. It is a *'situated activity that locates the observer in the world'* (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011:3) and recognises that *'social agents are central to the construction of knowledge and that the researcher's voice is one among many that influence the research process'* (Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001:67). Through fieldwork, the qualitative researcher is able to form a relationship with the people being researched, both physically and emotionally, which allows the researcher to understand the realities of their daily lives. This research, therefore, strives to present meaningful, credible and honest findings, which are supported by empirical data. By using systematic data collection and analysis procedures, I attempt to understand the complexities and multiple

realities of the world as they emerge and to be balanced in any conclusions drawn. This also demands that I am aware of any potential bias or error and that I reflect and report upon it accordingly.

This, in turn, demands a critical reflexivity from the researcher, whereby he or she is attentive to the '*cultural, political, social, linguistic, and ideological origins of one's own perspective and voice'* (Patton, 2015:65), as well as being conscious of the perspectives and voices of the people being interviewed. In order to communicate this self-awareness to the reader, I have chosen to write predominantly in the first person, active voice. This decision breaks with the traditional conventions of academic writing but was made out of a concern that these conventions *'alienate the person of the writer, and help create a distorted image of the people who are being written* about' (Holliday, 2002:123). Instead, I recognise that writing is itself part of the process of qualitative research and *'a text devoid of authorial presence undermines the acknowledgment in qualitative research that you, the researcher, carry an influence on the research process'* (Holloway and Brown, 2016:128) Through writing, we discover new aspects of our subject and begin to make sense of both the data and our role in the whole research process (Holliday, 2002). By using my own voice, or multiple voices, I am able to take the reader on a journey, in the quest for meaning. I take ownership of my own perspective and acknowledge the responsibility *'to communicate authentically'* the perspectives of those I encountered during my research (Patton, 2015:65). The written thesis becomes *'a complex train of thought'* within which my train of thought and my *'image of those of others are interwoven'* (Holliday, 2002:131). Harris, Wilson and Ateljevic (2007) point out that being reflexive is more than just writing in the first person. Instead, it forces us to ask ourselves how we relate to and voice the

experiences of those we are studying. Miller *et al*. (2012) advocate the more participatory interpretive voice as a way of integrating your perspective and your voice. Despite my intentions to 'give voice' to the researched in this study, I, in fact, had to interpret their voices in some areas, in order to unveil some difficult areas of inquiry. In this process, I acknowledged that there was a place in academic research for *'powerful, personal authorship'* (Holliday, 2002:128) but, by using the first person, I was also able to make very clear the distinction between the participants' voices and my own, thereby creating a more transparent relationship with my readers (Clark and Ivanic 1997).

Methods & techniques

5.7.   A Bricolage approach

Given that such complex and multi grained philosophies shaped my philosophical or epistemological approach, it is not surprising that my application of methods and techniques was similarly diverse. Indeed, I took a 'bricolage' or blended approach to the study and drew upon approaches and used methods and techniques which appeared to be the most appropriate and effective in *'opening up new understandings'* (Patton, 2015:400).   Denzin and Lincoln (2011:4) describe the researcher-as-bricoleur as someone who employs *'a wide range of interconnected interpretive practices, always hoping to get a better understanding of the subject matter at hand.'* In this way, I was able to choose a methodology and methods which were appropriate both to *'the area of enquiry and (my) own way of seeing the world'* (Somekh, 2005:2). Naturalistic research calls for a willingness to respond to new issues which emerge during interviews and other fieldwork and I, therefore,

began my inquiry with some of the key themes I intended to investigate but expanded and added to these as the fieldwork progressed and my own understanding and knowledge increased and, through this bricolage, was able to capture '*thick descriptions'* (Hollinshead, 2004). The research took place in two broad phases which are outlined below.

Phase One

Phase One involved exploratory conversations, in the form of semi-structured interviews, with respondents based at the three UK Higher Education Institutions with the largest numbers of PhD students in tourism and hospitality studies. As mentioned above, no attempt is made to generalise from these findings but this sample was selected purposefully as these respondents were considered to be 'information-rich cases.' The first phase of the research involved exploratory conversations with 9 students (7 international and 2 UK) and 4 supervisors within these institutions (Figures 5.1. and 5.2.). The aim of these conversations was to investigate the factors influencing the PhD experience for both students and supervisors in tourism and hospitality studies in contemporary UK higher education and how internationalisation is impacting upon the experience. Secondly, they sought to begin explorations into how internationalisation was influencing the nature of the knowledge being produced.

Phase Two

The conversations in Phase One were, as stated, exploratory in nature. It was during these conversations that I began to realise that the benefits of having such a

large body of international students at doctoral level were not being realised by institutions. In line with the emergent nature of this study, they highlighted issues such as the power dynamics within the doctoral process and the lack of opportunity for intercultural exchange to take place, which I had not fully considered during the first phase of interviews. The second phase of research also allowed me to explore in more depth some of the key themes which had arisen during the exploratory phase, such as the effect of intense isolation on the experience and the many constraints to internationalisation and knowledge exchange which appear to exist within universities.   The second phase of the research involved semi-structured, in-depth interviews with six full-time students (4 international and 2 UK) and six supervisors across the same three institutions and explored, in much more depth, some of the key issues above (Figures 5.3.and 5.4.).   Again, as a result of my discussions in Phase One, the key role of the supervisor in both the PhD journey and internationalisation had come to light and, therefore, equal weight is given to supervisors' and students' voices in Phase Two.

5.8. Sampling

There are no definitive guidelines as to sample size in social constructionist research. Indeed, Belk *et al.* (1998) acknowledge that depth of understanding is far more important than sample size. However, of course, all research involves some sort of sample and the sample of interviewees in this study is relatively small and was chosen purposefully in order to allow the PhD experience and issues surrounding knowledge creation to be looked into and understood in depth (Patton 2015). It was important that I should have a cross-section of nationalities, including UK students, as the literature had highlighted both the importance of investigating

the home student experience in an internationalised environment and the fact that international students should not be treated as a homogeneous other. The fact that there are fewer home students than international students is representative of the doctoral student body in Tourism Studies. As stated above, no effort is made to generalise from the findings but the participants were selected to give *'what is believed to be a representative sample'* (Gray, 2004:87) and *'to try to present a working picture of the broader social structure from which the observations are drawn'* (Henderson, 1991:132). 'Information-rich cases' were chosen to enable us to learn a great deal about the issues which are central to the research (Patton 2015:46). Lack of availability and a focus on the student experience in Phase One did mean that the supervisors were limited to two institutions, rather than three and, on recognising the importance of giving voice to the academic's experience of internationalisation, this is something I rectified in Phase Two by including two supervisors from each institution.

5.9. Exploratory interviews (Phase One)

Semi-structured interviews took place with 9 students and 4 supervisors at the three chosen Higher Education Institutions (see Figures 5.1. and 5.2. below). Having contacted a key academic in each institution, a list of students and supervisors was obtained from university administrators and all participants were contacted by email with details of the study and request to participate. The interviews took place within the three universities at a mutually agreed location as, for this naturalistic kind of study, it is important that research takes place in an environment which the participants are comfortable with (Patton, 2015). The students all chose to conduct the interviews either in the coffee shop or the student common room, whereas the

supervisors preferred to conduct them within their offices. None of the students were known to me before the interviews and I had only met one of the supervisors briefly at a conference. In an effort to maintain anonymity, random pseudonyms have been allocated to participants.

Figure 5.1. Details of Phase One students

Name	Part-time/full-time	Home country	Age	Year of PhD study	Institution
Maryam	Full-time	Oman	35	3	A
Khalid	Full-time	Oman	46	2	A
Kim Sun	Full-time	Korea	24	3	C
Perry	Full-time	UK	33	2	B
Jo	Part-time (staff member)	UK	39	5	B
Theo	Part-time	Greece	23	1	B
Natalie	Full-time	Taiwan	28	4	C
Said	Full-time	Oman	27	2	A
Hapi	Full-time	Saudi	30	2	C

Figure 5.2. Details of Phase One supervisors

Name	Home country	Position within university	Institution
Richard Brown	UK	Professor	C
John Forrester	UK	Dr	C
Alan Butcher	UK	Dr	B
Jane Gelling	UK	Professor	B

Interviews were chosen for the first phase of the research as they are regarded as a powerful tool for eliciting highly personalised and rich data on people's attitudes

and views and the meanings that underpin their lives and behaviour (Gray, 2014). Patton (2015:416) describes an in-depth interview as an opportunity to enter another person's world for a short period of time or to *'walk a mile in my head'.* This approach rests on the belief that the thoughts, experiences and perspectives of others are meaningful and that we are able to make them explicit (Seale, 2004). This phase of research was exploratory in nature and was uncovering the feelings and attitudes of the students and supervisors towards the PhD process and their role as creators of knowledge. It also explored the attitudes of participants towards their PhD journey within an internationalised environment and the particular challenges this raised. The use of interviews also allowed me to probe for detailed responses and seek clarification, which was particularly useful in the case of students whose first language was not English. Indeed, my own background of working in a cross-cultural environment for many years heightened my awareness during interviews of cross-cultural issues such as such as differing norms and values, in addition to language differences. Patton (2015:394) reminds us that *'getting valid, reliable, meaningful and usable information in cross-cultural environments requires special sensitivity to and respect for differences.'* I acknowledged, following Gillham (2005:15) that there are no general rules *'apart* from *the need to be alert to these confounding factors, not least in the interpretation of what people tell you.'*

As Arksey and Knight (1999:32) point out, interviewing enables us to examine the meanings that people ascribe to phenomena:

> *Interviewing is a powerful way of helping people to make explicit things that have hitherto been implicit – to articulate their tacit perceptions, feelings and understandings.*

The other strength of interview data is, as Veal (2011) suggests, that they are often more compelling than statistical summaries of a large-scale survey. In contrast to many studies on the internationalisation of higher education, my study focusses on real people in real situations and interviews do not just illuminate key issues, they are appealing and compelling because of their human character. My participant are the main players in my story and I am attempting to convey their thoughts and feelings (Holloway and Brown, 2016).

I chose semi-structured interviews as they allow for discovery at the same time as having a focus which allowed me to explore commonalities during the analysis phase (Gillham, 2005). During the interviews, I had a topic guide of issues I wished to cover. However, as the interviews were exploratory and based on the notion of the existence of multiple realities, I pursued issues which were not planned but emerged during the interviews. Semi-structured interviews allow for such probing of views and opinions which may lead the interview into 'new pathways' which were not anticipated but help towards meeting research objectives (Gray, 2014). At this stage, unstructured, narrative interviews were considered but I decided that, whilst I was encouraging an open-ended, free conversation with a narrative element, a broad categorical framework was needed, in order to establish some of the common key issues to explore in Phase Two of the fieldwork (Gillham, 2005). The interviews were designed to cover a wide range of issues and were, therefore, fairly lengthy, lasting between one and one and a half hours.

The interviews were recorded, with the agreement of the participants, and were then transcribed. Gillham (2005) suggests that each interview should be transcribed before progressing to the next one. Practicalities prevented this from happening as

I had to travel to two of the institutions and conduct several interviews over a short period. However, I did transcribe the interviews from one institution before visiting the next, in order to allow me to learn from interviews and incorporate any emerging issues into the following interviews. I transcribed the interviews myself which, although tortuous at times, meant that I became very familiar with my data and even began analysis during the transcription phase, even if not consciously.

The transcripts were then analysed and, following Gillham (2005), I approached analysis in a reflective manner and viewed it as another stage in the emergent process. Although each interview was unique in the sense that it is difficult to find commonality in each person's internal world (Gillham, 2005), the semi-structured nature of the interviews meant that, to some extent, boundaries were set and content analysis was possible.   However, the identification of substantive statements and then categories was an iterative and largely inductive process, whereby patterns, themes and categories emerged from the transcripts, rather than data being analysed strictly according to an existing framework (Patton, 2015). In writing up the analysis of the Phase One interviews, I sought to include large quotations from the participants themselves, thereby allowing them to speak for themselves, with linking material to ensure continuity and highlight the significance of what they were saying, as I interpreted it for the purposes of my research questions (Gillham, 2005). As Denzin (1978:109) reminds us, a fully inductive process allows so-called 'facts' to speak for themselves but '*facts do not speak for themselves. They must be interpreted.*' Janesick (2000) supports this in defining qualitative research as more than just observing and interviewing: it involves interpreting the beliefs and behaviours of the participants. The intention was that my constructs and interpretations of the data should not dominate the analysis but

should '*facilitate the reader's understanding of the world under study*' (Patton, 2015:457).

5.10. In-depth interviews (Phase Two)

Phase Two involved semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 6 students and 6 supervisors from the three chosen institutions. Again, the students' details were provided to me by the university administrators and I contacted them in advance to inform them of the purpose of the study and to seek their consent to participate. In this phase, the inclusion of two full-time UK students was purposive as it emerged during the analysis of Phase One that home students have an important role in internationalisation and, although full-time UK doctoral students are fairly rare in Tourism studies, it was important that their voice was heard in this phase. The other students were chosen to give a cross section of nationalities and stages that they were at within their PhD journeys. There were no part-time students who were members of staff in this sample and, therefore, as is further explained in Chapter 7, I have allowed my own voice to be heard in the discussion of the findings. Supervisors were selected in terms of their experience of supervising both UK and international students. It should be noted that five out of six of the supervisors were men and four of those men were professors. Again, this appears to reflect the gender balance amongst senior academics in Tourism Studies. In contrast to Phase One, two of the supervisors and two of the students in this phase were situated in my own institution and were colleagues of mine. This presented some challenges for all of us and these are discussed in the analysis and discussion of the results.

As stated above, these interviews were designed to focus on the key themes that had emerged during the exploratory conversations in Phase One. The interviews were recorded, with the permission of the participants, and transcribed before analysis. Whereas the interviews were conducting following the same approach as outlined above for Phase One, the analysis was informed by critical language study. I refer to critical language study informing the research and not to the method of critical discourse analysis because as Burr (2015:163) states, it is problematic to define discourse analysis and she refers to it as an '*approach to research, rather than a method or technique, as it is impossible to 'describe it adequately in 'recipe-type' terms'*. Therefore, thematic analysis took place but with a focus on linguistic elements which may reveal hidden power and accepted conventions within the academic world. This approach acknowledges that full understanding of a piece of speech requires an understanding of the social and political context in which it is constructed (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) and that our interactions are influenced by our embodied characteristics or members' resources (Fairclough, 2001). The members' resources of the participants are detailed in Figure 7.1. in Chapter 7 but brief details are given below (Figures 5.3. and 5.4.).

Figure 5.3. Details of Phase Two students

Ruby	Full-time	UK	25	Recently completed	A
Katie	Full-time	UK	40	2	A
Hye	Full-time	Korea	24	3	C
Aiko	Full-time	Japan	22	1	C
Changsai	Full-time	Thailand	49	3	B
Lydia	Full-time	Croatia	28	2	B

Figure 5.4. Details of Phase Two supervisors

Name	Home country	Position within university	Institution
Jack Hunt	UK	Professor	C
James Howells	UK	Professor	C
Ron Wood	UK	Professor	B
Paul Evans	UK	Professor	B
Alex Price	UK	Doctor	A
Charlotte Richards	UK	Doctor	A

5.11. Quality and credibility

Following an interpretivist or social constructionist perspective, the focus of this study is on 'particularity' or doing justice to the integrity of unique cases (Patton, 2015). There is no attempt to generalise or seek causal explanations but, instead, the work seeks interpretive validity and to comprehend phenomena not from the researcher's perspective but from those of the participants (Huberman and Miles, 2013). This was made more complex by the fact I was also a participant, making Richardson's (2000) criteria for autoethnography, mentioned earlier, all the more significant. As Holloway and Brown (2016) state, the different philosophical underpinnings and purposes of qualitative research lead to the appropriateness of different criteria to judge the quality and credibility of that research. Thus, the emphasis within this study was not on fulfilling the traditional positivist criteria of validity, reliability, generalisability and objectivity on the part of the researcher. Rather, it seeks to fulfil interpretivist or constructionist criteria such as trustworthiness, authenticity and acknowledgement of the subjectivity of the researcher, placing emphasis on concepts such as '*balance*', '*fairness*' and

'*completeness*' (Patton 2015:282). Lincoln and Guba (1986) stress that naturalistic enquiry should be judged by dependability, which Decrop (2004:160) describes as *'the correspondence between the data recorded by the researcher and what actually occurred in the setting.'* Dependability is a response to the positivist call for reliability and replicability and acknowledges that knowledge generated through interpretive research is multiple and contextual and is not absolute. The findings of this study are bound by time, context, culture and value and it would not be possible to replicate them as the social world in which the research was conducted is constantly changing (Marshall and Rossman, 2014). Equally important is authenticity, whereby I strive to remain reflexive regarding my own perspective and those of others and attempt to be open and fair in describing these multiple perspectives and the constructions that underpin them. This reflexive approach provides insights into my own background and worldview and how these have affected the way I approach the research and the presentation of findings. I am hopeful that this insight into my intellectual biography makes me more accountable for my input into the research and enables the reader to make a more informed judgement regarding the findings (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004:18)

5.12. Ethical responsibility

The ethics of research focuses on the appropriateness of the researcher's behaviour towards the participants or anyone else who is affected by the research. The main ethical consideration when conducting interviews is that participants should not be harmed in any way (Gray, 2014). This can include putting pressure on people to participate or them getting anxious or upset during an interview. My participants were fully informed as to the nature of the research and that they could withdraw

from the interview and the study at any point. In a process where knowledge is co-created by the researcher and the participants, issues are raised regarding the ethics of publishing other peoples' intellectual property and whether, rather than being anonymised, the participants should, in fact, be accredited (Somekh, 2005). In this study, informed consent was gained from all participants to use their responses as data but I was also aware that it was likely that some of the knowledge being shared with me was likely to challenge the processes, and even people, who had traditionally held power. Therefore, I decided, as far as possible, to retain the anonymity of my participants, following Barbour and Schostak (2011:41), who advise:

> *Knowledge is power. But those who 'leak' knowledge' that others wish to remain silenced are in positions of great vulnerability*
> *.*

Following Gillham (2005), I attempted to avoid being intrusive during the interview process and to maintain a friendly distance during the interviews. In order to set this tone, I ensured that I was overt about my role as a researcher and the purpose of my research. In this way, I endeavoured to establish a rapport with my participants and a climate of trust in order for them to feel comfortable about disclosing personal attitudes and feelings.

5.13. Summary

This chapter has presented the social constructionist interprevist paradigm which informs my research. It has explained that the study was emergent in nature and, in this way, my perspectives and methodological approaches developed throughout my own PhD journey. Semi-structured interviews were used in both phases of the

research but, by Phase Two, I was particularly interested in the powerful structures of academia, the opportunities available to challenge conventions and the constraints surrounding the doctoral journey. At this stage, therefore, Critical Language Study appeared to provide a useful perspective to inform the analysis of the interview data. The next chapter provides a discussion of the factors influencing the PhD experience from the Phase One interviews.

CHAPTER SIX

THE FACTORS INFLUENCING THE PHD EXPERIENCE IN UK TOURISM STUDIES

6.1. Introduction

6.2. Supervisors' awareness and understandings of internationalisation

6.3. Students' backgrounds, motivations and expectations

6.4. External pressures

6.5. The role of language within the PhD process

6.6. Isolation

6.7. Centrality of the supervisory relationship

6.8. Doctorateness

6.9. Opportunities for intercultural knowledge exchange

6.10. Summary and conclusions

6.1.   Introduction

This chapter examines the themes which emerged from the analysis of the exploratory conversations with four supervisors and eight students in the three case-study institutions in phase one of the research. It is acknowledged that the PhD experience is a journey with many challenges (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010) but that there is very little published research into the doctoral experience (John and Denicolo, 2013).   The focus of this chapter is to identify and explore the factors influencing the PhD journey of both students and supervisors. As I was committed to understanding the experience from the respondents' perspective, I have included extensive quotations, thereby privileging their own voices to a large extent. The chapter includes an exploration of each of the themes which emerged from the exploratory conversations, namely awareness and understandings of internationalisation, students' motivations and expectations, the supervisory relationship, external pressures, the role of language, isolation, the concept of doctorateness and the opportunities for intercultural knowledge exchange. The chapter addresses some of the issues affecting the experience before moving to discuss the centrality of the supervisory relationship and its influence on opportunities for (intercultural) knowledge creation and sharing.

6.2.   Supervisors' awareness and understandings of Internationalisation

As I was explaining the concept of my study, one of the supervisors, Dr Butcher, queried what I meant by internationalisation of Higher Education, stating, *'It may be helpful if you explain to me what you mean by 'internationalisation.'* Considering the wide discussion in the literature concerning the definition of internationalisation, it

was, perhaps, quite predictable that the issue should be raised. What was perhaps surprising was that only one of the interviewees asked me to clarify what I meant by the term, whereas others had their own understandings of the term.

Two supervisors from the same institution were keen to point out to me that internationalisation was not new to them. Dr Butcher explained that the majority of their doctoral community had been international students for many years and appeared to equate this to being internationalised:

> *I would assume by now that someone has pointed out to you that, here anyway, always has been internationalised. So, it's nothing new for us. In fact, what is new to us to some extent is getting UK students at PhD level as they are just not funded … we don't see as many … so our PhD community is quite a large one anyway and it really is very internationalised.*

He went on to say '*I think we've had a pool of international students for quite a long time now*', appearing to support views in existing literature that some academics assume that the presence of international students on a campus automatically leads to internationalisation of the department or university (Ward, 2001; Sawir, 2013).

Professor Gelling also began by equating numbers of PhD students to internationalisation of the department:

> *So, we have a long track record and a long track record of dealing with international students so it's not anything that's new to us it's something that's just second nature really. I mean if you do look at our list of PhDs that have graduated I think off the top of my head I would say probably maximum 30 percent are UK.*

However, she also showed an awareness of the broader issues involved in internationalisation when she added:

> *I think they've got an international profile in our staff not just in terms of ethnic groupings but we do work internationally on a regular basis. For instance, at the moment, we have two big projects in Hong Kong and one in Iran. So, as a department, we are very international in our outlook.*

Although it was unclear, at this stage, how internationalised departments are in terms of modern interpretations of the term (Knight, 2013), it became apparent that, in all three case study institutions, international students dominate the full-time PhD community. This means that factors which surround the effect of internationalisation on the learning and teaching experience are now interwoven with those involved in the PhD experience. What is of interest here is how aware students and supervisors are of these factors and what, if any, adjustments they are making to their supervisory styles. I was keen to explore the extent to which supervisors are changing their philosophy, process and practice and, even, their expectations of the end product. I was also attempting to investigate the role of supervisors as gatekeepers of knowledge and the implications this had on both the PhD experience and the creation and exchange of tourism knowledge.

6.3. Students' backgrounds, motivations and expectations

The interviews with students began by attempting to contextualise their experiences of doctoral study by exploring their backgrounds, their reasons for embarking upon the research and their expectations of the experience and the future. As my research approach is based on the premise that the researcher brings life

experiences, attitudes and worldviews to his or her research and these impact upon that research (Reinharz, 1997), it seemed appropriate to attempt to unveil, to some extent, the positionality of my respondents. This approach also reflects Hockey's view (1991) that the PhD process results in the formation of an identity which is influenced by the process itself but also by the aspirations which accompany it. As one might expect, students' motivations for embarking on a PhD varied, as did their expectations prior to beginning the process. This reflects the findings of the QAA (2015) and the UK Grad Report (Shinton, 2004:10) which concludes that '*there are probably as many reasons for doing a PhD as there are PhD researchers*'.

However, despite the diversity of motivations that exist, the majority of the student respondents did mention the desire for career progression as a factor in their decision. Two of the students stated that a PhD was a basic requirement for their career progression in their home countries, confirming Rizvi's (2010) view that international doctoral students are self-reflexive and recognised the importance of a doctorate in developing academic careers. Natalie, a university lecturer in Taiwan, described the necessity for her to get a doctorate:

> *Because of my job. Um, I am a lecturer in university, is requirement … actually, is basic requirement now. Yeah, in Taiwan. If you want to teach in the university, you must have a PhD degree … otherwise you are fired.*

However, these views are not limited to international students. Jo, a full-time lecturer at Strathclyde University, spoke of the pressure he felt to enrol on a PhD:

> *When I first came here, um I was strongly advised to register for a PhD because it looked better for the department if people either had PhDs or were registered for them, so I was more or less told to 'sign here' and that was that, but I was happy to do that. It was not a problem.*

For these students, it appeared that the pressure to do a PhD came from external sources, namely their employers. Interestingly, both of them were experiencing difficulties in progressing for seemingly different, legitimate reasons but I question whether the fact that the motivation to carry out the research did not originate with them has affected their progress. The PhD is a long, emotional, sometimes difficult and isolated journey and *'ploughing this lonely furrow'* (Jagdish, 1997:141) must be extremely arduous if you are not fully engaged with, or even passionate about, your subject and reason for pursuing it.

Another, Theo, a Greek student, spoke with more enthusiasm about his future career. He was passionate about learning and teaching and felt his future lay in academia:

> *No, I mean my father has a tourism business and all that but I've never wanted to get into that. I like writing and I like teaching. I've taught in colleges and I'm doing tutorials so I decided I should just stay in academia – if they'll have me.*

Several respondents agreed about the personal benefits that a doctorate bring, reflecting the findings of QAA (2015). Theo spoke of the sense of achievement of gaining the title of Doctor and talked about this in terms of a reward for the personal sacrifices he had made in order to come to the UK:

> *… And maybe a vanity thing, because I want to be called doctor …*
> *No, it's like, if left your house and everything you knew for six or seven years, you want to have something to show for it.*

Perry, a UK student, implied that his decision to pursue a PhD resulted more from push factors in his previous career than pull factors towards doctoral study. When asked why he was doing a PhD, he responded:

> *I didn't want to, erm, didn't mean to, it was an accident really. (…) I started it because I wanted to take time to think about what I wanted to do with the rest of my life.*

He went on to explain how he had left the priesthood and was looking for a job opportunity in the hospitality industry. He sought advice from a university lecturer and:

> *He said, well, I don't know anything about that, but would you consider doing a PhD with us? And I thought, well, no, not really, but, to cut a long story short, about a fortnight later, I'd signed the paperwork.*

However, having embarked upon, and nearly finished, his doctorate, he appeared to be thriving on the experience he seemed to now be intending to pursue an academic career, in the short term at least.

> *I've now decided, yes, we'll focus on hospitality academia (…) Yeah, we'll give it a career shot for the next three to five years, no long-term commitments, we'll see what happens after that.*

Although the supervisors were not specifically asked for their opinions on their students' motivations, some did express views on the role of a PhD as a necessary stepping stone on a career path in contemporary UK Higher Education. Professor Gelling described how the employment criteria in tourism and hospitality education had changed in recent years:

> *When we look at the profile of lecturing staff that are coming through now, in our institute and many others, you wouldn't get a lecturing position these days without a PhD. Now, particularly when you look at hospitality, that is a very big change from my day when industry experience was what you were appointed on.*

Interestingly, neither students nor supervisors mentioned the desire to create new knowledge as a motivation for pursuing a PhD, although creation of knowledge is still officially cited as the purpose of the PhD (QAA, 2015). This appears to corroborate Kemp *et al's* (2008) view of the changing nature of the doctorate with the skills agenda dominating.

When asked why they had chosen to study in the UK and why at a particular university, students again offered varying responses. The majority of respondents had followed a Masters course in the UK and enjoyed their experiences. Natalie referred to feeling of reassurance and familiarity with the UK system, stating, *'Because I did my Masters in UK and I am familiar with the education here.'*

With regard to their choice of university, the majority of respondents seem to have been influenced by the reputation of either the university or their supervisor, confirming Kemp *et al's* (2008) findings that the academic reputation of the institution is the most often cited reason by international students for choosing their country or institution. The International Student Survey (2015) confirmed this and found that it was particularly important for postgraduate research students who are concerned about research quality and reputation, as described by Kim Sun:

> *One of the professors, he recommended to me that Surrey is kind of famous for tourism. In the end, I chose Surrey. Kind of reputation is more affect me in the end.*

In addition to research reputation, it was apparent that some students chose their university purely because of the presence of a certain supervisor appears to reflect the literature regarding the importance that students place on the quality of the supervisory relationship (Hockey, 1991; Wisker, 2005; Gill and Burnard, 2008). The centrality of the supervisory relationship in the PhD experience is further considered in Section 6.7 of this chapter. The supervisors in question were eminent academics in the field of tourism and hospitality studies and the students seemed to assume they would also have the qualities necessary to be a good supervisor. Theo described the huge impact of the reputation of his supervisor on his decision:

I would have left but I was asking about supervisors and they said Professor X and I was, like, I'm staying.

Other factors mentioned when making comparisons between various UK universities were cost of living and the fact that Surrey University had a comprehensive website. It is perhaps to be expected that websites, social media and other promotional materials might have a significant role in students' decision-making, particularly at an early stage and if the students are overseas and institutions' marketing units and individual academic departments need to be aware of this if they are to be globally competitive This again reflects the findings of the International Student Survey (2015:25) which concludes that universities have been slow to adopt new technologies to communicate with modern '*digital natives*.'

Interestingly, none of the students mentioned issues of cost when explaining their decision to come to the UK, although clearly the tuition fees coupled with living costs for a minimum three-year period make it a huge financial decision. Marketers, therefore, suggest that the UK needs to position itself favourably in terms of price,

particularly in relation to Australia (Smith *et al.*, 2010). However, in this study, students did not consider price to be a primary factor in their decision-making.

6.4. External pressures

Although anecdotal evidence suggests that academic factors are the most important factors in international student satisfaction, it has been suggested that they are not the only elements involved (Botterill & Platenkamp 2004; Middlehurst & Woodfield 2007; Rizvi, 2010). Although price is not a primary factor in decision-making, my findings show that both home and international students are increasingly under financial pressure and many PhD students are international, mature students who may also have to satisfy sponsors, deal with immigration issues, in addition to the cultural and social upheaval of moving to the UK, either with or without their families. Whilst the supervisory relationship remains a key factor in their doctoral experience, it became clear during the semi-structured interviews that external pressures played a huge role in that experience.

6.4.1. Funding and sponsorship

During preliminary conversations, the dominant external pressure appeared to be that of funding and financial support. Some students were either partly or fully sponsored by their home institutions or governments whereas others were self-funded or funded by their parents. In both cases, the majority of them were working part-time, either within the department or externally.

Perry spoke of the demands of teaching within the department and commented that he is unable to carry out research during the period when he has high teaching commitments:

> *It's fine, it's actually great because I wouldn't want to take on any more whereas, I think it would be fair to say, when I teach in the first twelve weeks of the first semester in each year, it's dead time. I can't get anything else done so I just would not want anything more and I really don't see how people can work full-time and do a PhD at the same time. I think it would be impossible.*

This sentiment is perhaps mirrored by academic staff who are undertaking their PhD full-time and only find time to progress it during the university vacations. As Jo said:

> *Afraid it's the usual story - start the summer with the best of intentions and nothing comes of it. Trying to get lecture notes sorted for next year and my teaching in HK in September. May get a little time once that is out of the way....*
> (e-mail 24/07/2006)

Some students also revealed that they were under pressure from their sponsors, who were either employers or governments, to undertake research into a specified topic and complete their PhDs within three years. Khalid described how he had had a subject area imposed upon him by his home university, explaining, '*They have given me a subject to research and now I am trying to fit what I am interested in into that subject area.*' This appears to corroborate Rizvi's (2010) view that pressure is exerted upon students to pursue research that is approved by their governments and, therefore, the knowledge production at doctoral level is inherently political. It draws attention to the fact that, by imposing PhD topics, sponsors are key players in shaping the direction of knowledge creation in tourism studies and highlights this as an issue for further exploration in the second phase of this study.

6.4.1. Family commitments

Some students spoke of the huge impact that their PhD journey had had on their family life and referred particularly to the pressures they felt under with regard to care of their families. One student, Khalid, mentioned how, at one point, he had been contemplating taking a break in his studies as his wife was ill and he was feeling the pressure of caring for her, her possible hospitalisation and looking after their children.

The same student told me that his PhD dominates his whole life and that he never misses a day of study. His family question this but he says, '*it has to be this way*'. This appears to support Brydon & Fleming's (2011) view that family do not always understand the PhD journey. He also talked of the pressure he felt under to complete his PhD and return home, for the sake of his family:

> *My mother keeps asking me on the phone – when you come home?*
> *My youngest daughter, she only meets her family a few times during*
> *holidays. I need to get home.*

It appears there is a cultural and religious influence at play here too. Khalid told me that Arabic culture and religion decree that a son takes care of his parents and he feels very strongly that he needs to do this, supporting Vertovec's (2009) view of the heavy pressures exerted by family on international students.

Another student, Said, told me how he had left his wife and two children and mother in his home country and he spoke of the emotional pressures and financial sacrifice of coming to the UK, saying:

> *It is very hard to leave your family behind. My children, my wife, my mother. And I need to make sure they are OK and have money to look after the children. It is hard, very hard.*

He did acknowledge that technology and cheap telephone calls had helped to reduce the emotional pressure, contrary to Vertovec's (2009) view that improved telecommunications have exacerbated the pressure placed on international students by their families. Nonetheless, this student was feeling anxious as to whether he had made the right decision to come to the UK and whether he had a topic worth researching. He had recently arrived in the UK and was shocked and appeared dejected by the '*amount of paperwork'* he had had to complete in order to carry out tasks such as opening his bank account, registering with the National Health Service and enrolling.

Another student, Hapi, spoke of the pressures he was experiencing as his marriage arrangements were going awry. He appeared to feel powerless as he was away from home and said he would return home permanently if his marriage did not happen. Again, his cultural background was affecting his experience here as he liked Cardiff, had lots of friends but commented that:

> *Islam does not allow me to form relationship with British girl and I want a wife for company and household duties.*

Family pressures apply to female students too and are perhaps even more keenly felt given the structures of religion and culture surrounding them. One Islamic student explained that she had to take care of her husband and family, in a foreign country, at the same time as doing her PhD. These circumstances had definitely shaped her experience and provided a great deal of pressure on her:

> *Trying to care properly for my husband and family and do my studies in a foreign country is difficult, very difficult.*

6.5.   The role of language within the PhD process

Language emerged as a central theme during my conversations with both supervisors and students. It was apparent that it was a factor of influence on the PhD experience on two different levels. Firstly, there was the issue of students for whom English was a foreign language and how this affected their oral and written powers of expression. On another level, there is the issue of academic discourse, for all PhD students, and the extent to which different students master this discourse and the consequences this has for their doctoral experience. There are clearly links between these two elements and what is of particular interest in my research is how they both impact on knowledge creation, intercultural exchange of knowledge and creativity.

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) describes the global spread of *'knowledges in English'* which I am interested in investigating, especially the extent to which students have the language constructs and, therefore, power (Foucault, 1972) to create and share knowledge in English. Whilst all language acquisition is, in effect, borrowing, are students constrained by a narrow, borrowed academic discourse or linguistic toolkit (Burr, 2015) which curbs creativity and opportunities to share knowledge?

Some students clearly feel compelled to buy in to this academic discourse to get past the gatekeepers of knowledge, such as supervisors, examiners and journal editors (Ateljevic, Pritchard, Morgan, 2007) and, thus, effectively disseminate the knowledge they are creating. It could be argued that they are under pressure to

communicate using the linguistic repertoires (Potter and Wetherell, 1987) of this dominant group.

Another key issue related to language is the extent to which it affects the supervisory relationship and, in particular, the power balance within that relationship. I was curious as to whether students or supervisors were aware of this aspect of the language factor and the extent to which supervisors were conscious of their inter-cultural communication skills.

It is difficult to isolate comments and themes that belong solely under the heading of language and it has become clear that it is interwoven with many of the other elements of the doctoral experience, such as the supervisory relationship, social integration and knowledge creation and dissemination. However, some of the issues that arose are discussed below.

6.5.1. Oral communication skills

Several students commented on the difficulties they had experienced in communicating with their supervisors and attributed these to the fact that weaknesses in their English were leading to misunderstandings and a heightened feeling of nervousness. One student, Kim Sun, mentioned that this, in turn, was inhibiting her and limiting the amount and scope of discussion:

> *Initially, I was in struggle to have good relations …I don't know what good relations is … maybe difficulty of communication in my English and somehow, they take in wrong way, my expression of English. So, um … and I don't know, I'm kind of nervous, I don't really express much as I want and …*

It appears that if a student does not have the language to fully express her or his ideas either orally or in writing, it affects the doctoral experience, in that it leads to frustration, misunderstandings and a lack of confidence. It would also seem to lend weight to my feeling that students are being forced to curb their creativity and produce the knowledge that their, often limited, linguistic structures allow. It also means that supervisors are in an even stronger position to exert their influence and impose their ideas on the students, an issue that will be discussed further later in the chapter.

Professor Brown confirmed that communication problems were adversely affecting his discussions with Kim Sun. He seems to regard this student as problematic (Kelly and Moogan, 2012) and suggests that I will share this deficit perception when I interview her:

> *I mean, with Kim Sun, there's huge problems. As you will find talking to her. Um, she's got such a pronounced accent that she's one of the very few students that I sometimes have difficulty understanding what she's saying.*

One student, Natalie, did mention that communication difficulties did not only stem from the students but could be the fault of supervisors, as they are poor at articulating their ideas. Referring to her supervisor, who was British, she said:

> *I think he is not confident enough and he don't know how to deliver what he knows to the students. I think this is a major problem.*

Dr Butcher acknowledged this view when he said:

> *Because, I mean, one of things of supervising is that it's sometimes very difficult to articulate something that you just know. I mean, you know when something's right and when it's wrong but part of the process is trying to explain why. So, sometimes, you think you're doing a good job of explaining something and maybe you're not. The student's just too polite to say to you that you're not making any sense.*

By using the terms 'right' and 'wrong', Dr Butcher appears to be demonstrating the limited and culturally imperialistic viewpoint suggested by authors such as Stier (2002) and Stromquist (2007). He suggests above that his discussions with Kim Sun are taking place within a regime of truth which makes *'some things visible and others invisible, some things true and others* false' (Barron and Zeegers, 2006:78). However, contrary to Barron and Zeegers' (2006) suggestion that the dominant discourse can always be resisted, Dr Butcher appears to recognise that, perhaps due to language issues, cultural differences or lack of confidence within the relationship, students can be reluctant to challenge their supervisors.

The exploratory conversations highlighted that communication difficulties were not limited to the supervisory relationship. There is agreement in the literature that the doctoral experience can be a very isolated one, particularly for international students (Rizvi, 2010; Percy, 2014) and it was clear from these interviews that students' confidence in their communication skills and the fact that English was not the language being spoken by the students around them were contributory factors to this isolation. As Maryam said:

> *When I was in America, people around you always used to talk. Here, we are all Arabic speakers. I am sometimes jealous of my friends on Masters courses going into classes and meeting people. I see my supervisor maybe once a month … and that's it.*

6.5.2. Writing, reading and academic discourse

None of the students overtly expressed concerns about their reading skills. In fact, most did not consider this to be an issue for them, which surprised me somewhat, considering the volume of reading a PhD entails. However, several students, including British students, acknowledged the difficulties and frustrations encountered when attempting to write academic discourse in English

As with oral communication, lack of writing skills was an obvious source of frustration to students and was hindering them in expressing their real thoughts about their subjects. It was clear to me during my meeting with Kim Sun that she encountered some problems expressing herself orally, but, when asked, she did not consider oral communication or the understanding of literature to be any real problem. However, she did regard academic writing in English as a major issue:

> *I think is a big problem in writing. Meetings is not big problem but normally writing is much deeper and academic writing …*

Maryam also voiced her frustrations in this respect:

> *Everybody in Oman used to say I was a good writer. I don't know but that's what they used to say. Here I don't always know how to use the words – I feel depressed and frustrated about it.*

This kind of comment appears to substantiate the findings in the literature that international students are battling to overcome language and cultural barriers in order to find their voice and avoid losing their self-esteem and identity. (Ryan and Viete, 2009; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014).

However, it became apparent that these language constraints were not only a concern for international students. Perry, a British student, alluded to *'academese'* and pointed out that there was an accepted academic discourse and that writing for your doctorate was about '*knowing how to speak the language,'* supporting Hall's (2004:142) view that academic language is used as a partially hidden mechanism of power in tourism studies which influences what *'is acceptable or unacceptable in being represented as tourism knowledge'.*

This is recognised by Dr Butcher who acknowledges the difficulties experienced by several students, both home and international, in engaging in the accepted academic discourse:

> *… a PhD has a language of its own. I mean, academese or whatever*
> *you want to call it … that is a whole language, a whole way of being*
> *and that's part of what students get. … so yeah, language is a problem*
> *generally in the PhD process but for some of the overseas students,*
> *it's more of a challenge than others…*

These comments appeared to evidence an awareness from both supervisors and students that academic discourse was a specific type of language and that the acquisition of this discourse was necessary in order to gain a doctorate and create the kind of knowledge that is disseminated in academic journals. This would appear to indicate that there is a great deal of power invested in language and discourse and these issues warrant further investigation in the second phase of this research.

The question of how far supervisors should go in correcting students' work was clearly a contentious one. Most supervisors appeared to accept it, to some extent, as part of their role, although, when corrections are extensive it may lead to queries

over the ownership of the knowledge being produced. Professor Brown accepted that it was a task which he had to embrace, if somewhat grudgingly:

> *But I can't even concentrate if it's written in poor English. Um, of course, what I should do is to say 'I'm not going to read this until you get it all properly proof-read' but I recognise that students can't actually afford that, so you end up doing that.*

However, others, such as Dr Butcher, displayed obvious frustration at this task:

> *… and that's something I don't like doing, is having to correct someone's grammar and so forth.*

On the other hand, the same supervisor had already acknowledged that there was an academic discourse which needed to be learned by all students and he was prepared to help them along that journey:

> *Having said that, to be honest with you, I would say across all three of the supervisions, I do have to spend quite a lot of time working on the writing style, but that's part of the PhD process in terms of writing for an academic journal is not something that comes naturally …*

He did, however, stress that he expected to undergo this academic writing process in conjunction with the student, not as a proof-reader:

> *That's part of what I expect to do as part of the PhD process because, what you are hoping is that you do that process with them. It's a bit of a sitting with Nellie.*

6.6. Isolation

It is well documented in the literature that PhD students are on a solitary intellectual journey (McCallin and Nayar, 2011) and students cite intellectual and social isolation as one of the main difficulties they encounter along the way (Ryan and Viete, 2009). For international students, this isolation may also be compounded by a cultural disjuncture (Hockey, 1994; Shiel, 2008; Amran and Ibrahim, 2011). For example, social interaction may take place but is based around a pub culture or involve the mixing of males and females in public, both of which may be inappropriate for some students.

This study addresses the acknowledged lack of research (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014) into the factors that contribute to the feelings of isolation for doctoral students, both home and international, and the measures taken to overcome them. This is a particularly important gap in research as it has been concluded that the quality of the research environment and contact with other researchers is vital to the doctoral experience and successful completion (QAA, 2011).

During our exploratory conversations, the vast majority of students confirmed that they had little contact with other PhD students within their departments, either on an intellectual or social level. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, language difficulties can contribute to this isolation. However, generally, there seemed to be the feeling amongst both UK and international students that there was not a strong research community within departments and one UK student, Jo, spoke quite firmly on this:

> *Well, it's been very difficult … in terms of the research community. I know that for the past six years, there hasn't been a research community.*

This supports findings from the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES (2015) that a large number of postgraduate students do not feel integrated into their department's community. It raises concerns in terms of knowledge creation as findings show that the isolated nature of the journey impairs the ability to think creatively and share knowledge (Hockey, 1991).

A student from the same university as Jo mentioned that there were research seminars that he attended out of a sense of *'collegiality'*, but intimated that they were rarely beneficial to him, as they were on topics or methods unrelated to his research. This appears to support Deem and Brehony's (2000) findings that many students reap limited benefits from research training and seminars.

There also appeared to be a common perception from newly enrolled PhD students that other PhD students were *'busy people'* and that any relationship between them would be *'artificial'*. This may reflect the fact that PhD study is highly individualised and students struggle to find common ground, even within their subject area.

However, it was interesting that many students felt they had benefited from contact with the wider academic community outside of their department. Kim Sun accounted for this apparent contradiction by explaining that she felt less pressure to participate or to *'perform'* when she was mixing with students from other disciplines:

> *But sometimes I feel free because I don't have the pressure of talking about my process of PhD. If we slow, you feel … when you compare*

> *to other people, you feel slow, you feel like pressure but when I meet other departments' students I really don't need to discuss much and also, I don't need to think about the politic things.*

However, by avoiding this pressure, she is turning away from her own discipline and restricting her opportunities to share her knowledge and learn from others. Again, it seems that universities need to recognise these feelings and attempt to provide spaces where students feel comfortable exchanging ideas (Leask, 2008).

Other students described their contact with a wider research community as *'motivating'*, *'reassuring'* and offering *'support'* and *'different perspectives'*. It was interesting that several students seemed to have been influenced in their methodological choices by their peers. For example, Natalie explained:

> *I talk quite a lot with PhD students in different universities and I attend many conferences and I think I got a lot of experiences and a lot of feedback from them. Actually, it's quite help … quite help me to develop my conceptual framework and my research, even my writing.*

On a social level, I had the impression that the majority of students were fairly isolated. Those who had completed Masters degrees in the same city appeared to be more integrated and this can probably be accounted for by the fact that they have spent a longer period of time in the city and that they had the opportunity to mix with their peers in a classroom environment during their taught Master's degree.

It is well documented in the literature that there is little integration between international and home students (Marginson *et al*, 2010) and it was fairly predictable that PhD students would experience this issue, especially considering the solitary academic life they tend to lead. The international student respondents were fairly

unanimous in the fact that they had little contact with British people, other than occasionally through part-time jobs, and Kim Sun summed it up as follows:

But, for me, when you come for PhD, actually, everybody international and also, you don't really have kind of other class (…) so you have mostly no chance to meet the British people. At least if you are working, in British environment, you have chance, but I'm not.

She went on to describe how the hostility she had felt from British people had been a point of shock and compared that unfavourably with the attitudes she had experienced whilst studying in Australia, suggesting that Australia was perhaps more multi-cultural and tolerant of other cultures:

People's kind of er … I don't know, they don't really express their emotion but sometimes sarcastic talk and it hurts sometimes. When I come here first time, I was like shocked the different atmosphere compared to Australia … to the kind of friendly atmosphere.

When asked about social integration, several students mentioned cultural differences as a difficulty, reinforcing the findings of Fotovatian and Miller (2014) who found that international students avoided social interactions for fear of making a cultural blunder. Theo, a Greek student, commented:

Well, no, I don't know why, maybe because I think there's a nucleus of Thai, Malaysian and they hang out together and maybe they have a different kind of lifestyle and … I don't know.

Kim Sun expressed similar sentiments:

Because, other students, they have a family and lot of time, lot of them, they are Muslim and it is not appropriate to interact, especially if have family. Even, they are their own people, they are very attached by each other … it's different culture.

It appeared that here feelings of isolation were exacerbated by the fact that she was surrounded by a large group of male Arabic students who appeared, to her, to have family members with them and a sense of community from which she was largely excluded. As was suggested earlier in the chapter, it seems that strong cultural communities, such as Arabic and South East Asian, exist on campus and other students are not able to penetrate these, which has a significant impact on the potential for cultural and knowledge exchange. This appears to confirm the findings of Urban and Palmer (2014) that international communities form strong communities on campus and that cross-cultural contact does not happen easily. By recruiting large numbers of students from certain countries and not recognising that this causes issues, universities are not creating the right environment for knowledge exchange to take place – in other words, somewhat ironically, internationalisation is stifling internationalisation. My findings support the assertion that cross-cultural contact on campus does not happen automatically (Otten, 2003; Sawir, 2013) and, contrary to Middlehurst and Woodfield's (2007) recommendation, universities do not appear to be finding mechanisms to integrate students. Sawir (2013) also highlights the fact that further research is warranted into the experiences of home students and this study addresses this gap by including in-depth interviews with two full-time UK students in phase two of the research.

This lack of integration was underlined by the obvious divide between full-time students, many of whom are international, and part-time students, most of whom are UK. Obviously, their lifestyles and working culture are different and this appeared to have produced a *'cultural rift'*, evoking strong emotions from Jo, a staff member who was pursuing his PhD part-time:

> *Cos it's very very difficult with the PhD students that we have in the department here because they are all full-time, that's all they do … and it's amazing the things they get hang-ups about, in terms of where they can go for coffee, how much paper they can get and that kind of stuff … and I must say, I find our departmental PhD students intensely irritating.*

There seems to be a general lack of awareness of the issues of social and academic isolation among supervisors and institutions. Indeed, strategies to overcome this isolation are not embedded within university cultures and appear to depend on the motivation of individuals. For example, few supervisors mentioned the issue of cultural, social and academic isolation for their students and only one, Professor Gelling, spoke of a deliberate strategy to address such issues:

> *Erm, I was Director of Research before I took over this role and I sort of brought to the system very much more cohorts of research students. So, previously, they would come in at different times of the year and, at one point, they were described as Phantom of the Opera because you would see them at odd hours in the corridors and there was no community and so I sort of brought in more of a cohort approach where we had more fixed events like seminars and social events and things. And that worked very well in terms of self-help groups for that particular three year period as that group moved through, it worked well. We've become a little more fragmented again but Harry will tell you, he's Director of Research, what he's doing in that respect.*

As mentioned earlier, this appears to support research which has found that, despite the recognition that a vibrant research community is vital to a successful experience and completion, few universities have strategies in place to support this (Kemp *et al,* 2008; Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014). In fact, the fact that culturally bound communities have taken shape on campus seems to actively work against the development of a vibrant, intercultural research community.

6.7. The supervisory relationship

Despite the fact that there is a general consensus in the literature that the supervisory relationship is a key factor in the PhD experience, it is also recognised that it is under-researched (Wisker, 2005; Halse and Malfroy, 2010). This, coupled with the recognition that, despite the academic being a key player in the internationalisation of Higher Education, their experiences are rarely exposed to critical examination (Trahar and Hyland, 2011), led me to explore this relationship in some depth in the conversations and it was commonly agreed by both students and supervisors that the relationship was of great importance. We discussed several facets of the relationship including its basic workings, such as regularity of meetings and who instigated the meetings. I also asked students and supervisors their opinions regarding good and bad relationships and how problems within supervisory relationships were dealt with. It could be claimed that the most interesting discussions, particularly in light of the aim of this study to identify constraints within the PhD process, related to respondents' perceptions of the extent to which supervisors influenced students' approach to their subject or inhibited their creativity. As Salmon (1992) points out, there are power dynamics at play within the supervisory relationship which are very rarely voiced in research and this study explores some of these power dynamics.

6.7.1. Workings of the relationship

The first element of the supervisory relationship which was discussed was what can be described as the workings of the relationship, for example the regularity and format of meetings and speed and quality of feedback.

With regard to the regularity of meetings, most respondents met with their supervisors either once or twice a month. The only two exceptions to this were a student whose supervisor is regularly out of the country and a British member of staff who had only met with his supervisor formally on two occasions. However, it was noted that he, and the only other British full-time student, were the only two respondents to mention casual meetings or chats with their supervisors. It could be argued that these informal meetings offer British students more mentoring experiences than international students. However, the member of staff did imply that this lack of formality may be impeding his progress:

> *So, we spend a lot of time working together so the PhD doesn't happen sort of separately from that, it's linked in with that and we end up in a discussion about the class, which ends up being a discussion about the PhD. It's interesting and, in that respect, it's good that the research is informing the teaching but it doesn't always help with the research.*

On the whole, the students seemed happy with the meeting arrangements but several students implied that they would have liked to meet their supervisors more often. In line with Green and Usher's view of *'fast supervision for fast times'* (2003:44), Kim Sun also suggested that time restrictions in the meetings were limiting discussions:

> *But, you know, time … when you are tied to time schedule, you can't really discuss all things. After one month, later or two months later, it's forget little half the things and when I go back again to the same point, it's kind of lost.*

Some students also suggested that more regular and informal meetings may foster a more relaxed relationship and lead to improved communication. Kim Sun

highlighted the differences in supervisory approach, supporting Kemp *et al's* (2008)

findings that supervisory practices vary widely:

> *So, it's all the time (…) stuck to the official relationship, nothing more than that. So, it depends on what the supervisor wants from the relations with the student. If they want only official relationship, they will have only official. But, it depends on the supervisor. Some supervisors, they want to have more than official, they go out more regular some kind of dinner or lunch, so they're meeting some different place and it's quite friendly.*

This also appears to reinforce the view of the power held by the supervisor

within the relationship and the effect that can have on the quality of

communication between student and supervisor (Grant, 1999; Deuchar,

2008).

Several authors suggest that, in a climate where the emphasis is placed on

successful, timely completion, 'fast supervision' is needed (Green and Usher, 2003;

McCallin and Nayar, 2011). This means that:

> *Supervisors need to be readily available, be succinct and speedy in their feedback, smart in their guidance along projected timelines, and resistant to intellectual meanderings*. (Green and Usher, 2003:44).

However, if the purpose of the PhD is to make a contribution to knowledge, then it

could be argued that these '*intellectual meanderings'* are essential to creativity and

sharing of ideas. The concept of fast supervision and a formulaic system inevitably

influences the nature and evolution of the PhD. However, responses from my

students seemed to endorse the wish for fast supervision, as a significant number

of them cited availability of supervisors and quality and speed of feedback as an

important element of the supervisory relationship. Natalie praised the accessibility

of her supervisor:

> *Even if he's not in the department, you send e-mail to him, he will respond immediately.*

Similarly, Perry highlighted the importance of feedback to his experience:

> *On the whole, my supervisory relationship with Jane was, is, wonderful. I give her piles of complicated stuff, you get it back 48/72 hours later, read and annotated, 99% of the time with sensible comments. So, I have no problem with that side of things at all.*

In the same vein, Natalie, who had experienced difficulties in her relationship with a

supervisor mentioned the quality of feedback as the main contributing factor,

commenting, *'I didn't get any benefit or feedback.'*

Supervisors recognised that PhD supervision was one of many roles they were

required to carry out as academics but were also keenly aware of time constraints

and the need to adopt fast supervision practices. As Dr Forrester explained:

> *Um … I have the slight … I'm not sure if it's advantage or disadvantage … I have the slight difference, in that I'm Deputy Head of School, and, as Deputy Head of School, that means my time is a little more constrained than some other people. What that also means is that I therefore make my time available … when I'm not elsewhere … as available as I possibly can to anyone who wants to come along and see me. So, I do have a fairly open policy in terms of that, but it is sometimes difficult for my PhD students to find a time when I'm not elsewhere, either in the University or in the School or, indeed, in the country.*

Despite Halse and Malfroy's (2010) claim that supervisory styles have become more interventionist, the students all stated that they instigated supervisory meetings and, although the format of meetings varied according to the stage at which they were at in the PhD process, they generally took the form of a discussion based upon a piece of written work.

Several supervisors recognised that a *'one size of supervision fits all'* (McCallin and Nayar, 2012:64) approach is no longer tenable and supported findings that supervisors treated each student as an individual case and responded to any faltering in the progress of the student's PhD by reassessing the student's capacities and exerting more control over the process (Hockey, 1997; McCallin and Nayar, 2012).

 As Dr Forrester said:

> *It varies by PhD student. So, there are some PhD students where you can leave it very firmly in their court because you know, if they need to see you, they will come and see you. And there are some PhD students where you know you have to organise a meeting or they'll never see you at all … and there are some where you need to organise the meeting because they need that, um, structure. And there are some where you need to organise the meeting because, if you don't, they'll forget because they are so involved in what they're doing that they don't realise that they haven't seen you for a bit.*

However, having suggested that he adapts his supervisory style to each student, he then goes on to talk about supervision as a process with different stages, with no further mention of individuals and their needs, appearing to corroborate Deuchar's (2008) view that supervisors are reluctant to be vary their working practices and supervisory styles.

Dr Forrester did recognise the fact that supervision requires a delicate balance of control and freedom with regard to the management of the student's research process (Hockey, 1997) and that the balance of control and freedom often changes during the course of the journey:

> *And it does vary, obviously, from different stages of the process, so, fairly obviously, in the early stages of the process, you probably need to meet a little more frequently so that you understand and they understand what the process is and what it's about, get through the literature review, get into the methodology. At that point, to some extent, in terms of data collection, they just have to go away and do it and it's then just a matter of touching base and making sure there aren't any issues and so on. And then, data entry, initial data analysis, again, there probably isn't a great deal you can do at that point, but, once there are some results, whatever those might be and whatever form that might be, then you need to get together again to identify what's going on and what needs to be done, what have they found out, what do you think might be interesting areas to pursue, and, therefore, how the analysis is going to go and then you can let them get on with that again and then there's a bit later on where you come back and say, 'Right, let's actually see what you're doing.'*

6.7.2. Interpersonal skills and intercultural communication

When I asked students what they felt was important in forming a good relationship with their supervisor, most of the respondents mentioned interpersonal or communication skills, thus corroborating findings in the literature on cross-cultural supervision that effective communication is essential to good student-supervisor relationships (Adams and Cargill, 2003; Deuchar, 2008). Theo praised the communication skills of his supervisor:

> *I like the fact that he doesn't like, he is Mr International Tourism and he is very down-to earth and he chats like a friend and a normal person. I really like that.*

Natalie referred specifically to the cross-cultural understanding that one of her supervisors showed:

> *He knows international students' difficulties and he care about his students. ... I think he know our culture as well …he know international students' national culture and he know how to supervise based on a student's personality.*

Natalie's comment seems to suggest that there may be pockets of understanding within universities, apparently, at first glance, contradicting much of the literature on internationalisation which claims that UK academics remain blind to their own academic culture and are reluctant to adapt (Trahar, 2011; Haigh, 2014). However, it can be argued that being sensitive to students' needs is not the same as embedding cultural knowledge exchange.

Perry mentioned interpersonal skills as important but reflected that these were secondary to an interest and understanding of his topic:

> *The rest are the interpersonal skills, by and large fine, but Jane could have wonderful interpersonal skills, we could have many chats, meals or the proverbial pint or whatever but, if she's not remotely interested or intellectually engaged with the topic, what the hell's the point?*

It should be noted that this student was a mature, UK student, living in his home town and therefore did not feel he had any issues with communicating with his supervisor or feelings of isolation. This may account for the fact that he put interpersonal skills as a lower priority than other students.

However, a significant number of students also mentioned that they would rather their supervisors were more explicit and direct about their expectations regarding basic matters such as how to address them and more complex issues such as boundaries in their relationship. This appears to support the view of authors such as Burns *et al* (1999) and Lee (2008) who highlight the importance of discussion regarding roles and expectations with the supervisory relationship in order to minimise a mismatch in expectations.

Despite the increasing numbers of research students and the pressure for timely completions, the majority of supervisors were categorical in their assertion that they benefited hugely from the PhD supervision process and enjoyed the personal relationships involved. Most cited it as an '*enjoyable part of the job*' and spoke of the '*huge gains*' in terms of '*intense interaction*', '*real immersion in the subject*' and '*intellectual proximity*' to people. One supervisor described it as '*challenging and stimulating*' and spoke of '*investing time*' in the relationship.

Despite the debates in the literature regarding the one-to-one relationship (Deem and Brehony, 2000), supervisors, in the main, highlighted this personal relationship with the student as one of the most important ingredients for successful supervision. Dr Butcher went as far as to say that it was necessary in order for the process to reach a successful outcome, echoing Brydon and Fleming's (2011) view that valuable supervision is brought about by forming an effective working relationship:

> *If you don't have that relationship, then it's not going to work because it is an emotional experience for both parties, so you have to build that sort of background up …*

Some students were honest enough to admit that they had had problems with their supervisory relationship and, echoing Deuchar (2008), it appeared they felt that issues of communication or the supervisor's interpersonal skills were at the core of the difficulties. Natalie talked of the problems involved in her first supervisory relationships and the way in which her supervisor dominated discussions:

> *Because, er, it was awful supervision, I have to say. Because I am doing the supervision during the meeting, I am not allowed to talk a single word, always listen to him talking about history … that's his major … Glasgow history. (…) I didn't get any benefit or feedback.*

It was notable that, although Natalie was honest enough with me to describe her supervision as *'awful',* she had not felt empowered enough to challenge her supervisor during their meetings.

6.7.3. Trust, honesty and respect

Several students cited *'trust', 'honesty'* or *'respect'* as key factors in the relationship. When I probed further into what they meant by these expressions, I received a variety of answers, demonstrating the importance of the role of language and how it is used and received.

One student, Jo, linked trust to honesty and a mutual respect. When first asked, he said:

> *Well, I think you need trust, you need respect and you need honesty.*

He went on to talk about his supervisor being honest in his assessment of his work and showing respect for his ideas. When I queried what he had meant by trust, he responded:

> *I mean honesty. I mean, sort of, saying it the way it is… if something's rubbish, say it's rubbish and don't sort of pussyfoot around and pretend … I would include in it saying things that you don't particularly want to hear because, at the end of the day, if you don't say them, you just end up wasting time. … So, I think that's what I mean about trust, in terms of being able to be fairly brutal and frank about things.*

This reflects the findings of Brydon and Fleming (2011) that an effective working relationship requires supervisors and students to be open and honest. However, it is interesting to contrast Jo's view, as a male staff member with Natalie, a female international student, who does not feel empowered to undertake these negotiations. In other words, this open, honest relationship may be much more difficult for female, international students who have cultural, linguistic and gender barriers to overcome when challenging a male, western supervisor.

Several supervisors also mentioned trust as an important element in the relationship and made the connection between trust and openness, leading to an ability to accept criticism, echoing Deuchar's (2008) concept of the supervisor as a critical friend. Dr Butcher explained his perception of trust:

> *A relationship where you can say what you think and the student's able to handle that. So, it has to be open … if you can't get to that stage, then, at some point the likelihood is that there's going to be a problem … but you have to establish that the student trusts you and will be open to what you say and for them to respond to …*

This also appears to support Hockey's (1997:49) findings that *'supervision is then a complex synthesis of criticism and assistance which practitioners can find difficult to disentangle.'*

Respect was another word which was mentioned several times by students in our discussion of qualities of a good relationship. Theo made the link between respect and experience:

> *First, you have to have a lot of respect for your supervisor. Um, if you think your supervisor has been there and done it, you feel more secure. If you don't respect your supervisor enough, you can have some doubts. But if you get some advice from someone who has been there, done it and has the t-shirt to prove it, you are OK.*

Kim Sun, who felt she and her supervisor had a poor relationship, made the following comment, implying that she felt that her supervisor had shown her a lack of respect:

> *One of my second supervisor … the previous one … she doesn't want me to send e-mail, she want me to fill out the form in front of her door, her free time. I feel I was treated as Masters or undergraduate student, so I was not a bit happy about that.*

This comment directly supports Rizvi's (2010) findings regarding the feelings of marginalisation of some international doctoral students as they perceive they are treated in the same way as undergraduates after many years of prior learning and experience in their home countries. This seems to relate back to academics problematizing international students and placing them in a discourse of deficiency (Koehne, 2004). This loss of status can hinder their transition along their journey to fully identify as a research student (Deem and Brehony, 2000).

Several of the students showed signs of having so much respect for their supervisors that they were in awe of them, as in the master and apprentice model (McCormack, 2004). For Theo, there was an inference that this encouraged him in his work, as he was keen to impress his *'hero'*:

> *Er, first of all, when I grow up, I want to be like him. Of course, it's kind of awe, like a shock and awe factor. One minute you read the book and the next you meet the person in the room.*

However, in several cases, it appeared that the issue of respect, possibly for cultural and linguistic reasons, was having a negative effect on the relationship, in that students were unable to communicate and express themselves effectively during meetings with supervisors. This supported the findings of Fotovatian and Miller (2014) regarding the struggles of international students to overcome language and cultural barriers in order to progress in the western academic environment. Kim Sun explained how her respect led to nervousness, exacerbated her language difficulties and inhibited communication:

> *Yeah, I'm always nervous for the meeting with my supervisor. That's the reason I can't really talk much and, whatever he suggests, I needed to kind of give him my opinion but, in that spot, my brain kind of doesn't work, you know. It's like sitting there in front of professors.*

One of the supervisors, Professor Brown, also recognised that respect or awe could become a negative factor in terms of a student's progress towards autonomous learning and ownership of their work:

> *I think one of the things and, I guess Kim Sun is an example of this and so are others, is that they think their supervisors …me, in this case …is a fountain of all knowledge and that you know everything. … And*

200

> *it's quite a long time …you know, getting them to have the confidence*
> *to say 'I think this is the best way of doing this, for these reasons'*
> *rather than saying to me 'Well, what shall I do now?'*

It appears that some students are mindful of the balance of power within the supervisory relationship and that their interactions can be hindered by their perceptions of hierarchy between students and academics (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014). In this way, they position themselves in a subordinate role and adopt discursive practices which reflect their position (Fairclough, 2001). As has already been stated, there is agreement in the literature that this hidden power is under-researched (Salmon, 1992; Deuchar, 2008) and it is a theme which is explored in more detail in the second phase of my research.

6.7.4. Difficulties within relationship

As I have already mentioned, some of the students did refer to difficulties they had encountered within their supervisory relationships. Some of the reasons they offered for these difficulties, such as poor interpersonal skills, lack of respect and poor-quality feedback, have been discussed above.

Of the four students who expressed dissatisfaction with their supervisory experience, two did so with some reluctance, whereas the other two were fairly forthright in their views. My explanation for this difference in attitude would be both cultural and linked to the stage the student was at in the doctoral process. The first student, Perry, was British and appeared to have no qualms in telling me:

> *My original second supervisor, we've now replaced, just wasn't going*
> *well, he was in the hospitality industry, managing a five star property,*

> *type of thing, no conceptual base, no concept of what we were trying to do and, in formally or formally, I'm not sure, we've replaced him now.*

The second student, Natalie, had had major problems in her first viva, following a very difficult supervisory relationship, and was awaiting her second viva. She was very frank regarding her first supervisor, *'Because it was awful supervision, I have to say.'*

She also reminded me that she was a customer and expected value for money, reflecting de Vita's (2003) and Bilecen's (2013) concerns that international students, in particular, are increasingly regarding education as a commodity for which they have paid:

> *I am not satisfied at all … because he is wasting my time and my money.*

The final student, Kim Sun, was the least forthcoming when asked about her relationship with her supervisor and said, *'Oh! That is really difficult thing to say.'* I suspect this reluctance was, in the main, influenced by her culture as it was the first time we had met and she was hesitant to complain. However, when she did begin to discuss the issues, she also reflected upon the improvements in the relationship which had taken place over time. Interestingly, she implied that these improvements had only started to happen when she had learned how to adapt to his boundaries, again highlighting the need to discuss expectations and roles at the outset of the relationship (Lee, 2008). Her comments also suggest that the supervisor holds the power within the relationship and the student is expected to conform to his wishes, following a dictatorial supervisory style (Gatfield, 2005):

> *It is getting better now. I learn to adapt to him, to his boundaries.*

Some students had attempted to change their supervisors and had been met with reluctance on the part of the University to do this. Natalie described her feelings that the University had employed delaying tactics when dealing with a difficult supervisory situation:

> *[I complained] a lot. The department just don't want to solve it … they just want to leave it. And, er, before, the previous PhD Research Director asked me to finish my Literature Review and, after complete my Literature Review, then she will allow me to change my supervisor. But, even now, I nearly complete my PhD, but I am still doing Literature Review.*

The students' feelings of dissatisfaction with their experience and their perceptions that there are few mechanisms in place to monitor or solve any problems appear to reflect the traditional individual approach to supervision. It has been argued that this solo approach potentially allows the supervisor to exert a great deal of power over the student (Gatfield, 2005; Lee, 2008) and, while processes such as supervisory teams are in place, my interviews appeared to indicate that these arrangements are often, at worst, a formality and, at best ad hoc, contrary to the recommendations of the Quality Assurance Agency (2011). In fact, institutions by and large appeared to be paying lip service to the concept of supervisory teams and, in fact, the majority of supervision takes place following the traditional model (McCallin and Nayar, 2011). As Dr Butcher said:

> *To be perfectly honest, again it's a ticking box exercise. In all cases, my second supervisor has never participated in any meeting with the student.*

Professor Brown illustrated the ad hoc nature of the arrangements within one institution, reflecting Kemp *et al's* (2008) findings that supervisory arrangements vary widely within institutions:

> *Different approaches and you should ask Sean Bond about this … he has a different approach … he tends to treat me as a bit more of a longstop. So, in other words, all the meetings are with Sean and his student and then, from time to time, they kind of come to give me a report on what they're doing, to get a second opinion. Now, he may be doing that with me because I'm an experienced supervisor … it may be that, if he had an inexperienced supervisor, he would involve them in the team, in the way that I do.*

There also appeared to be issues raised by having two supervisors. Natalie, for example, said that her two supervisors had contrasting approaches:

> *Actually, I would say, all those supervisors actually, they allow you to develop yourself and, um, Doctor X, his style is more control, he would like to … he would like his student follow what he say. But T is different, T … I think T's style, he would prefer students develop themselves, because that is your subject. So, there is a big difference about the supervision with two my supervisors.*

This raised obvious issues regarding the use of supervisory teams which is encouraged by the QAA Code of Practice (2011) and disparity of styles leading to possible confusion so I asked the student concerned about this and she responded fairly positively:

> *At the beginning, it is very difficult for me to … to judge also their style, but … anyway, I am the student, I have to accommodate both my supervisors' styles. I think that's the job of the student.*

However, her view that she had to adapt to each of her supervisors seemed to support Trahar's (2011) findings that many academics are either unwilling or unconvinced of the need to adapt to international students.

Supervisors, in the main, were keen to deny any conflict or confusion arising from dual supervision. However, Dr Forrester admitted that disagreements did occur but he seemed to be of the opinion that they managed to hide those from the student:

> *I don't think so, I haven't come across any conflict in the time that I've been supervising … not, um, serious conflict. There have been times when I've been rather cross with a second supervisor in a meeting and had to bite my lip and go back to them later. But, nothing, no long-standing or serious conflict in any way, shape or form.*

Recent literature has highlighted the increasing emphasis and scrutiny placed on research supervisor training (McCallin and Nayar, 2011) and attempts that are being made to standardise and increase the quality of research supervision. However, these interviews appeared to demonstrate that formal research supervisor training had only been put in place in recent years and was generally aimed at new staff. Many of the longstanding supervisors had had no formal training and appeared to retain very powerful status within the doctoral process and as gatekeepers of existing *'academic tribes'* (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014). In addition, none of the supervisors was aware of any institutional training for supervisors in cultural awareness or sensitivity.

Professor Brown did talk of supervisor training and described the changes in training over recent years:

> *So, five years ago, it was just sitting by Nellie. So, the training is still a little bit sitting by Nellie but it is now a bit more than sitting by Nellie because all newly appointed tutors and lecturers have to do a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice as part of their probationary period and that includes Research Supervision.*

Professor Brown's institution appeared to place as much importance on the mentoring of new research supervisors than the formal training, whereas Dr Butcher at Strathclyde rued the fact that a mentoring scheme did not exist, again highlighting the ad hoc nature of training for supervisors, seeming to support Kemp *et al's* (2008) view that supervision practices vary widely across the UK.:

> *There was a course at Strathclyde that all supervisors have to go through. In the past, I think it was a fairly light touch. I think it's got a slightly heavier touch now. But, it is almost a case of, not an MOT, but it's more a case of ticking boxes than anything else. I think, in the past, it has been a ticking box sort of exercise, But, yes, there is something here but what there isn't here, which is probably of more significance, there's not a system whereby new supervisors are mentored.*

Dr Butcher was openly critical about the supervisory model within the UK, commenting:

> *What there isn't here, which is probably of more significance, there's not a system whereby new supervisors are mentored. Basically, you are given someone to look after and that's it, which I don't think is ideal in some ways. And, that's the thing, when you actually think about the model, the model is actually very archaic. In some ways, the danger of the system is that it clones itself, which I guess is the weakness of the UK system.*

Burgess' (1996) and Hockey's (1997) research pointed out that there did not appear to have been much evaluation of the content and effectiveness of research supervisor training programmes at that time and my findings seem to indicate that

this situation has not changed greatly in the intervening period. As a result, as Dr Butcher stated, the system is in danger of *'cloning* itself' with the supervisory process rooted in a particular culture and way of seeing the world, which reinforces the traditional system and values.

6.8.   Doctorateness

There has been significant debate in the past twenty years regarding the nature and purpose of the British PhD (Turner and McAlpine, 2011). Fuelled by increasing concerns over submission rates and completion times, a debate has existed for many years as to whether the PhD process is one of '*training or scholarship*' (Pole 2000) or, in other terms *'training'* or *'authorship'* (Salmon, 1992). Pole suggests that the doctorate is no longer the main route to highly specialised, expert knowledge but states that the real facts regarding what is gained by the process of doctoral study should come from students. He found that students viewed skills-based training as the main gain from their doctorate and that they either took substantive knowledge for granted or, worse, viewed it as of secondary importance.

These findings were mirrored in my conversations with students. When asked what they felt they had gained or would gain from the doctoral process, initial reactions from all respondents referred to transferable skills. The majority mentioned research skills and others included other academic skills such as critical and analytical thinking and the ability to organise ideas. Several respondents also talked about personal skills they had gained, such as networking, *'using people to your advantage'* and negotiation skills. Two of the students also described the teaching experience that they had gained within the department as *'valuable'*. Other gains

mentioned included opportunities to publish and present papers at conferences, thereby furthering one's academic career and gaining entry into the Academy of Tourism and Hospitality studies. These views seem to support findings that, in the knowledge economy, the main purpose of the PhD is no longer to create new knowledge (Green and Usher, 2003; McAlpine, 2011). This has implications for how we value the knowledge being produced and what we understand to be tourism knowledge. If the main purpose of the PhD is not to create new knowledge, it calls into question where any new diverse knowledge perspectives will emanate from (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). This debate surrounding the role of the doctorate is explored in more depth in phase two of my study.

When asked what was considered as the most important gain of the PhD process, the most unpredictable response was *'It'll have been having three years to think about what I want to do with my future.'* There is no evidence in the literature that students embark upon a PhD as a means to delay any decisions about their future.

Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, given Pole's findings (2000), none of the respondents mentioned expertise or substantive knowledge without being prompted. However, once I questioned them on the subject of expertise, only one student considered himself to be an expert in his subject. Several others described how they had expected to be experts in their field prior to commencing their doctorate but how, in fact, they now did not perceive this to be the case. Kim Sun described her feelings as she progressed through the PhD process:

> *Initially people start 'Oooh, I can do lots of things and I can write down*
> *a lot of things and I can research' but, in the end, most people seems*
> *like they kind of lost the sense of direction and confidence because,*
> *when you dig more and more, you realise that there a lot of things to*

> *know about and still you don't know many things and that you feel like so, um … I don't know, it's like my expectations too high but some reality can't fit that expectation in the end and that gap is bigger and bigger.*

This statement appears to reflect findings that, during their PhD journey, students experience periods of self-doubt where they question the knowledge they have gained (Owler, 2010; Amran and Ibrahim, 2011).

Two of the students displayed a surprisingly negative response to the suggestion that they may be experts or specialists in their field. For example, Jo spoke of his desire to complete his PhD but not to limit his future research career to the area he had researched for the PhD:

> *I know too many people who have done a PhD and ended up hating it so much they wanted nothing more to do with it afterwards. So, I think to tie yourself … to put yourself into a box and force yourself into that particular field for the rest of your life, I think would be mind-numbing.*

Theo appeared to regard any suggestion that he would be an expert in his field as arrogant and added:

> *What is an expert anyway? … No, I mean, if you sit down and say, 'I'm an expert now', you have lost before you've even started … there's always something to learn.*

Pole (2000) suggests that transferable skills owe their appeal to the lack of job opportunities for postgraduates and this view seems to have been substantiated by the comments of the respondents. Tammy explained:

> *If I think only about PhD, knowledge is more important, but if I think about my career in the future, skills will be more useful for me, because in Japan, Tourism Studies is not popular at all so it's difficult to find a job in a tourism research company (…) so, if I want to get a job in a normal research company, research methods or conducting research and other skills will be more useful for me.*

This feeling was echoed by one of the supervisors who emphasised the importance of research skills over substantive knowledge, stating '*They are probably the thing that's durable about the PhD … its contents will go very quickly.*' These comments suggest that both supervisors and students value the development of the person over the product (McAlpine, 2011).

The emphasis that students appear to place on transferable skills may well have been encouraged by the compulsory methods and employment related training which now forms part of the PhD process. Salmon (1992:16) argues that this training curbs creativity and states that the '*view of research knowledge as something to be acquired by training must ultimately reduce it to specific skills relating to already defined problems'.*

The Winfield Task Report (1987) concluded in favour of taught courses on research methodology but noted that PhD students they interviewed saw little value in them and this opinion was corroborated by Wilson (1987) who also was in favour of formal work training but acknowledged that students found it *'useless'.* He argues that training is only beneficial if it responds to the perceived needs of the students themselves. This suggests that universities' initiatives are not appropriate to the needs of the students and this, in turn, contributes to the lack of research communities and opportunities for knowledge exchange within departments which was considered earlier in the chapter.

The views of my respondents regarding research methods training were diverse but seemed, in the main, to corroborate the findings of previous research. There did appear to be a distinction between full-time and part-time students, in that the full-time students seemed to be more critical of the training than part-timers. There were several references to the fact that it didn't meet *'expectations',* supporting the view that students and supervisors often have different expectations of where the responsibility for learning lies (Brown, 2008). It was suggested by Jo, one of the part-time students, that the criticism may be explained by cultural differences and expectations, reflecting suggestions in the literature (Carroll and Ryan, 2007) that international students (which most of the full-time students interviewed were) expect a more didactic, all-encompassing approach to teaching.

> *… the M.Res has been very useful for me, although, if you speak to other people, particularly full-time PhD students, you may find they are quite critical of it. Um, I think there's the cultural thing there as well, in terms of what people get from it. Certainly, I approached the M.Res classes from the point of view of well, if I pick up two or three new things, that's great, whereas I think some people on the M.Res course expected every bit of it to relate directly to every bit of their PhD and, with 30/5 people in the room, all of whom are doing different things, there's no way that you can appeal to everybody.*

Several students appeared to reflect Wilson's (1987) views that the full-time students were critical of the training and felt it was not wholly appropriate for them. Perry, for example, appeared to find the training quite useful for his progress as a teacher but irrelevant to his own PhD:

> *Mmmm, for me, it was interesting … and, if I go on to a career in academia, I'll have to supervise dissertations and theses and, yes, it would be useful. For my own particular PhD research, no …*

Kim Sun explained that the training was too generic and was not did not respond to her perceived needs at the time:

> *I didn't really feel helpful initially but … and then, after I doing the second year, I kind of get idea when I go back to that material that I took the Research Methods Class. It helped me, so, kind of timing, I feel like the timing … and they needed to kind of divide each year of student to fit in each year's schedule. It's much better … better than trying to get everyone to explain the whole.*

Clearly, the fact that students do not appear to attach great importance to the substantive knowledge they are creating during the doctoral process has implications for the role of the doctorate as a mode of knowledge production. This, and the students and supervisors' role as co-creators and exchangers of tourism and hospitality knowledge, is fundamental to my theses and is an area that is explored in more depth in phase two of the fieldwork.

Whilst there is increasing emphasis on producing a 'professional researcher', it is still recognised that a PhD needs to make a significant contribution to the body of knowledge (QAA, 2011). The majority of respondents appeared to be well versed in their responses to the notion of their contribution to knowledge, in preparation for their viva. They seemed to have considered their contributions to the body of knowledge and were confident that their topic was either totally original or that their application of it was original. Perry, for example, exhibited confidence in the originality of his work:

> *Well, everybody's unfamiliar with it because nobody has done anything like this before. I think that's what a PhD should be.*

Some students also talked about creativity within their approach or methodology and regarded this as their original contribution to knowledge. Natalie said, '*The approach I have done has not been done before*' and Theo regarded his methodology as equally innovative *'I'm going to try to see if it can stand by itself and that will be new.'*

Supervisors appeared united in the fact that doctoral students were making a contribution to knowledge but, as Dr Forrester explained, the extent and form of that contribution varied between students:

> *By and large, I think most of the PhDs will make a contribution in terms of the content. Er, yeah, it's actually quite easy to make a contribution. I think a significant contribution is probably another challenge.*

Only one student, Jo, seemed to have doubts over the mode of knowledge (Gibbons et al, 1994) he was producing and feared that his work may not satisfy the original contribution to knowledge criterion of the PhD (QAA, 2011):

> *Now, is that a contribution to knowledge? The danger that I'm going to be in is that it is going to be very much a practical thing, rather than necessarily a theoretical model. (…) And I did have one quite long discussion with my supervisor whether I might not be better off doing a DBA rather than a PhD because, apparently, the requirements for the contribution to knowledge are less there than they would be in an, in inverted commas, proper PhD.*

The view that the requirements for a contribution to knowledge are less for a SBA than a 'proper' PhD appears to reflect findings in the research regarding stakeholders' perceptions of the validity and academic standing of newer forms of

doctorates (Denicolo and Park, 2010) and the role this scepticism plays in the ongoing debate regarding doctorateness.

6.9. Opportunities for intercultural knowledge exchange

Much of the existing literature highlights the tensions between independence and direction in the traditional supervisor-student relationship and some suggest that this balance changes as students' progress on their doctoral journey (Philips and Pugh, 1987). Others, however, suggest that there are hidden power agendas within this relationship (Grant, 1999) and that this results in an ongoing 'master and slave' interaction (2008). Deuchar (2008) acknowledges that there has been little research into this aspect of the relationship and I was keen to explore it, despite Lee's (2008:269) assertion that this would *'raise hackles amongst a powerful group.'* It seemed particularly pertinent in the light of the suggestions in existing literature that the heavily internationalised PhD community that exists in many UK universities should provide a perfect opportunity for intercultural knowledge exchange **(**Ryan, 2012**).**

Aware of the inhibitions and reluctance that may exist to discuss these issues, I began by probing into the amount of influence that supervisors had over the subject area and approach that students took in their PhDs.

Only one student was explicit regarding her supervisor's influence over her approach and choice of methods. She explained to me that the influence of her supervisors over her methodological choices was *'overwhelming'* and was frank enough to admit that she would not be using her chosen methodology if it had not

been for her supervisors. Having said that, she appeared fully committed to her somewhat alternative methods and content that they were appropriate and rewarding for her.

Perry also acknowledged that his supervisor had had some influence in the area of methodology, saying *'With the methodology side of things, she's certainly come up with some ideas.'*

Both these students are full-time British students, demonstrating that power imbalances are experienced by UK students as well as international students. However, I suspect the UK students were franker with me, and possibly themselves, than some of their international peer group regarding the influence their supervisors have had over their approach to their research.

Other students were less frank but implicitly hinted at their supervisors' involvement in their decisions regarding their approach. For example, Theo commented:

> *Well, first of all, I was trying to research altruism…. Now, we've decided, Professor B, to look at destinations and create a matrix …*

The shift from the use of the first person, I, to the plural, we, indicates that the decision to shift the focus of his study was, at best, a joint one.

Some supervisors appeared to be much more open and honest, with me and themselves, about their role as gatekeeper (Tribe, 2006) in the process and, ultimately, in the knowledge created. In fact, one intimated that the first decision where he held some considerable power was in whether to take on the supervision of a PhD in the first place:

> *I am very choosy about who I supervise. I only take on supervision in an area that generally interests me and fits with what I'm doing and an area that I think that I can gain something from it and I can actually give something to the student as well, in terms of so-called output.*

This is a form of institutionalism (Merton, 1973 in Tribe, 2010) whereby norms are set out by institutions for new areas of study in terms of what is to be studied and how it is to be studied.

Dr Butcher was frank in his description of the influential role he played in the PhD process of his students:

> *So, that was very much a case of … up until the very end … very hands-off. Thereafter, it was very much a case of right in there and just saying, right, this is what we're doing and when we're doing it … which, ideally, at that stage, you shouldn't be doing but …*

Professor Brown spoke of his frustration when students would not take direction from him:

> *Um, I think the worst kind, I find the most frustrating, is students who really haven't got a clue what they want to do and, when you try to give them a steer, they actually don't want to take a steer.*

This seems to support Haigh's (2014) findings that academic staff can be inflexible and believe that international students should fit in with their academic culture. Professor Brown then went on to admit that *'one or two, they've actually been my PhDs, not theirs',* corroborating Hockey's (1997) findings that, in a minority of cases, supervisors offer too much intellectual input into a student's work, meaning that the finished doctorate fails to meet the criterion of being an original piece of work by the student and produces reproductive, confirmatory knowledge (Ateljevic *et al.,* 2007).

Dr Forrester admitted to pushing students towards certain methodological approaches but defended this by suggesting that it had enhanced the student's experience:

> *…and we weren't actually pushing very hard. There was an open door there that said, 'Oh, actually, I haven't considered this before and I need to explore it' and, in exploring it, it opened up a new world of experience for her, which is why it's been such an exciting journey.*

At the same time, some students complained of a lack of direction and felt they would benefit from more input from their supervisors, reinforcing the tensions referred to in the literature regarding a mismatch of expectations along the PhD journey (Deuchar, 2008). Kim Sun described her frustration at having to find her own direction in her research:

> *He … normally he waits for me to get the direction first and then he give me some comment and at that time, he specifies. So, that is quite useful, but it's sometimes it's kind of frustrate too much … to find out by myself is, yeah, it's hard work.*

Perhaps surprisingly, when discussing which elements helped to create a good supervisory relationship, only one student mentioned a shared interest in the subject area. Perry, who did mention it, in fact, named it as the most important factor:

> *First and foremost, the supervisor must be interested in the topic. … If the supervisor isn't fundamentally interested in the topic, I don't think it's going to go anywhere. Erm, I would name that as the sole criterion. … if she's not remotely interested or intellectually engaged with the topic, what's the point?*

However, unlike the majority of students, several supervisors did mention a shared interest in the topic as an important factor and used terms such as '*excitement*' and '*buzz*' to describe the feelings that the PhD process should evoke. One said, '*I mean, if it's just a chore, it's soul destroying.*'

Professor Brown explained that this opportunity to share knowledge was one of the aspects of the relationship which he enjoyed most:

> *No, I have actually been blessed with some extraordinarily good PhD students who I've gained a lot from in the sense that their knowledge of the subject areas that they're looking at is better than mine, so I've actually learned from them.*

Dr Butcher echoed this view:

> *Research is the thing I think most of us are in this for, so it's an enjoyable part of the job and good to work one-to-one with somebody who is actually very very good as well.*

This contrasts with suggestions in the literature that UK academics are resistant to internationalisation (Haigh, 2014) and indicates that some supervisors are, in fact, aware of and excited by the opportunities for knowledge exchange. It may be that, in fact, institutional constraints are limiting opportunities for internationalisation and the second phase of research explores this suggestion in further depth.

Hockey (1997:60) suggests that an important aspect of the mentoring role of the supervisor is to encourage *'positive exposure of the student's intellectual talents'* and that this is most commonly achieved by encouraging students to publish their work and to participate in intellectual debate at conferences. However, the literature

also realises that individual supervisors have a major role to play as gatekeepers to the academic community (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014).

Many supervisors appeared to recognise the importance of this mentoring role and claimed to be actively encouraging their students to present at conference and to publish journal articles. Dr Butcher was very clear that he thought publishing was a positive and appeared to use publications or 'outputs' as a way of structuring the PhD process:

> *And the other thing as well is that I tend to work towards having very clear goals in terms of outputs. So, by the time he's finished his PhD, he'll have two to three, maybe four, articles published.*

Perry referred to publishing as something that was expected of him by his colleagues and the academic world, implying that it was part of the process of joining an academic tribe (Becher and Trowler, 2001):

> *It just seemed like part of playing the game, just something… you're expected to turn up for class, I would have thought it's just something you're expected to do.*

This view was shared by several supervisors, such as Dr Butcher:

> *In all cases, that's absolutely essential. It's very much part and parcel of the training. It's part of the process of showing the PhD is working.*

The issue of the amount of direction given and shared authorship of the work (Salmon, 1992) came up with regard to journal articles. Dr Butcher said:

> *They don't do it on their own. … I'd like to have a situation whereby I was casting an eye over it and putting my name on it. It's not like that, it really is not, it's a considerable amount of effort. And hopefully, over time, it becomes less, but I'm not entirely sure about that.*

In addition, it appears that not all supervisors share the view that publications are an essential part of the PhD process and when the students were asked whether they were actively encouraged to present or publish by their supervisors, there were mixed responses. There appeared to be several cases where there were differences of opinions between first and second supervisors as to the value of presenting and publishing and students were receiving mixed messages:

> *T, he really encourages his students to get their work published but, Dr X, I think this guy, he is really different. I think he just want you to get finished … he didn't encourage his students to publish their work. I don't know why …*

This seems to reflect the views in the literature that supervisors take individual approaches to the process and some feel that they and students need to be *'resistant to intellectual meanderings'* (Green and Usher, 2003:44). It also highlights the powerful position that supervisors hold as disciplinary gatekeepers (Green and Usher, 2003; Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014).

When asked about presenting papers at conferences, students generally were positive about the benefits. They seemed to view it as an opportunity for networking and knowledge exchange and one of the benefits that many students cited as most valuable was the opportunity to gain feedback from peers and new perspectives on your work from established academics and the confidence that this can give you. Natalie described the value of the feedback gained:

> *The opinion or suggestion they give you is very specific to your work. I think that's very important because, sometimes you just attend a conference […] and then they pick up some specific point … actually, normally you have ignored completely or perhaps your supervisor, he didn't realise.*

It was clear from these interviews, then, that both students and supervisors recognised the importance of knowledge dissemination and sharing as part of the PhD process but, as with so many aspects of the supervisory process, the extent to which students were actively encouraged and supported in their endeavours to place their work in the public domain appeared to vary according to the individual supervisor and student, once again highlighting the gatekeeping role of supervisors.

6.10. Summary and Conclusions

The exploratory conversations of phase one revealed that many factors are instrumental in shaping the PhD experience of both students and supervisors. Few studies have examined the doctoral student experience in an internationalised climate but the phase one interviews uncovered factors which appear in literature regarding either the PhD experience or the international student experience. There has been even less work focussed on the experience of supervisors in the contemporary UK Higher Education climate and it was apparent from the interviews that supervisors had given little consideration to the internationalised environment they were now working in.

The findings of the conversations corroborated previous literature which places the supervisory relationship at the heart of the doctoral process. Whilst challenging the suggestion that this relationship is untenable (Tennant, 2004), the research revealed highly individual approaches to supervision, which, in some instances, led to

confusion and dissatisfaction on the part of the students. However, the interviews also demonstrated that it was the personal nature of the relationship that was valued most highly, certainly by supervisors, and, indeed one could argue that it is the uniqueness of each experience which contributes to the creativity in knowledge production. However, what also came through in the interviews, albeit very discreetly, were hints of the power dynamics which were at play in the supervisory relationship, supporting suggestions in existing literature (Salmon, 1992; Grant, 1999; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014) that these dynamics exist but are rarely voiced in discussions regarding academic life. Students' perceptions of themselves as marginal confirmed the findings of Barron and Zeegers (2006) but very few students appeared to be challenging the hegemonic discourse, leading to, in many cases, the curbing of creativity on the part of the student, issues over control and ownership of the knowledge being created and a lack of opportunity for meaningful intercultural exchange. The individual nature of the mentoring process appears to give rise to a lack of scrutiny and opportunities for power to be wielded by supervisors. It has been suggested (Burgess, 1996; Hockey, 1997) that there has been a lack of evaluation of the content and effectiveness of research supervisor training programmes thus far but that improved training may go some way to averting any abuse of power. However, a heavy focus on training and standardisation of supervisory processes gives rise to concerns regarding a leaning towards model PhDs, where students are left less and less space to allow their own voices to be heard and reflect upon their own positionality within their research. Whereas calls are being made for the Academy of Tourism Studies to embrace hitherto marginalised voices (Botterill and Gale, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007), the findings of this chapter call into question whether we are, in fact, creating a supportive, encouraging environment in which these voices may flourish.

Whilst the supervisory relationship emerged as a key factor in the PhD experience, other issues were also highlighted as important by the students. It became clear that PhD students were on a transitional journey but, during that journey may have multiple identities and roles in life. In addition to the role of student, they may be husband or wife, son or daughter, mother or father, employee and so forth. In our discussion, it came through that their backgrounds and these external pressures on them were of great importance to them but the challenges of travelling this journey are often overlooked both in the literature and by supervisors and institutions. These factors are obviously significant for both home and international students but international students appeared to have added pressures, particularly regarding sponsorship, family upheaval and social isolation. Institutional responses to internationalisation often involve dedicated services for international student welfare support but these services are mainly targeted at undergraduate students who arrive in one cohort in September and are easily identifiable and accessible. In addition, there is little literature regarding the home student experience of internationalisation, particularly at doctoral level, but the conversations suggested that home students, being very much in the minority in the tourism and hospitality postgraduate community, are experiencing an enhanced feeling of isolation. It seems, then, that institutions need to address some of the issues facing the postgraduate community in their responses to the internationalisation agenda.

The conversations have shown that the PhD experience and, ultimately the creation of knowledge, are influenced by a series of issues, some very personal such as personal and educational background, motivations, external pressures and individual supervisory relationships, as well as linguistic and cultural constraints.

This means that each student's story, whilst sharing common features, is unique and, as Owler (2010) reminds us, there is little recognition of the passionate process and personal journey involved in knowledge production. The exploratory conversations with students and supervisors were invaluable in identifying key themes and strands of research to follow and the following chapter will explore these themes in more detail.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONSTRAINTS AROUND THE PHD JOURNEY

7.1.   Introduction

7.2.   The purpose of a PhD and the concept of doctorateness

7.3.   Constraints around the PhD journey

7.3.1. Isolation

7.3.2. Language

7.3.3. Personal pressures

7.3.4. Gatekeepers and sites of power

7.3.4.1.   Sponsors

7.3.4.2.   Supervisors

7.3.4.3.   External examiners

7.3.4.4.   Journal editors

7.4.   Summary

7.1. Introduction

Congruent with the emergent design of this study, phase two of the research developed from the exploratory conversations conducted during phase one of the study which revealed that the PhD experience is shaped by many factors, including isolation, language, external pressures and the supervisory relationship. Unsurprisingly, these findings corroborate previous literature which places the supervisory relationship at the heart of the process and suggests that power dynamics are at play in the supervisory relationship, although they are rarely voiced in discussions regarding academic life (Salmon, 1992; Deuchar, 2008). It seems that little emphasis has been placed on reflecting upon power relations within tourism studies, both in higher education institutions and in the wider Academy, particularly through the students' voice (Lee, 2008).

The following chapter, therefore, explores six different students' experiences and journeys towards the 'mysterious rite of passage' of the PhD (Owler, 2010) in more detail, by presenting the findings from in-depth interviews. It includes interviews with both home and international students as it recognises the key role that both play in the internationalisation process and the lack of research into the home student experience of undertaking doctoral studies in an internationalised environment. It also presents the results of in-depth interviews with six supervisors in an attempt to fill a gap in existing literature regarding the experiences and perceptions of academics of internationalising higher education (Trahar and Hyland, 2011). The interviews sought, in particular, to investigate the key role of the academic in both the PhD journey and the process of internationalisation.

This chapter explores the journeys of both students and academics and focuses on the hidden power and other constraints within the PhD process that were identified in the previous chapter. *On the surface, the doctoral environment seems to be a ripe environment for intercultural exchange and knowledge creation and the second phase of research aimed to explore whether the power and constraints identified* are curbing opportunities for intercultural exchange, creativity and the renewal of the canon of tourism knowledge. It questions whether students, academics and universities are, in fact, taking advantage of the opportunities provided by international doctoral students to access *'a breadth of knowledge about other cultures'* (Else, 2014) and *'question established knowledge'* (Smith et *al*., 2010).

This chapter, therefore, begins by exploring staff and students' perceptions of the purpose and role of the PhD as a rite of passage. It then turns to the constraints which surround the experience and may affect the journey and the outcomes. These include isolation, language issues, personal pressures and various gatekeepers and sites of power, including sponsors, supervisors, external examiners and journal editors. It then goes on to explore how this affects opportunities for intercultural exchange and for hitherto marginalised voices to challenge the dominant discourse.

The exploratory conversations also revealed that each doctorate is a personal and very individual journey for both students and supervisors. This journey is influenced by their cultural and personal background or Members Resources (Fairclough, 2001) and therefore, this chapter explores, through a critical language approach (Fairclough, 2014), how peoples' Members' Resources, or background knowledge

or experiences, influence their PhD experience. It considers these issues from the viewpoint that our identity gives us a status and structure of rights which shapes how we experience the PhD journey and our relationship with the gatekeepers along the way.

Critical language study also highlights the importance of self, which is generally ignored in tourism research (Hall, 2004; Tribe,2006). For this reason, I include my own voice in places throughout this chapter. I felt this was particularly important as I am entrenched within the PhD process and represent a significant body of PhD students who are rarely discussed in the literature, namely a part-time student who is a full-time academic. These students are increasingly common as UK universities seek to increase the number of academic staff who hold PhDs. A critical language approach calls for people to acknowledge their Members Resources, which are all the experiences in life which you can draw upon in order to interpret texts and conversations. With this in mind, whereas the previous chapter gave bare demographic details of the participants, this chapter provides a pen portrait of each of the students and supervisors in order to aid understanding of their interpretation of their experiences.

7.1.1. Participants and their members' resources

Figure 7.1. The students

Ruby	Katie
Ruby is a female student in her mid-20s from a small British coastal town. She has taken the traditional route from undergraduate studies in	Katie is a female student in her mid-40s from South West England. She attended a grammar school. She did not get the grades required to study her first choice of subject but went

Tourism to a full-time, fully-funded PhD. She was brought up on a Council Estate, her parents divorced when she was at primary school and she was the first in her family to go to university. She has completed her PhD in the past few months and has been teaching part-time throughout her PhD studies.

straight to University to pursue a degree in Social Studies. She then did a Master's Degree in Sport and Leisure and embarked upon her career. Having taken a career break to have children, she heard of an opportunity to pursue a PhD in a field in which she had experience. She is a full-time, fully-funded student in the third year of her PhD. She has funding for 3 years. She has 2 children and a husband and is juggling her PhD with bringing up her family.

Lydia

Lydia is a female student in her late-20s from Croatia. She did her undergraduate degree in Croatia in 2001, then went to London to do an MSc in Tourism Management. Following completion of her MSc, she returned to Croatia to work in the industry, before returning to the UK, to Strathclyde University, to start a PhD. She is partially sponsored and works within her university department to fund her studies. She has been doing her PhD for a year and a half. Both her parents are professors in Croatia and her father completed his PhD in the UK.

Changsai

Changsai is a 49 year old male student from Thailand. He worked in the hotel industry in Thailand for 13 years before becoming a university lecturer. He was sponsored by the Thai government to complete a Master's degree in Birmingham University and then returned to his job in Thailand in order to pay back his scholarship. Having done this, he returned to the UK and embarked upon a PhD at Strathclyde University. He is sponsored by the Thai government and has to pay back his loan to the university which employs him upon completion. He has been at Strathclyde for two and a half years and is President of the University Thai Society. He has no wife nor children.

Aiko

Hye

Aiko is a full-time, female student from Japan. She did her first degree in Tourism in Japan but, due to the lack of post-graduate Tourism degrees in Japan, she decided to come to the UK after completing her undergraduate degree. In order to reach the required level of English, she undertook a Masters pre-programme here at Surrey University and then continued to do a Masters in Tourism Development. She started her full-time PhD 4 months ago. She is doing a PhD because of a deep interest in her topic and to gain an advantage on the many Japanese graduates with Masters degrees as she wishes to be a researcher in industry in the future. She is in her early 20s and has no children. Her family is in Japan and she is sponsored by her parents.	Hye is a full-time, female student from South Korea. She studied Biology in South Korea and then studied a Masters in Tourism in Jameston University, Australia. She is now in the third year of her PhD in Tourism at Surrey University. She wishes to be a researcher in a university in the future, either in South Korea or an English speaking country. She is in her mid 20s with no children and no family in the UK. She is sponsored by her family.

Figure 7.2. The supervisors

Professor Jack Hunt	**Professor James Howells**
Jack Hunt is a Professor of Tourism. He undertook his undergraduate degree, Masters and PhD in London and has worked at 2 universities in the South East of England during his academic career. He has supervised 8 PhD students to completion and is currently supervising 10, all of whom are international students. He is the Editor of two prestigious Tourism journals and has been a panel member for the RAE.	James Howells is a Professor of Hospitality. After graduating, he worked for a large hotel chain and then was self-employed in the hospitality industry for 5 years. He spent six years at the University of Brighton before joining his current university 10 years ago. He achieved a PhD by publication and has been a panel member for the RAE. He has been supervising PhD students for 7 years and has supervised 4 to completion. He is currently supervising a further 9, all of whom are international students.

Professor Ron Wood	Professor Paul Evans
Ron Wood is a Professor of Tourism. He is in his mid 60s. He began his PhD in Glasgow but got a job in Canada when he had been studying for 3 years. It took him a further 6 years to complete his PhD. In the meantime, he had got married and had children. After several years in Canada, he returned to the UK and has worked in 2 prestigious universities. He has published many books and articles and is currently Editor Emeritus of a leading journal. He has supervised over 30 PhD students and is currently supervising 3.	Paul Evans is a Professor and was a research director in the public sector before moving into higher education. He has conducted extensive research in Africa and Asia and was responsible for setting up 2 overseas partnership programmes. He has supervised over 30 PhDs and is currently supervising 5 students.
Dr Charlotte Richards	**Dr Alex Price**
Charlotte Richards is a Reader in Tourism. After completing her MSc and PGCE, she embarked upon a teaching career at a FE College. After a short time, she returned to University to do a sponsored, full-time PhD. After submitting her PhD, she became a researcher in the public sector before returning to the university where she had done her PGCE and PhD, firstly as a researcher and then as a Lecturer. She has supervised 6 PhD students to completion and is currently supervising 7.	Alex Price is a Reader in Tourism. He began a funded PhD in the mid-1980s but, before completing, got a job as a researcher in the public sector. He, therefore, wrote up his PhD part-time whilst working. He worked for a further four years in the public sector before getting a job as a lecturer in tourism marketing in his current institution. He has supervised 13 PhDs to completion, 2 non-completions and is currently supervising 9 students.

7.2. The purpose of a PhD and the concept of doctorateness

During the exploratory conversations in phase one of my research, it emerged that students did not appear to attach great importance to the substantive knowledge they are creating during the doctoral process but considered the transferable skills gained as more important. Clearly, this has implications for the role of the doctorate as a mode of knowledge production and reflects the debate in the literature

regarding the purpose of the doctorate (McAlpine, 2011) and its traditional claim of being evidence of having made a significant and original contribution to knowledge (Kemp *et al.,* 2009). I was keen to explore more deeply in the interviews the perceptions of both students and staff of the role and purpose of the doctorate as it seemed to me that one's perception of the purpose of the PhD would impact upon the experience and, more particularly, upon the scope for creativity and reflexivity within the doctoral process of knowledge creation. Also, the phase one findings had raised questions regarding the future development and renewal of tourism's knowledge canon if PhDs were focussed on skills training, rather than knowledge creation and I was keen to explore these further.

Professor Wood was the only supervisor to specifically refer to the PhD as making a contribution to knowledge and seemed to recognise that he may be unusual in the contemporary environment, when he said:

> *If it's a true PhD, and this probably dates me, but, it's a new contribution to knowledge.*

His observation that this dates him appears to support Green and Usher (2003: 48) who observe that '*no longer is the creation of new knowledge the very purpose of the research process'* giving rise to a contest *'which pits the traditional values of the academy against the new values of the knowledge economy.'* This, in turn, presents a potential threat to the renewal and broadening of the tourism knowledge canon.

Ruby was aware of the concept of an original contribution to knowledge but did not seem very clear as to the meaning of the concept, corroborating

Denicolo's (2004) findings that it is difficult to define explicit assessment criteria for a doctorate:

> *No no I had no idea. I remember one of the first things that my supervisor did for me was I asked her 'What exactly is a PhD?' and she cut out this little bit of paper for me which said 'A PhD is an original contribution to knowledge' and it was just like, well how vague is that and you know I just had no idea, no idea because it is totally untaught isn't it.*

However, several of the supervisors, whilst not mentioning the original contribution to knowledge specifically, spoke of the fact that, as a Doctorate of Philosophy, students should engage with philosophy. For example, Professor Howells said:

> *Um, in some cases … I literally have discussion with the student and say, 'What does a PhD stand for, what's the Ph for? And what does that mean?' But, even doing that doesn't necessarily turn the switch on in their head. I mean, they just can't get to grips with it, in the minority of cases.*

Professor Hunt echoed this view, stating:

> *My students … I always say to my students, you are doing a PhD, what does that mean? A Doctor of Philosophy! (laughs) So, unless you have some understanding of the philosophy of knowledge, then it's going to be very difficult to get a PhD, which should rightfully bear its name, so I do encourage my students.*

In referring to a PhD which should *'rightfully bear its name',* Professor Hunt is acknowledging the clash between the way knowledge itself has been redefined in the knowledge economy and how the academy traditionally understands knowledge (Green and Usher, 2003). He prefers to define knowledge from an epistemological stance, rather than an economic one and appears to regard universities as

significant producers of knowledge, rather than *'agents of economic growth'* (Green and Usher, 2003:38).

Referring to a colleague and his student, Professor Howells also commented regarding the fact that knowledge within a PhD cannot be efficient managed as if you were '*painting by numbers'*:

> *But, the other week or month, he was saying that she suddenly got it, in the sense that the penny's clicked that it's about this kind of particular way of thinking that is to do with philosophical thinking, if you like, that it isn't a mechanistic process, that it isn't sort of painting by numbers, that it is an incredibly creative process, as well as being a very rigorous and empirical process.*

However, only Professor Hunt mentioned how he encouraged students to be reflexive and recognise their own culture in their work. He was the lone voice encouraging this reflexive approach, reflecting Phillimore and Goodson's (2004) comment that, tourism scholars are hesitant '*in their understanding of the philosophical and theoretical process that underpins knowledge production and practices'* (2004:4). This was perhaps not surprising if we consider the MR of Professor Hunt. Although he would qualify as one of the established elders of tourism studies, he is unusual as he has written various academic articles regarding the importance of reflexivity in tourism research. He commented:

> *It's impossible to do anything in a cultural vacuum, so our culture and our history and our embodiment determines so many of the things we do, really. So, it's inevitable that …and I'm taking the term cultural in its broadest terms … that people's culture, i.e. not just the culture of their everyday culture, but also their specific knowledge culture is going to determine … after all, their knowledge culture is, you know, a baggage of specific things they've done, so that's going to cause them to look at the world and record the world in a particular way. I very*

234

much encourage them to understand the relationship between themselves and their research and the research process.

He did, however, appreciate that many students found the philosophical and reflexive elements of the journey difficult:

> *I very much encourage them to understand the relationship between themselves and their research and the research process. So, yep, I very much encourage them to try to understand what knowledge creation means and that, er, it's a very difficult and problematic process, definitely.*

Only one supervisor mentioned creativity when talking about the PhD process. Professor Howells described a fairly mechanistic process but conceded:

> *So, it's a very logical, very deductive process that leads to a very specific outcome, and so forth. But I think there is scope for creativity, in the sense that … students can not only simply follow that logical deductive process that I've described, but they can also make breakthroughs in coming up with some original thinking in terms of theory development and make a contribution to theory.*

Whereas, in the first phase of conversations, I explicitly asked students about their contributions to knowledge, in these interviews, we talked what they felt they had gained or achieved during their PhD. Interestingly, none of the students referred to their contributions to knowledge, although some of them did appear to have embarked on the journey in the anticipation of becoming *'experts'* in their field. Whatever respondents deemed to be the purpose of the PhD, there was a consensus that the PhD is a journey or rite of passage. Therefore, before exploring the perceived gains at the end of the journey, it seems appropriate to investigate the journey itself and the concept of a PhD as a rite of passage which, upon completion,

bestows a new status and a new structure of rights upon a graduate (Fairclough, 2001; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014).

It became clear during the interviews that both students and supervisors appeared to support the views of authors such as Delamont *et al.* (1997) and Owler (2010) that the PhD was a rite of passage to becoming a fully-fledged scholar. However, before examining this view, it is necessary to examine the concepts of identity, status and subject positions. This is particularly important in this discussion chapter as it has been identified in the literature that the doctoral process is about the formation of an identity which is influenced by the process and the motivations for doing it (Hockey, 1991; Deem and Brehony, 2000; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014). In addition, the ease with which students make the transitional journey will be influenced by their identity or multiple identities at the beginning of the journey and the status which they confer upon the end goal which is the label of fully-fledged academic (Rizvi, 2005; Owler, 2010).

The structure of a university can be likened to Fairclough's (2001) explanation of subject positions within schools. He argues that a school is a social institution with a social order and an order of discourse. This involves the social space being structured into a set of situations and recognized social roles in which people participate in discourse. Within a university, it can be argued that each of us occupies a subject position, giving us access to certain rights and limited discoursal rights. Of course, many of us have '*multiple selves*' (Reinharz, 1997:3) and therefore occupy several subject positions, either within the university or wider society. However, within the PhD experience, we must occupy one of these subject positions, either as student or supervisor. Respondents occupying the subject

position of student appeared to show varying degrees of awareness of the limitations this imposes upon them and the power it bestows upon people in other subject positions within the institution, such as their supervisors.

Rizvi (2005:4) argues that the identities of international students are '*clearly shaped not only by their personal histories, cultural traditions and professional aspirations but are also continually reshaped by new cultural experiences, but in ways that are neither uniform nor predictable'.* From my interviews, it appears that this applies not only to international students but also UK students and that a student's perceptions of their own identity and position within the institution influences their PhD journey from the start.

For example, Ruby seems very aware of her subject position from an early age. She refers to *'the position I was allocated in life'* and this appears to have been a large motivator for her:

> *When I was quite young really like I think I always had it in my head like situations being in Aberystwyth, growing up in a council estate, I always had it in my head like 'I'm going to get out of here' and not even in a sense of working class hero type sense which I can be a little now … but I think there was always something, it's really hard to explain, there was always something in my head which was just like I knew I wasn't going to stay there I knew I wasn't going to stay in the position I was allocated in life really which sounds a bit odd.*

Me and my sister were interviewing each other and I said I want to go to University and I remember that was the thing from a very young age that I decided I wanted to do for no other reason other than it sounded quite grand really.

She clearly regards universities as offering an opportunity to move into a new, more elevated, subject position and demonstrates this by the use of the word *'grand'*. Ruby also talks of her gap year job as a waitress, and how peoples' negative attitudes to her during that time motivated her to go to university. She describes waitressing as a *'rubbish job'* and appears to recognise that one's subject position or employment status gives you respect and access to a new structure of rights. (Fairclough, 2001):

> *So I worked for half a year and worked as a waitress and really sort of taught myself that I didn't want to do a rubbish job because it's absolutely horrible and people look down on you and things and it was horrendous.*

Having successfully completed her first degree, Ruby applied to do a PhD at the same university. She makes it clear during her interview that, as an undergraduate, she formed good relationships with a small teaching team. However, universities are social institutions with social structures of their own and Ruby appears to recognise that structure and hold the academic staff in very high regard and in an elevated position in comparison to herself. This is evidenced by the use of an abstract *'they'* in several of her comments regarding the teaching staff and the use of the verb *'allow'* below:

So I went along and did the interview and really thought no way after the interview are they going to allow me to do it because it was really critical and quite academic.

Katie, however, seems more comfortable interacting with members of academic staff, which may be because she feels she has more commonalities with them in terms of age and gender:

> *I mean someone just came down now, a staff member and she said it was really nice to talk to me. Completely different ends and it's nice for me to say 'Well I've learnt from this. I'll do that'*

However, she describes herself and the staff member as being from *'completely different ends'*, which, when I probe, she explains as being in different positions in the academic hierarchy. Her MR as a practitioner in a field outside tourism, making the transition to a tourism PhD student (Brydon and Fleming, 2011) goes some way towards explaining the fact that she is flattered that the staff member has stopped to speak to her. Katie clearly respects the staff member's views (although they are both students in this case) and is immediately prepared to act upon her advice. Lydia, on the other hand, seems to consider academia as perfectly accessible to her, even though she is only a year and a half into her PhD. In fact, she talks about an academic career as a stepping stone on to *'something more challenging'*:

> *At first, I wanted to stay in academia, I see myself in an academic career, but I see myself in academic career as a starting point which is opening to me some other possibilities like working on a project and developing tourism in some places where tourism is not developed … And I think about doing it jointly ... academic career and then, when I establish myself, then I will have more chances to do something more, something more challenging.*

Lydia's attitude to the subject position of academics and her own transition into academia probably stems from the fact that both her parents are academics and she has grown up as the child of members of that tribe. With those Members'

Resources, it is, therefore, less likely that she will be in awe of the status of academics.

Aiko, however, seems to display some confusion over the subject position she holds in relation to her supervisor. She describes the high status which academics hold in Japan and how difficult she was finding it to adapt to the more informal approach at PhD level in the UK:

> *In Japan, in Japanese university, professors are very very high-level compared to student but, here, they try to treat us in equal.*

These cultural perceptions of the hierarchy between students and academics have implications for the internationalisation of knowledge. If students limit interactions to formal conversations with academics, they are positioning themselves with an institutional identity of a student, rather than an aspiring academic and exchange of knowledge will be limited (Fotovatian & Miller, 2014).

The interviews revealed, however, that, many students and supervisors, echoing the literature, regarded the PhD as a personal and transitional journey and as a rite of passage to constructing their identity firstly as a doctoral student and then as a bona fide academic (Delamont *et al.*, 1997; Brydon and Fleming, 2011).

Some express this transition in terms of career progression supporting the argument that international students' professional identities are in a state of *'becoming'* rather than *'arrival'* (Smith and Guarnizo, 1998:21, cited in Rizvi, 2010). For example, Changsai explains that a lecturer without a PhD in Thailand has a much lower status

than a '*Doctor*' and comments that '*in Thailand, the salary of a lecturer is very low*'. However, he goes on to talk of how the title of PhD gains you '*respect*' in Thailand and how he feels his career will be enhanced in the short-term because there are so few people with PhDs in Thailand. Changsai also seems to expect peoples' attitude towards him to change when he has gained his PhD, in terms of both career progression and his standing within the community in Thailand:

Yes, career progression and also that is Thai culture. In Thailand, when we have title of PhD, it helps you a lot …

One of the supervisors, Dr Richards, also recognised it was a rite of passage to a career for many, with this view appearing to stem from her own experiences:

I think some people would take it on for quite cynical reasons because you know, in this day and age you've simply got to have a PHD either to retain your job or to get another job somewhere else. I think that then links into someone's motivations for doing it. I suppose if I'm realistic that's why I did it…It's sort of about seeing the end product and where that potentially is going to take you, whether it's over here or back in your home country in terms of your future career, so I think that it's very much about career and career direction.

Other students focus less on career progression and more on their personal conversion (Delamont *et al*., 1997:327). For example, Katie describes her PhD as a '*journey*' which is '*about yourself.*' She uses expressions such as '*self-belief*', '*confidence*', '*how much you can still learn*' which, again, probably reflect her Members' Resources as someone who is in transition into academia. Expressions such as '*I'm in my early 40s*' and '*my brain's gone through a lot already*' reflect her perception of herself as more mature than her peers:

> *I mean, this isn't just about academia it's about yourself, it really is about yourself and I know again that's a bit of a cliché but it really is a journey about self-belief, confidence, your own ability, how much you can still learn. I mean I'm in my early 40's, you know, my brain's gone through a lot already, so it's, you know, when you get to that point when you actually click from everything that you've read about certain things that is fantastic but getting to that moment is really hard work, really hard work.*

Ruby, like Katie, talks of the difficult and lonely journey she has undertaken but acknowledges that it is a life-changing experience or 'personal *rite of passage*' (Delamont *et al., 1*997:327). However, her very different Members' Resources are apparent and refers several times to how '*different*' things would have been without her PhD, seemingly relating once again to her background:

> *It was like perhaps chance a bit of it that those chances came along but then sometimes you just think well was it just meant to be you know because I think if I hadn't have done the PHD my life would be entirely different right now, absolutely entirely different and so that's quite weird and I think through doing the PHD it wasn't really anything really about getting a PHD and learning about Tourism. My brain has expanded and I see things differently and I have grown up really in the process of it and I would be such a different person if I hadn't have done it which is really weird and sometimes you just think, was it meant to be?*

Ruby's self-doubt as a child where '*she was always very unsure of herself*' and her family '*didn't expect anything of her*' and her current view of herself as *'different person'* appears to echo Hockey's (1991) view that the formation of an identity during the PhD process is influenced by both the experience of the journey and the aspirations which accompany it:

> *I think I always knew somewhere in me that I had a brain and I had an ability to do things but I was always very unsure of myself and unaware*

of my ability because people at school hadn't encouraged me, my family didn't expect anything of me but there was this little thing, I don't know it's really hard to describe, in my head that was like 'I will achieve something' and I guess I see it now as the PHD means I have achieved something.

While recognising that the PhD is a rite of passage, several students mentioned that the path was not a smooth one and recognised the fluidity of their identities during the period (Deem and Brehony, 2000). For example, Changsai appears to have experienced fluidity in his identity during his journey from practitioner to academic and academic back to student (Otten, 2010). He demonstrates that, even with great experience, your identity is transformed by the PhD journey. He says:

It's strange. You spend years working in hotel, then become lecturer in own country. When you come here, you start again. You are just student – until you start to learn and you become more knowledgeable on subject …you feel good, like expert … and then next day, you think you know nothing again …

Ruby also seems to have struggled to identify her own subject position throughout the PhD process:

… and it takes you down all sorts of avenues doesn't it a PHD, like you're reading about different things and so there was a point where god I used to go out with people and I would start talking about absolute rubbish you know, like stuff, stuff that I had been reading and you would see people's eyes glaze over and you'd think my god, and I couldn't really talk about anything else at one point which is strange. You get so into it and you're so in your own head that you actually become a little bit like an eccentric weird academic you know and so it is quite strange and I am totally out of that now, totally away from that, don't talk about it anymore at all which is weird.

From this extract, Ruby appears to have experienced a temporary change of subject position. She seems to have regarded herself, temporarily, as *'an eccentric weird academic'* in the eyes of her social group but acknowledges that she is now *'totally*

away from that'. Interestingly, in other parts of the interview, her use of *'they'* when referring to fellow academics suggests that she did not really feel part of the academic tribe whilst carrying out her PhD and, from this extract, we can see that she also appears to have felt marginalised in relation to her friends outside academia (Brydon and Fleming, 2011). It appears, then, that the transition in identity can lead to uncertainty and the challenge of having multiple identities which can contribute towards students' isolation.

Katie, however, appears quite positive about the transition:

> *I do think it is going to open more doors for me. I don't know which doors yet … yeah I really do feel more like an academic and I feel much more in power of myself to be a bit more confident and believe more that what I do know should help …*

Despite appearing to share Ruby's view of academics and their elevated subject position, Katie acknowledges that she feels, after three years, she has undergone a change of subject position from an employee in the voluntary sector to an academic. However, she does acknowledge that she has experienced periods of self-doubt along the journey (Owler, 2010) with the expression '*it's taken me a while to actually call myself an academic*':

> *I think my problems have been, because I've been in the voluntary sector for so long, trying to become an academic, it's taken me a while to actually call myself an academic and what that entails. It's a bit of an education into academia, completely different to anything else.*

My own experience also involves periods of self-doubt and moments of *fear, inferiority, darkness and invisibility'* (Amran and Ibrahim, 2011:531). Despite being

244

a fully-fledged lecturer, I have struggled to develop my skills and identity as a researcher at the same time as juggling my personal and professional responsibilities (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010) with often conflicting demands from families, institutions and sponsors.

Despite the view in the literature that the PhD is a rite of passage to being an academic, the students who had completed or were near completion were less positive about the knowledge they had gained at the end of the journey. For example, Hye appears to have come to the realisation along that journey that she is, in fact, still not an expert in her field and that her academic research may not fully equip her to work in the industry:

> *I don't know, in the beginning, I want to be expert, I thought I would be but, in the end, I realise, still many things to learn and I realise that practical point would be different from the research, so … changed the view of the experience actually, in the end … I don't know, maybe I give too negative point, so it depends on the people, some of the PhD student, they felt they are expert after three or four years but, for me, I feel like there's still something to learn.*

Similarly, when asked what she has gained from the PhD experience, it is interesting that Ruby mentions words such as *'confidence', 'writing skills', 'organisation'* and *'budgeting'*. At no point does she mention having gained any knowledge. When I asked her about knowledge, she still did not mention having gained any knowledge of Tourism. Rather, she briefly mentioned having learnt a great deal about methodologies. Likewise, Katie described her gains from the PhD experience as *'extending her vocabulary', 'meeting new people* and *'boosting self-confidence'* and Hye talks about *'time management'* and *'meeting deadlines.'* Aiko does

245

acknowledge that she has gained tourism knowledge but suggests that the other transferable skills she has learnt will be more important in terms of her future career.

> *If I think about only PhD, knowledge is more important, but if I think about my career in the future, skills will be more useful for me, because in Japan, Tourism Studies is not popular at all so it's difficult to find a job in a tourism research company.*

These comments from students support the suggestions in the literature that the role of the PhD is no longer solely about preparing future academics but also future researchers or future knowledge workers in other employment (McAlpine, 2011). It appears to reflect the changing nature of the doctorate with an increased focus on skills formation of graduates rather than traditional knowledge creation (Deuchar, 2008; QAA, 2011). It calls into question understandings of the concept of doctorateness and signals a move away from the product to the process whereby the focus is on evidencing the development of an autonomous academic researcher (Park, 2005). This focus on training the '*complete postgraduate*' (Cryer, 1998) potentially limits opportunities for intercultural knowledge exchange and for multiple worldviews to be introduced in to the canon of tourism knowledge.

Despite recognising the role of the PhD in gaining access to academia, many supervisors do not regard view of the creation of new knowledge as the sole purpose of the PhD (Green and Usher, 2003). Professor describes the PhD as an *'internal passport'*, rather than a *'valuable, stand-alone qualification'*, suggesting that it gives you access to a new status within academia as opposed to any other sector:

> *I'm just trying to think within my own PhD students and I think one, one has dropped out of academia through choice and she works as a kind*

of consultant, another one has sort of left academia for family reasons. But all the others have remained within the university sector. So, the whole notion which D and I explored, of a PhD as, if you like, an internal passport, rather than as a valuable, stand-alone qualification seems to be validated by that. In some parts of the world, it's almost an entitlement, get your three years overseas and the motivation is driven by that …

Likewise, Dr Richards refers to the PhD journey as an *'endurance test'* but is not evidence that you are intelligent or an expert:

I mean you get some people that, they get their PHD and they think they think they're sort of bloody Einstein and that's just bullshit. I mean having a PHD doesn't make you more intelligent. It doesn't make you clever or anything like that. It just means you've looked into a particular issue in a huge amount of depth and written it up and you have endured that process over three years or more. That's all it is. You know, it's a bloody long essay.

One of the students, Ruby, appeared to have had high expectations of how others would perceive her when she gained a PhD and became an academic and, perhaps more significantly, the positive effect it would have on her self-confidence. She admits, however, that her confidence had not been boosted in the way she had hoped. This lack of increased respect may, of course, reflect the loss of status of academic jobs in the real world. Ruby says:

It meant that I would be called Doctor at the end so that was quite appealing, quite a fun thing to think about, 'Wow I'll be a doctor' and it meant to me in a sense all the way through it that if I got this PHD then I would be confident and all my issues and inhibitions would disappear because I would be a doctor, I'd have a PHD and no one could mess with me then and I really believed that and that didn't happen at all which is ridiculous.

… but I didn't have that sudden shot of confidence when I got the PHD and I was now Doctor Ruby you know and I think I was expecting that really, that was what I was hoping for and so in a lot of ways it was sort of an emotional thing rather than a job. I think that in a lot of ways

> *it hasn't been about a career at all, I knew I wanted to get somewhere in life and I wanted to be respected by other people.*

It should be noted, however, that Ruby's aspirations and expectations are linked to her MR regarding the way she feels she has always been perceived by others and her self-image. She hoped to '*find a shot of confidence*', to '*get somewhere in life*' and to be '*respected by other people*' with '*all my issues and inhibitions*' disappearing because she was a doctor.   However, in describing her feelings after her viva, Ruby appears to display feelings resembling grief.   She describes the feeling of anticlimax in the immediate aftermath and then refers to '*recovering from the PhD*' in the following weeks:

> *I remember going home the day of my viva and just sitting on the floor and crying because I didn't know what to do with myself … I was like, so that's it, what do I do? Scott wasn't home from work you know and I basically sort of shattered my social life to actually do the PHD and so it was like what do I actually do now and I was just totally lost and totally like an anti-climax, like I can just remember being downstairs and walking back into the room and they said 'Congratulations you've got it' and I think X said 'Do you want to go and get everyone Y' and Y was like 'There's no one here' because it was summer so I think we just had half a glass and that was it of wine so it was like a real anti-climax …it was such a personal journey and no one can experience the same elation as you did about finishing that PHD and it was really anticlimactic not having anyone to sort of share it with really you know and my family were miles away and I remember just after I'd finished crying, a box of chocolates and a bunch of flowers arrived from my mum. You know, so it was just like, well that's it but then it's just like well I had no job to go to, it was the middle of the summer so it was like 'Well have a break now' and it's like right but what do you do with yourself when you've got no money and the stress of that hanging over your head so in a lot of ways there were a lot of lows and I would say recovering from the PHD takes a long time, like it's taken me you know, now I go out with my friends and things in the evenings, I'm doing a lot more, I'm much more laid back and things. I had cut myself off in a lot of ways to actually get the PHD finished.*

Terms such as '*shattered my social* life', '*I was totally* lost', '*real anti-*climax', '*not having anyone to share* it' and '*I had cut myself* off' highlight the emotional consequences that the PhD journey can have. Owler (2010) argues that, in the current higher education climate, there is little recognition of the passionate process involved in knowledge production and little meaningful research has been done into the emotional and intellectual experiences of the PhD journey (Amran and Ibrahim, 2011). However, in this extract, Ruby describes the significant personal cost (Brydon and Fleming, 2011) as she completed the lone venture of her PhD (Wisker *et* al., 2007).

The PhD is conceptualised by many authors as an isolated journey with many challenges or milestones along the route (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010; Brydon and Fleming, 2011). The participants in the exploratory conversations of phase one agreed that the PhD is an isolated and challenging journey but it also became clear that this journey is a very personal one which is experienced in different ways by different people. In response to Brydon and Fleming's (2011) contention that there is little literature which, from a student perspective, considers the challenges on this transitional journey, the rest of this chapter explores in more detail student and staff perceptions of this journey and the challenges it brings. Furthermore, doctoral education appears, at first instance, the ideal environment for international students, home students and academics to come together, under the banner of internationalisation, to exchange and create knowledge. However, the first phase of research had suggested that this was, in fact, rare. Therefore, in the second phase interviews, I was keen to investigate in more depth some the constraints placed upon both students and supervisors in creating spaces, both physical and

intellectual, for creativity and intercultural knowledge exchange to take place and for previously marginalised voices to be heard ((Botterill and Gale, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). The following section explores these constraints which include some of the factors identified in phase one, such as isolation, language issues, family pressures but also include other sites of power and gamekeepers, such as institutions themselves, sponsors, supervisors, external examiners and journal editors.

7.3.   Constraints around the PhD journey

7.3.1. Isolation

Despite widespread recognition that both home and international doctoral students continue to experience intense academic and social isolation (Deem and Brehony, 2000; McCallin and Nayar, 2011; Janta, Lugosi and Brown (2014), relatively little research has been done into the factors that contribute to feelings of isolation and the measures taken by both students and institutions to overcome them (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014). The exploratory conversations revealed isolation to be a key factor in the doctoral student experience but I was keen to explore it more deeply in this phase of my research as links emerged between students' feelings of isolation or marginalisation and their capacity to engage in opportunities for interaction and exchanges of worldviews, confirming the view that *'so much of one's self and so much emotion … is invested in the research process, personal friendship and human chemistry are vital ingredients in successful collaborations'* (Ren, Pritchard and Morgan, 2010:900).

Both the home and international students I interviewed shared the view that the PhD was a very intense and isolated experience. Ruby, for example, uses many emotive metaphors to represent both the PhD and the experience, such as *'journey', 'my baby', 'it had taken on a life of its own'.* Ruby seems, at times, to be likening the PhD to a human and many of the, often negative, emotions she describes are those related to a human relationship. She talks of *'loneliness' 'frustration', 'isolation'* and *'stress'*:

> *What I found in the PhD is there's no one who's done the PhD who's around just to talk to you about the difficulties of dealing with the emotions that you feel and the loneliness and you know, the stress of all of that and that really used to get to me …*

Although Ruby has lived in Cardiff for six years and lives with her boyfriend, she goes on to describe her feelings of social isolation as she *'put her life on hold'* to finish her PhD:

> *Oh extremely, extremely isolated because you cut yourself off from social groups, well not everyone does but the way that I did it, the way that I felt I had to do it, I felt isolated. I also felt like nobody really understood apart from the people around you who were doing the PHD and you just feel really isolated in that people don't understand you know and that you're on this journey and it really was in the end like I just decided right I've just got to get through this you know and I've got to do this as quickly as I can because otherwise I am going to be miserable for even longer just having it hanging over my head and … I put my life on hold for something like say 6 months or something to get it finished in the end … I just did it you know and it seemed like that was physically impossible but I actually managed to do it in the end so in a lot of ways there were a lot of sort of bad points.*

It could be suggested that this was self-inflicted isolation but Ruby's comments support the views of Brydon and Fleming (2011:1008) who state that family and

friends try to support you in your '*solo swim event'* but do not really understand the journey. My own experiences echo that of Ruby in that, as a member of staff, I had colleagues with whom I could share my journey but, even then, few were at the same stage as I was when I was writing up and the intensity and sheer workload was overwhelming. Outside of the workplace, whilst sympathetic, my family and friends did not really understand the challenges of the journey and certainly did not understand if I refused a social engagement.

In fact, at the end of the interview, Ruby showed me a scrapbook of memories in which she had kept a poem she wrote during her PhD experience. In this, she uses the metaphor of being *'imprisoned'* and talks again about *'frustration',* being *'anxious',* and *'alone.'* Interestingly, she asks *'where is the person who understands, been through it?'* and suggests that they are *'busy writing or teaching, not time to share the path they took'*:

> '*Sitting in front of my computer feeling anxious, alone and imprisoned*
> *I ask how can I do this, how when I just want to be free*
> *The humming of the crummy computer, the humming of the buzzing outside*
> *The light's too bright too dim*
> *My body's wriggles with frustration, hot and cold, too tense to sit still'*
> '*I ask you how can I do this, where is the guide for me*
> *Where is the person who understands, been through it*
> *Busy writing or teaching, no time to share the path they took*
> *Only a few words which you know don't help'*
> *Lots of things people just go 'how's it going, oh don't worry it will be fine'*
> '*How can I do this, find the voice inside, draw on the inner strength*
> *Bury amongst monsters of memories*
> *I've got to do this now, anxious alone and imprisoned*
> *I've got to find my own way, paddle my own canoe'*

Ruby's obvious intense feelings of isolation are important to note, as much of the focus in the literature on isolation has been on the experiences of undergraduates

and international students. There has been little research into the experiences of UK full-time PhD students who have recently been through the undergraduate system but are clearly susceptible to the same feelings of social and academic isolation as their international student peers (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014).

With the large number of doctoral students from overseas in UK institutions, the PhD environment appears to be an ideal area for intercultural exchange at both an academic and social level (Ryan, 2012). However, despite the fact that the role of peer interaction in doctoral students' experience has been widely acknowledged as being important (Gardner, 2007; Hadjioannau *et al*., 2007), it is also recognised that many international students find it very difficult to interact with UK students (Marginson *et al*., 2010; Urban and Palmer, 2014). My findings supported this, with opportunities for cross-cultural interaction between UK and international students or between international students from different countries very limited.

In light of Sawir's (2013) opinion that a deeper understanding is needed of home students' experiences as both home and international students play an equal role in facilitating internationalisation, it was interesting to note both Ruby and Katie's experiences of undertaking a PhD as the sole British full-time students amongst a group dominated by international students. Little research has been conducted into home students' perspectives of interacting with international students at doctoral level and my interviews revealed that they had mixed views. Both Katie and Ruby talk of some positive elements of being in the minority as UK students in the PhD environment. However, they also spoke of the major contribution they feel this situation made to their feelings of isolation, which is an issue that has had little consideration in the literature (Clare, 2008; Janta *et al*., 2014).

Ruby begins by explaining how her experience of doing a PhD changed over a period of time. She talks of the small group of students undertaking doctoral research when she began and how they actually made a pledge to support one another through the process:

> *When I first came on board there was a little group of us, we met everyone and it was very nice to be supportive of each other and you know there were international students and we were clear about, right, we're going to look after each other and this is what we were doing and helping each other through and we were all at the same stage.*

With the use of '*we*', Ruby seems to be demonstrating a feeling of belonging, perhaps to the same tribe, and indicating that this made created a feeling of togetherness and a strong sense of support, even though students came from very different backgrounds.

However, over time, and as the group got larger, Ruby acknowledges that this feeling of unity diminished. In fact, as the next quotation highlights, she appears to feel a divide between herself and the other students. She distinguishes between home and international students and talks in terms of '*us*' and '*they*' and makes sweeping cultural assumptions, arguably bordering on racism, when she says, '*obviously they don't feel the heat or something as much as we do*':

> *Then we moved downstairs and the group multiplied and got absolutely huge and that was difficult. I mean, they were a great group of people and I made some really nice friends but I used to work at home every day and I would never work in that office because there were just too many people. There were people on telephones, people having chats, people making coffee. You know, it was just too much and you couldn't work in there. Not aside from the fact this side of the building was absolutely boiling, people would have the radiators on*

254

> *and things like that because obviously they don't feel the heat or something as much as we do and so all that sort of stuff.*

Ruby is frank about the fact that she would have liked to have had more British students around her '*to relate to the exact situation*' she was in:

> *Because I know it's like, it's not very PC to say this but it would have been nice to have people who were from British backgrounds who would have been able to relate to the exact situation that I was in, more directly in a lot of ways. When I talk about those feelings of isolation, they possibly could have been helped by sort of, having more interactions with people and a few more British students to mix it up a bit. Because it was like being the only British student in a group of 20 people, it's quite weird isn't it.*

Unlike many of the supervisors, the home students were aware of cultural differences between themselves and the international students. Both Katie and Ruby talk of cultural barriers and it is interesting that they appear to consider international students as an homogenous 'Other' in opposition to local students referring to them throughout as *'they'*. Koehne (2005) cautions against this approach and considers that, by appreciating that international students have their own multiple subjectivities, we can foster intercultural learning. However, both Ruby and Katie refer to 'their' work ethic, again appearing to make a cultural assumption that all foreigners have a strong work ethic. For example, Ruby uses a discourse of difference when she talks of the cultural barriers between herself and her international peers, using terms such as '*nobody really understood*', '*they're all from different backgrounds to me*', '*their priorities were very different to mine*':

> *I also felt like nobody really understood apart from the people around you who were doing the PHD and with all respect for the people I was sharing a room with, they're all from different backgrounds and so their*

priorities were very different to mine and their work ethic was just ridiculously strong, you know working every night and that makes you feel like right I've got to be working ridiculously hard all the time and you just feel really isolated in that people don't understand you know and that you're on this journey
.

Ruby goes on to describe the difficulties in forming friendships and a social life with the international students as their cultures meant that they spent their leisure time in different ways. She is aware that informal interactions are often culturally loaded for international students (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014:291). Interestingly, she does refer to one international student who engaged with the Western pub culture and how this divided him from the rest of the group:

You know like, it wasn't very much like you could actually build proper friendships really, although we did have friendships but they always only went so far, I don't know. Maybe because of the barrier really, in terms of their culture and things and the way they live their lives really and their dedication to their work and sort of that sort of thing. And very different to you know, I mean I go out on a Saturday night and go down the pub and go dancing and things like that and the thought of them doing anything like that, that would, I mean, I know that one person did occasionally go out and do things like that and they were sort of frowned upon by the rest of the group because of that sort of thing so I think that the cultural divide in terms of what we like doing was very obvious. So there wasn't really a social side of it.

However, on a social level, Katie talks about her international student colleagues and all that she has learnt from them. This higher level of empathy may be attribute to Katie's MR as a more mature person with life experience and an established family and social life.

I don't know whether the other element is that you know, a lot of them are from overseas as well and they do all get together to eat and everything. And I have been asked to join them which I have done a couple of times which is really nice isn't it. So that's been good. … I mean I've learnt so much and been brave enough to ask certain

> *questions like 'Why can you have more than one wife', you know and*
> *we've had a group of us all sitting there and it was absolutely, it was*
> *great you know and it actually dispelled some of the myths I had about*
> *them you know. … Yeah so that's not bothered me at all. The*
> *language doesn't bother me because I'm used to being around Welsh*
> *so it's just another language around the place and they're very kind,*
> *they're really very kind. They have helped me with my computer,*
> *they've tried to give me tea to cure my cough but no, it's really good.*
> *Some are friendlier than others you know, but on the whole, it's yeah.*

Again, when talking about international students, Katie refers to them as *'they'* and *'them'* as if they are a homogenous Other, which she is not part of. This supports Fotovatian and Miller's (2014) view that home PhD students stereotype international students and use the discourse of we and you, indicating that they perceive them as the Other. It is interesting to note how this process of othering can in fact lead to feelings of marginalisation for local students themselves. Katie also seems hesitant when talking about the fact that other students eat together on a regular basis and occasionally invite her, indicating that she has positioned herself outside the group. She uses the interrogative and says *'which is really nice, isn't it?'*, as if she is seeking some confirmation that she is receiving a genuine invitation to join their tribe, if only temporarily. Katie is very honest regarding her assumptions as a white middle-class mature female when she refers to '*dispelling the myths'* she had about other nationalities. Her repetition of the phrase *'they're very kind, they're really very kind'* again hints at an element of surprise and an attempt to reassure both herself and me.

Whilst Katie alludes to language and communication issues, she dismisses them as not being a problem as she is used to being around Welsh speakers. This reflects her MR in terms of her family situation where she is a married to a native Welsh speaker and Welsh is the language in the home. Ruby, however, when asked about

the research culture within the group, referred to the lack of English skills amongst the international students as hindering interaction and '*intellectual debate*.' It is interesting that she appears to feel guilty about criticising her fellow students on this point and qualifies her sentence with '*they were all lovely lovely people that I used to get on with really well*' and then uses the connector '*but*':

> *Because the problem is a lot of them are really struggling with English as you know, so if they're struggling with English, they can't have a conversation, quite often about epistemological stance. (…) We did, I mean like they were all lovely lovely people that I used to get on with really well and we would have conversations and things but I wouldn't say there was a huge amount of intellectual debate that would go on in our, in our group.*

Reinforcing the fact that international students cannot be regarded as an homogenous Other, Aiko describes her lack of interaction with her peers. She tells me that the majority of the PhD students within her department are international students and that five of them share an office. However, when asked if she has much contact with them, she says '*Just with one student sitting next door and we're both doing Tourism and disabled people from different perspectives*.' She goes on to say that the one sitting next to her is from the UK and is doing a part-time PhD whilst working, which implies that the common bond between them is the subject matter of their PhDs, rather than their nationality or culture.

Hye, who is studying at the same institution as Aiko, seems to acknowledge that there is a community in the department, but that she does not feel part of it:

> *I don't really get along with PhD students in this department, but some other research office mates, they get along with each other, they have regular meetings. We don't really go out because everybody is broke for the money, so when I see some other people, some of them cook and invite some of the other PhD students … office mates normally …*

> *so they kind of gathering with each other normally inside the kitchen*
> *… rather than going out drinking.*

However, she does go on to say that she is part of another PhD social group outside of her discipline where, although she says she feels isolated because they speak a '*strange language*', she appears more comfortable as she does not need to engage at an intellectual level. This fact that she is relived that does not need to '*worry about grasping things*' appears to be in opposition to the idea of international students contributing to research communities and developing '*conceptualisations of tourism that encompass multiple worldviews*' (Ren *et al*., 2010:885):

> *Me, I get on more* [with] *other PhD students in the science department, so sometimes, I feel kind of isolated whenever they talk some strange language …… because I'm the only one who is not, er … relate to their topic so it's time just sitting like that listening. But, not needed to worry about grasping things, it's quite more convenient for me. Normally go out restaurant and eating, cooking* [for] *each other, yeah, that is best solution for social life.*

When asked about her interaction with British students and academics, Hye appears to have encountered difficulties, although she suggests that she has not had the same experiences outside of the university:

> *It depends some people, some people are really nice and friendly but some of them are so … kind of closed. And other international students follow, they observe this attitude …   But here, I tried to smile to everybody, kind of 'hello', they don't reply me back and I was kind of like 'aaah', I was shocked because they just kind of pass by and that was my …er.. . first shock thing, but people said to me 'You are in academic environment so you can't, don't judge to British people as with the academic environment as with whole of the British.' After that, I just keep quiet, yeah … It's alright, other people who I met outside seems alright.*

This feeling that people within universities are less welcoming and friendly than those outside is concerning in the light of initiatives to internationalise universities and provide a welcoming environment in order to gain a competitive advantage over other English-speaking countries (Smith *et al.*, 2010).

The international students were very aware that language was a barrier to their communication with other students and, therefore, their feelings of marginality and isolation (Amran and Ibrahim ,2011). For example, Changsai commented:

> *But, sorry, about English, for PhD student, we only do reading and writing usually so I don't think my speaking … we don't have a chance to speak …it is very isolated.*

However, not all the international students I interviewed corroborated views in the literature regarding the lack of home and international student interaction. Lydia, for example, was very positive about her experiences. It should be noted that Lydia had a very good command of English and a very confident personality and may, therefore, have found interaction with home students easier than an international student who was more linguistically challenged (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014):

> *And all the people as well makes like high points … all the international and people from the UK which I met, not just from this department, not just from Tourism, but from all the other PhD communities and, when I can talk and chat and see that we can understand each other exactly and the moral support …*

When asked whether she enjoyed studying in an internationalised environment, she spoke of the benefits of gaining different perspectives:

> *Uh huh, definitely. Yes and it's really valuable because it is why probably PhDs in the UK are much more interesting and you can find out from a different perspective, a different angle, something about your topic and, er, it's what makes it more fun.*

Such notions of sharing ideas and perspectives amongst students was rare in my interviews but, one supervisor, Professor Evans, did speak very positively about a close group of international students who supported each other through the experience:

> *But, the really good ones, I mean, I had a group, they all finished last September, a group of four or five of them, all Asian actually, and we had a fantastic, bantering … it was a self-support group …a girl from Taiwan, two Malaysians, one Chinese, Malay. Those four were fantastic, there was banter, the relationship was very good, they were all very very focussed. They all … very different areas … but they supported each other and they were all very very productive.*

The need for academics to be a *'core player in the process'* of integration and internationalisation in higher education has been recognised in extant literature (Teekens, 2003:30). The role of the supervisor as a gatekeeper on the PhD journey will be explored later in the chapter but it is interesting to note attitudes of both students and academic staff to the supervisor's role in alleviating isolation.

Whilst several academics acknowledged the isolated nature of the PhD journey and were supportive of the students, they appeared to offer no strategies to alleviate the isolation supporting Deuchar's (2008) findings that supervisors did not always understand which type of support was required at which stage of the process. For example, Professor Howells talked of *'sharing'* the lonely experience but appeared to offer no solution to the issue:

> *I think it's difficult also sharing with the students their very very lonely experience … I think it's a very lonely experience for students, so I find that quite emotionally kind of, you know, there's a bit of an emotional aspect to that, that you can't avoid feeling empathy with.*

However, contrary to findings in the literature, several students acknowledged the importance of their supervisor in easing their feelings of isolation. Changsai, for example, had undergone some family problems and had avoided telling his supervisor as he felt he was not a child and should deal with his own problems. However, he had trouble concentrating and became very lonely. He describes his feelings of relief when he told Dr Wood:

> *He was very kind, very supportive. He made me feel much less alone.*

It was apparent that even UK students need support to overcome the isolation and Ruby acknowledges the role of the supervisor in mitigating these feelings, echoing findings in the literature that the supervisory role has expanded and now includes the pastoral management of students (McCallin and Nayar, 2012). Ruby refers to one of her supervisors as being very *'emotionally supportive.'* She also recognises that her own personality or life experiences meant that constant encouragement from her supervisors or mentors was important to her:

> *She would pop into my room because I would only be across the road and she would pop in just to see how I was doing and I'm the sort of person who really values little things like that and so I really valued all that sort of stuff.*

Katie also talks of the isolated experience of a PhD and the importance of her supervisory team in supporting her throughout the journey. Again, her MR of having no previous experience in tourism appears significant when she says she has been given some '*confidence building*' when she has been '*thinking about what am I, what am I doing, what do I believe in?*'

> *I have also been given personal support for various things, you know some confidence building …Yeah because you sit, don't know whether it's a PHD thing or a personal thing, again it's probably a mixture, you kind of sit there stewing over what you're reading and what you've found out and you're thinking about what am I, what am I doing, what do I believe in?   And you just need someone to tell you, 'Well this has happened to other people' or 'that's right' or you know 'don't worry about it'.*

Kemp *et al.* (2008) note that institutions, as well as supervisors, have a key role to play in creating an academic community for doctoral students. Unfortunately, both Katie and Dr Richards note that, in their institution, students are physically isolated from the academic staff. Katie points out that the staff are '*behind closed doors*':

> *I think it's the space that everybody's in. We're downstairs; the staff are upstairs behind closed doors.   There's been a few times where I've walked past and had a look and then if there's nobody there, well that's alright, if there's people in there you think 'Shall I, shan't I?*

Dr Richards also spoke of this physical isolation and compared it to her own experiences as a PhD student, again drawing upon her own Members' Resources:

> *I think that when I was doing it there wasn't a researcher's room. You were all within the same two corridors and so people knew that you were a research student. They sort of probably had a bit of an idea about what you were doing and you probably did a bit of teaching as well. I think that has changed completely and there's much less of it*

than there was and I think that's a really bad thing. I think the researcher's room has separated out the students completely. I mean there are far more students, I'm not saying, so that's difficult anyway. But, even I don't, I mean I know a lot of the students, but even I don't know the vast majority of them or even what they are doing and I do a lot of internal examining and chairing, so you know, in some ways I'm better placed than most people but, a lot of the overseas students don't contribute to teaching. But I think when we were doing it, when we were sort of the School there were less students, you were located within the teaching environment. You did a little bit of teaching as well. Plus, we used to have research seminars where either you would present for 15/20 minutes on your project or we'd just sort of go round the table and talk about what we were doing, where we were at with our projects and everybody sort of attended that so everybody knew what everybody else was doing and now I think that it's much more disparate that you don't really know what's going on. I think what I found with some of the research students as well is because of the researcher's room, where if they're all in they can't work, a lot of them will work at home, so you don't really seem them much on campus. They come in maybe to do certain things or to do supervisory meetings so I don't think that helps with the integration with staff as well. I think they would benefit, I think particularly with the overseas students in terms of talking about, getting used to talking about their research, helping their English.

This comment from Dr Richards raises the issue that isolation does not only increase as a result of the physical space which is allocated to PhD students. There are also issues surrounding the increase of student numbers, fewer group activities such as research seminars and less integration with the wider department as fewer PhD students teach within departments. It is quite possible that feelings of isolation are exacerbated by technological developments, meaning that students and staff are now more likely to work from home. These mechanisms have traditionally aided students to access research cultures where knowledge production takes place (Becher and Trowler, 1989) and, without them, research students will find it increasingly difficult to access research cultures (Deem and Brehony, 2000). My findings show this to be the case for home students but previous studies have found it to be an even bigger issue for international and part-time students who expressed

concern that they were excluded because of factors such as lack of information and lack of confidence to join in and express themselves in English in a group situation (Deem and Brehony, 2000).

Ruby, who is based at the same institution as Dr Richards, shares her views. When asked about a research culture with the School and the University, she describes the divide between PhD students and staff. What is noteworthy here is that Ruby was, during her PhD, undertaking a large amount of teaching within the department but still appears to feel marginalised from the tribe of staff, again referring to staff as *'they'* and students as *'we'*. This seems to echo Fotovatian and Miller's (2014) view of the challenge that faces PhD students and academics in crossing power barriers and supports Percy's (2014:3) notion of *'imposter syndrome.'* Ruby says:

> *There's not really much sort of mixing of the staff and the students. That's one thing that the PHD students always complained about, that the PHD staff were not mixing with the PHD students and I guess if you got them to mix more then those conversations might happen.*

My own experience supports the view that an *'imposter syndrome'* exists, even for full-time members of staff, such as myself. I have had very little contact with the full-time PhD students over my journey and, whilst I have very comfortable relationships with my colleagues whilst doing my 'day job', I still do not feel like a fully-fledged researcher when discussions regarding the research strand of the department take place.

However, unlike Dr Richards, several supervisors in different institutions shared positive stories of initiatives which had been put in place in order to foster integration

amongst the research community, including Research Methods modules and more informal research forums. Interestingly, Professor Howells spoke of a regular research forum but neither of the students from his institution appeared to be aware of this forum, corroborating the findings of Kemp *et al.* (2008) that initiatives of this type appear to be haphazard.

Dr Price talked about the value of a Research Methods course in terms of students getting to know each other. He appeared to derive a lot of satisfaction from bringing together this community but acknowledged that it was a more difficult task when international students were involved:

> *With our new certificate, we are trying to get all the Social Scientists together so they can talk the same language. I like teaching it in blocks because I feel like you get to know them which is great because you might not be their supervisor but you can have a coffee with them, talk to them and get to know what they're doing. But, more importantly than me knowing what they're doing, they all know what each other's doing, which I think is brilliant. We actually did an icebreaker session and it ended up being an hour and a half and they said that was probably the best session of all the sessions we did – where they just talked about their own issues, really. So I think just getting them physically together and talking, and I ranged quite widely outside the epistemology stuff, I opened it up quite widely, I quite enjoyed doing that – and I think they enjoyed it.*
> *I think it's as much about the community as much as what they learn. The dynamics of the group are interesting because this year we have hardly any international students – I think we had one person- and last year, it was like a 50-50. So, this year it was virtually all staff with 2/3 full-time funded people. Totally different type of conversations – it's harder, I think, I mean one international student, he was happy to contribute but a lot of the others last year, they wouldn't say much, I couldn't get much out of them, it was hard.*

Once again, a clear distinction is drawn here between home students and international students and this distinction is seen throughout the interviews with home students and supervisors. This repeated 'othering' of international students

appears to lend weight to Fotovatian and Miller's (2014) view that universities are creating two distinct identity groups and magnifying the social, cultural and physical space between the two groups.

Dr Price's comments also seems to suggest that, even when initiatives are put in place, international students still find it difficult to integrate. The fact he says '*, they wouldn't say much, I couldn't get much out of them, it was hard'* suggests that he is aware of the lack of integration but, rather than being '*the engine which must drive the initiative'* (McNicholl *et al*., 2008:3), he is not equipped to be the core player in the internationalisation process (Teekens, 2003).   It seems that, in the increasingly international climate of doctoral supervision, disciplinary expertise is no longer sufficient to carry out a supervisory role and formal professional development is needed (Green and Usher, 2003; McCallin and Nayar, 2011).

7.3.2. Language

Language was one of the central themes to emerge from the exploratory conversations in the first phase of my research and is a core consideration for the approach of this study. As such, it is a theme which is embedded throughout the discussion but is presented as a separate theme here as it emerged again in the Phase Two in-depth interviews as a key issue. Firstly, as has been seen above, it is a contributory factor in students' feelings of isolation and, consequently, to their marginalisation. Secondly, language is core to the culture of academia which is arguably a mechanism of power which is hidden behind the rubric of convention and style (Tribe, 2006).

Unsurprisingly, the international students were very aware of the challenges of operating in a second language. Several students talked of the difficulties of writing in academic language. Changsai, for example, talks of *'big difficulties with writing, with academic language'* and Aiko reflects upon the gap between the language needed for Masters study and that required for a PhD, stating *'I have a 6.0 in IELTS which was what I needed for the Masters but it seems it's not enough for PhD.'* One of the supervisors, Professor Evans also referred to the IELTS entry scores not being high enough to do a PhD. Having been a Language Support Tutor, I am very familiar with this test and am of the opinion that it is not an adequate enough tool to assess a student's linguistic capacity to undertake a PhD. Aiko goes on to explain the complexities of the language issues she is facing in making the transition from native speaker to second language speaker (Fotovatian and Miller, 2014):

> *I'm writing in English so, um, in my brain, I can really explain and I can write the easy way, but when I'm actually writing it, it's so difficult to integrate, to evaluate, criticise and to make the structure of some tense and I don't know which one I should cut it down and whether I'm missing some points or not, so … I prefer … my supervisor, normally, basically, he gave me some direction before I started the chapter.*

As has been discussed earlier in the chapter, interaction between home and international students appears to be hampered by language skills. Ruby confirmed that these communication difficulties hindered any meaningful academic exchange with her international peers:

> *But the majority of the time was me proof-reading their stuff so 'Ruby could you have a look at this quickly', you know to make sure. Because the problem is a lot of them are really struggling with English as you know, so if they're struggling with English, they can't have a conversation, quite often about epistemological stance. Oh well you*

know, they haven't, their English wasn't that great and so there wasn't that much of bouncing of ideas and stuff.

This supports Bilecen's (2013) argument that, although UK Higher Education, is deemed to be a multicultural and multilingual society, international doctoral students were still made 'the Other' based on language a point that is often neglected in the literature.

The interviewees were aware of their weak language skills which hindered communication between students and their supervisors and led, in some cases, to '*an intense loss of self-esteem and identity*' (Ryan and Viete, 2009:307). As Hye commented:

I can't really talk in front of him [supervisor], I feel nervous, shy, so kind of for me, it's really difficult to communicate in meetings.

Supervisors gave very mixed responses to the issue of language difficulties. Some recognised the huge challenge posed by the lack of language skills. Professor Evans, who works at a non-Russell Group institution, suggests that economic drivers are forcing him to accept students on to a doctorate without high enough levels of English:

*But, yes, it is a real challenge and I'm not sure what the answer is …
I don't think the sort of standard admission requirement in IELTS terms
which is 6.5 is probably anywhere near high enough for this sort of
thing but I think if you vary it, you won't get your PhD students.*

He seems aware that some international students, therefore, are not equipped with sufficient academic discourse to express their thoughts but says *'if you vary it, you won't get your PhD* students' suggesting that economic necessity means he has to accept these students on to the doctoral programme. He goes on to explain how many international students do not have the breadth of language at their disposal to express their thoughts clearly, echoing Burr's (1995) view that we can only describe our experiences using concepts which are embedded or pre-packaged in our linguistic toolkit. He comments:

> *So, yes, language … it tends to be the nitty gritty language. I mean a guy who just had his viva in March and will graduate now, he has, I think, some really great ideas, just the English, his expression, to get it down on paper is difficult. But, we got him there. It was worth it cos the ideas were there but, yes, it is a real challenge and I'm not sure what the answer is.*

Other supervisors, such as Professor Wood, seemed unaware that any difficulties existed, stating *'It hasn't been a particular problem at PhD level, I think it's much more of a problem at Masters level.'* Professor Howells echoed this view and attributed the lack of problems to a rigorous selection process, *'Actually, language isn't normally a problem for my students 'cos I don't recruit students unless they've got very good language skills. I mean, I just don't think it works otherwise.'* It should be noted that both these participants teach at Russell Group universities and, therefore, have the scope to be more selective than Professor Evans who is at a non-Russell Group institution. However, it could be argued that they are actually lacking in awareness and are failing to '*develop their understandings of how the languages and cultures of their students influence their thoughts, values, actions and feelings'* (Leask, 2007:87).

As a consequence, few of the supervisors appeared aware of students' feelings of marginalisation as a result of their inability to communicate effectively. In fact, Professor Wood admitted that it had taken him and a colleague a year and a half to realise the extent of the communication difficulties between themselves and a student he describes, rather patronisingly, as *'the most delightful woman':*

> *I was working with a colleague and it took us about a year and a half to realise that most of what we were saying, the student didn't understand. She would say, yes, yes, taking notes and then, by the time we got it back, in written form, we were sort of, eh?! I mean, she was the most delightful woman, very polite, punctual, just had a terrible time with English.   So that was the only one I really had a language problem with and it took a long time to realise, partly because of what she was doing and partly because she* **seemed** *to be responsive and understanding so I've taken a bit more care since then.   I mean, I thought I was old enough and experienced enough to be able to pick it up but …*

The fact that he *'thought I was old enough and experienced enough to be able to pick it up but …'* highlights the fact that the need to move away from the situation where the supervisor's role as researcher has taken precedence and pedagogy has been the *'absent presence'* (Evans & Green, 1995:2, cited in Pearson & Brew, 2002) and move towards supervisor training, particularly in intercultural awareness.

Other supervisors, such as Dr Price, appear to contradict themselves, saying that they sometimes cannot understand students but that it doesn't hinder discussions to a large extent, which seems to suggest that, in fact, it is a problem which they are reluctant to face as a solution is not obvious:

> *With discussions, I think it gets in the way less. Occasionally, I think it does but, erm, not too much. Sometimes, it's a terrible thing to say, isn't it, you can't actually understand what some people are saying and I think that's a problem.*

As mentioned earlier, language is a key part of academic convention which is, in turn, a strong mechanism of power (Hall, 2004). It was clear during my interviews that students were aware of the need to conform to academic language conventions and, when unable to do so, felt excluded from the academic tribe and its discourse as language can be used to *'claim and reject identities, to signal relationships and to display memberships'* (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat and Crozet, 1999:50).

For example, Lydia, who is an international student but speaks very good English, acknowledged that a lack of awareness of nuances of the language had caused her some embarrassment at a conference in front of the academic tribe she aspires to be part of:

> *Sometimes, but, er, it's not like real troubles with English but, when I'm presenting … I just remember, when I was presenting at the Research Colloquium, I was using the term, 'leisure tourism'. I was thinking about every other aspect of tourism, not just beach tourism, relaxed tourism but cultural tourism, dark tourism, mountaineering and the audience wasn't from a tourism background so they thought I'm thinking about beach tourism. Probably, … if I am native speaker, I would know to make a difference … to have some other… just to explain what I mean by leisure tourism. But I didn't explain it so they were like 'Oh my God, you want leisure tourism in Belfast? What's wrong with you?' It was like, oh wow, they thought leisure tourism was, like beaches. It was very difficult.*

It is interesting to note that, as was seen in the exploratory conversations in phase one when a UK student referred to learning 'academese', it is not just international students who feel that they do not possess the language to gain access to the

272

academic world. Katie talks about how academic discourse is inaccessible, meaning that the dominant groups are able to impose constraints on who has access to the powerful subject positions of higher education and PhD students can remain locked in their subject positions and structure of rights (Davies and Harre, 1990). Katie appeared to be quite scathing of the order of discourse used in academic writing but acknowledged that it was necessary to comply with it. She seemed to doubt her own ability to write at the required level to make the transition of identity to an academic. Again her MR as a non-tourism related practitioner goes some way to explain her self-doubt expressed in terms of *'I don't understand and I need to understand it', 'I don't know if I can aspire to that'* and *'I can't achieve that kind of level.':*

> *I don't know I think it's the way people think and talk, it's very in depth, it's quite heavy. Because in the end I just want people to understand what I'm saying, what I'm writing … because I read all these journals and articles and what have you and it's great stuff but some of so, and I do appreciate that you have to do them in certain styles for certain people but that would be a down side, is when you read all this magnificent stuff you kind of think 'I don't know if I can aspire to that'. So you're putting yourself on a bit of a downward slope as it were because you think you know, 'I can't achieve that kind of level.'*

Many of the supervisors spoke of correcting the work of students in order for it to conform to the academic conventions. It was interesting that they did not seem to consider the feelings of international students when doing so. In fact, Professor Howells said that he corrected them *'in order for them to learn how to write good English.'* Others, however, such as Dr Price, acknowledged that part-time UK students also encountered challenges with writing in the appropriate academic discourse:

But I actually find that writing for a PhD is a skill and I do think it doesn't matter if you're international or a domestic student or a member of staff, I think it's something that everybody goes through. And it doesn't stop when you get a PhD either cos if you go on writing for publication, I think, the more writing you do, the better your style gets.

However, supervisors seemed much more reluctant to correct UK students' grammar and writing style. For example, Dr Richards said:

> *Issues about spelling and grammar and things like that also comes through on part-time staff as well. Now I find that more difficult because when you go through and if you start to change what they've written, I feel quite uncomfortable in a way because I'm thinking to myself, well this person is actually assessing probably, certainly undergraduates and quite probably post-graduates themselves yet they can't string a sentence together. There's a massive issue with that I think.*

Whereas earlier in the interview, Dr Richards has stated that *'with overseas students, I will start changing and correcting it',* when speaking of staff, she uses terminology such as *'more difficult'* and *'uncomfortable',* perhaps reflecting her MR as a colleague of staff members who should be comfortable with academic discourse and convention as part of their daily job. She goes on to reveal her own view of the hierarchy of supervision and the structure of rights that exist within universities when she says that she likes somebody *'senior'* to her to be DOS (Director of Studies) as staff members will *'take it from them.'*

> *Well, normally in that situation, that's why I like somebody senior to me to be DOS because I think you know if X or Y says it to somebody, you know 'This is incoherent' then they'll sort of take it from them. I mean I think if, to all intents and purposes, if I sort of said it in a nice way I think they'd take from me but I would feel uncomfortable saying it because I'm thinking, you know what I mean, this is part of the job that you do on a daily basis …*

Some supervisors did recognise that, in correcting students' work, they were in danger of taking ownership of that work. However, Professor Evans uses expressions such as *'very detailed in my correction'* and *'I'd really had to work hard at it'*, indicating that he had decided what was right and wrong, with no discussion with the student as to what he was trying to express:

> *Huge. Huge language problems. Um, cultural, yes, in terms of encouraging international students to be truly analytical and critical in what they're doing … can be a real challenge. Language problems, I mean, I, I again, for better or for worse, I've got myself into the practice of being very detailed in my correction … I mean, so much so, that one viva about a year and a half ago now, a Malaysian student … I'd struggled with the English, I'd really had to work hard at it …the pages came back red and then the External complimented him on his English … I thought 'I did well!!'*

Professor Wood made a similar remark:

> *Now, that's an interesting problem cos how far, I mean, you can argue that what I do in terms of correcting is more help than they should get in terms of writing because then the writing style is a combination of ours and theirs, not theirs, so are we going too far in terms of writing it?*

Others referred to the debate between academics as to whether making grammatical corrections was part of the remit of a supervisor. Interestingly, they justified making corrections by referring to the fact that a poorly written thesis would reflect badly on them as supervisors in the eyes of the examining team, again suggesting that they felt a level of ownership of the thesis. Dr Richards, for example, said:

> *I know other colleagues don't do that and say 'That's not part of my remit'. Well I'm not convinced about that because at the end of the day I think the finished product, it belongs to the student but it's also a reflection of the supervisory team in terms of whether it's a really scrappy piece of work or whether it's a fairly well polished PhD and I think it's an issue if you've got scrappy pieces of work going forward because that reflects badly on the supervisors.*

Professor Wood shares this view, stating:

> *I think if one comes out that I've been supervisor of, although it's not mine, I'd cringe if somebody were to say, oh God, look at this.*

The interviews unveiled the importance of language as a mechanism of power within universities and more particularly, as a difficult obligatory passage point or hurdle to overcome (Tribe, 2010) for researchers within the doctoral process. The findings demonstrated that some students are very aware that they do not possess the language to fully engage with the academic tribe nor fully express their ideas. Supervisors seemed less aware of the limitations imposed on students by the lack of academic discourse they possess. However, many of the supervisors appeared to be trying to help their students whose language skills are often weak. This calls into question both the recruitment policies and institutional language support available for international students. However, regardless of where the blame lies, it appears that my findings support the view of Burr (1995:117) that the prevailing tribe are providing students with a limited *'toolkit of resources'* to complete and cope with their journey.

7.3.3. Personal pressures

The phase one conversations had raised some personal issues which affected the PhD journey for students, such as family commitments and financial pressures. I did

not specifically ask about personal pressures upon students during the second phase of interviews but it was particularly noticeable that the UK students mentioned the personally demanding nature of the journey during conversation. The fact that only the UK students mentioned personal pressures could be attributed to a cultural openness or the fact that, perhaps due to communication skills, our interviews were longer and more informal than those with the international students. Alternatively, it could be due to the fact that, in the era of '*fast supervision*' (Green and Usher, 2003:44), students and supervisors are now being trained to handle their emotions more appropriately, leaving less scope for recognition of the impact of our embodied characteristics and personal journey on our research (Hall, 2004). However, for many, the personal nature of the journey is central to the research process and, in acknowledging this, this study addresses the gap in research into the emotional and intellectual experiences of the journey (Amran and Ibrahim, 2011).

The main factor which affected students' journey was family commitments. Katie, in particular, emphasised this, as she is a wife and mother of two young children, studying a full-time PhD:

> *I mean you don't want to milk it either because you know, people have varying responsibilities and what have you but it actually took me a long time to get into a routine because my husband has a very pressured job too so we're trying to work out things and you know and one child then starts half a day nursery and all these sorts of things and they do actually make a big impact on things.*

Ruby is younger with no children but her boyfriend is working full-time and she is still aware of the impact of her personal life on her PhD and, equally, the impact of her PhD on her family:

> *It's your life for three years isn't it so as well as doing the PHD you're also doing tons of other things as well which made your life high and low. You're not just the PHD graduate, you're someone's sister, someone's daughter, you're someone's girlfriend.*

She alludes here to her '*multiple* selves' (Reinharz, 1992) and I am able to empathise with these feelings. As a mother of twins, a daughter and a sister, with a full-time job, I am only too aware of the challenges of juggling my PhD with my personal life (Miller and Brimicombe, 2010). Like Ruby and Katie, I am aware that, for much of my journey, my personal life has proved to be a constraint on my time and motivation to work on my PhD and, towards the end of the PhD journey, the PhD has had a huge impact on my family life.

Katie also talks of the lows in her PhD journey which have been caused by her personal life and refers at this point to the death of her step father which affected her greatly and led to writer's block for a considerable amount of time:

> *I think the lows have really been more effected by my own personal life. Getting into a routine and all that, not seeing your kids as much …you know, not being a family very much at the moment, you know, I've already mentioned about my step dad. So those do actually bear a lot on how you're feeling and your capacity to study really.*

Again, I am able to identify with these feelings as I experienced the sudden death of my mother in the early stages of my PhD which brought my PhD to a complete standstill for a lengthy period of time. Then, in what should have been the final stages of my doctorate, my father fell terminally ill and subsequently died, again deeply affecting my capacity to complete my PhD. I include this story not as a tale

of sympathy, but to highlight the fact that each student is not only undertaking an intellectual journey but will be experiencing highs and lows in their personal journey and, inevitably, the longer the PhD journey, the more likely it is that you will, like myself and Katie, endure some significant personal challenges along the way (Hockey, 1991).

The review of literature highlighted the current debate regarding the extent of the role of the supervisor in this personal journey and the lack of research into the expectations of doctoral students and supervisors with regard to emotional and pastoral care (Janta *et al*., 2014). McCallin and Naylor (2012) suggest that supervisors have become both teachers of research and responsible for the pastoral management of students. My interviews disclosed that supervisors are aware of the personal challenges that face their students but have mixed views as to the extent to which they should offer pastoral support.   For example, Professor Howells acknowledges that supervisors need to be trusted to understand the personal challenges along a student's journey:

> *And, I suppose trust on the part of the student that the supervisor knows what they're talking about and is listening to what they have to say and understand the issues and problems, not only relating to the research itself but also their personal issues that might be affecting them and all the rest of it.*

However, Dr Richards appears to view herself as having less of a pastoral role:

> *Some of the, in terms of what happens outside their research, some students will tell you about external issues that they've got going on and that's fine and you deal with them. And I don't know as a supervisor, unless there is something that is going to really impact on*

279

their studies, like a bout of ill health or something like that, I don't know whether I want to know about other things that are going on.

She does, however, differentiate between full-time and part-time students and appears to have more sympathy with the broader challenges which face part-time students who have multiple selves and with whom she has a relationship on several different levels:

I think with the full-time students, if they're full-time and they're sponsored the vast majority don't have a job, any part-time job so at the end of the day they're here to study, they're here to work so I suppose I have to treat it in that same sort of fashion, whereas it is more difficult with the part- time students because you know they've got other times, and they'll have peaks and troughs in their work and family life and things like that and as I say, I think that's where it comes back to the blurred boundaries, because if they're a part-time student and you're supervising them and they're a friend and work colleague, you know what else is going on in their life, so you're much more aware of it and you don't necessarily, just generally through sort of conversations through coffee and things like that, so it is more difficult.

Again, this is an example of a supervisor drawing clear distinctions between part-time UK students and full-time, sponsored (usually international) students. Dr Richards knows of the personal issues of her colleagues but makes the assumption that international students are not experiencing the same pressures although, in fact, their personal lows may be more extreme as they are often a long way from their families or are juggling bringing up their children in a foreign country, whilst negotiating their transnational journey.

7.3.4. Gatekeepers and other sites of power in UK Higher Education

In addition to the constraints discussed above the interviews also suggested that the doctoral process is controlled by various sites of power and gatekeepers of

knowledge (Hall, 2004; Tribe, 2006; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). Tribe (2010:28) acknowledges these gatekeepers or obligatory passage points and suggests that they are less important for established researchers but '*may block the paths of younger or 'third world' academics.*' In an attempt to address Hall's (2004) accusation that tourism scholars are reluctant to explore the power wielded by gatekeepers in the legitimisation of tourism knowledge, this chapter now goes on to explore the layers of power and gatekeepers involved in the PhD process.

Becher and Trowler (2001) describe a gatekeeper as someone as an elder of the academic tribe who decides whether someone is welcomed into or excluded from a particular academic community. Within my research, various gatekeepers emerged, including supervisors, External Examiners, sponsors and journal editors. It became clear that these gatekeepers were not only deciding who could join the tourism tribe but also preserving the academic system, the conventions surrounding it and, therefore, the regime of truth which determines which behaviours are regarded as acceptable (Foucault, 1980). The following section will explore these gatekeepers and also the role of other sites of power such as sponsors within the process.

7.3.4.1. Sponsors

It emerged during the interviews that the first gatekeeper along the journey, particularly for international students, can be their sponsor. My research found that these sponsors, usually either overseas universities or governments often impose the topic which the student will research. For example, Changsai says:

> *Yes, you know, before I come here and my Rector or President of my university said the topic I should study to help them and my job. I am*

> *sponsored by the government. But I have to pay back to my university. That's a policy from the government.*

Supervisors also showed an awareness that sponsors are imposing PhD topics on international students. Professor Howells says:

> *Most of them … certainly the ones I've mentioned have scholarships, usually from their government or, in some cases, from universities … In some cases, their university stipulate what they must research. This is particularly true in the case of students coming to us from the Middle East and certainly from Egypt.*

Dr Richards shares this experience:

> *Now some of them come with a project that is given to them by their Government and it's really, particularly some of the Egyptian ones, it's really strict, they can't change their title.*

Dr Price explains how sponsors' briefs can impair capacity to challenge the norm and curb creativity and is creating a very business-oriented, mode 2 type of knowledge (Gibbons *et al.*, 1994). This commodification of research, inevitably, has implications for the body of tourism knowledge as it is influenced by disciplines such as economics, business and management and lacks the capacity to be creative or reflexive. This corroborates Tribe's (2006:372) findings that '*the purpose of knowledge also exerts an important influence on what truths researchers seek.*' Dr Price says:

> *There have been situations where sponsored students have really wanted to do something, say, on gender but their sponsors are not happy with that and I think that's a big issue on how that's having a negative impact on the kinds of knowledge that's being created*

> *because it's really driving a very business-orientated, practical agenda whereas there might be outcomes and areas you want to explore which grow organically in the PhD which are limited then.*

Professor Evans confirms this view when talking about one of his sponsored students and suggests that, because of the pressures he is under from his university, he has not, in fact, engaged in enough depth with his subject area and is producing a consultancy report instead of PhD:

> *The problem is, he's not very open to looking at alternatives. I think part of the challenge is that he's been set an agenda by his university so, there's a part of him that's being torn in the direction of almost a consultancy project as opposed to a PhD, in the academic sense. I've probably let him go at a speed or in a direction that maybe I may have cause to regret down the line, in the sense that I am not convinced he's engaged, in my terms, sufficiently, in the literature.*

This also draws attention back to the purpose of a PhD. It appears that Professor Evans shares the view that a PhD may not be the best way to generate the knowledge needed for the knowledge economy (Green and Usher, 2003) but that this heavy focus on managing the production of knowledge will lead to a quashing of creativity as we see a decline in curiosity-driven research where outcomes are not known in advance (Deuchar, 2008). The extract above also highlights various layers of gatekeepers in the process, for example external power structures such as his sponsor – *'he's been set an agenda by his university', 'his university have put him under some pressure'* and then an internal site of power, his supervisor – '*I've probably let him go at a speed or in a direction that maybe I may have cause to regret down the line'* and *'finishing off the PhD, will be challenging for him and it will be challenging for me.'*

Professor Evans emphasises the lack of enthusiasm which can occur on the part of both student & supervisor as a result of a topic being imposed:

> *Certainly Egyptians, they tend to come with a project which they have no say in at all … and I think that's not terribly helpful. It's usually a very mechanistic type of subject which is very difficult to get excited about. And I think excitement is part of the PhD. You want people to get a buzz out of what they're doing, at least have a sense that it's something they really want to do. I mean, if it's just a chore, it's soul destroying.*

It seems, then, from the interviews that, in light of earlier discussion regarding the purpose of the PhD, some sponsors are destroying the traditional nature of the PhD as a vehicle to make an original contribution to knowledge and, in doing so, shaping tourism knowledge. Furthermore, two tracks of knowledge are being created by sponsored and non-sponsored students, which is not only influencing the journey of both students and supervisors but also shaping what we know and why we know it.

7.3.4.2. Supervisors

As has been seen in the literature and in the previous chapter, supervisors are generally recognised as central to the PhD experience, particularly in Social Sciences. In addition, Teekens (2003) suggests that academics have a key role in the implementation of internationalisation and intercultural knowledge exchange. However, several authors also share the view that supervisors are the masters who are responsible for inducting their apprentices into their discipline and, as such are able to decide which gates to open along the student's journey (Lee, 2008; McCormack, 2004; Green and Usher, 2003). This section will continue to explore

the centrality of supervisors and, in particular, the key role they play as agents of internationalisation and gatekeepers to the academic tribe of tourism.

The first observation I made regarding this element of my interviews is that the two Asian female students I interviewed were much more reluctant to discuss or criticise their supervisors than the other students. In fact, when asked about the relationship with her supervisor, Hye began by saying *'Ooh, ah, it's a really sensitive issue.'* Although I have no substantiated reason for this reluctance, I have chosen to interpret it within its social context and in light of the high status which the students had already confirmed that they accord to academics. Their reluctance may have been exacerbated by the fact that we were strangers and they were aware that I was an academic and, therefore, a member of the same tribe as their supervisors. However, as they relaxed during the interviews, they began to express their views more openly.

The UK students were less reluctant to discuss their relationship with their supervisors and both seemed to view it quite positively. This could be pure chance or could perhaps be attributed to their expectations of the relationship and the fact that they were from a shared culture. For example, Ruby considers that she ended up *'building really strong relationships with them.'* She appreciates their student-led approach to supervision, whilst acknowledging that other supervisors may influence their students more strongly:

> *They were just really approachable, like my sort of people really, like I know that lots of people have very different ways of approaching supervision and I think X and Y's approach was let the student take the lead and for them to find their own way and then they would sort*

> *of support you on that road. They're not telling you what to do which I know happens in some PhDs.*

Again, it is notable here that she refers to her supervisors as *'her sort of people.'* This seems to indicate that Ruby views society as being comprised of 'types of people' or *'tribes'* (Becher and Trowler, 2001*).* Although, in other parts of the interview, she clearly suggests that she does not feel that she belongs to the wider academic tribe, she appears to be signalling here that she feels that, at the very least, she shares some common characteristics with some members of this tribe. She goes on to describe her relationship with her supervisors as supportive and again appears to value the fact that they are *'quite similar people … you can relate to'* who may have the same Members Resources to draw upon and, therefore, were able to understand and interpret her work as she intended it to be interpreted. She appears to be assuming that I, as a fellow member of the PhD student tribe, will share these views too, with her use of *'doesn't it?'*

> *It's just nice to have people around you that believe in you and that are supportive and I just think that we are quite similar people as well in the way that we are and that's something, when you feel you can relate to somebody that makes a big difference doesn't it because there a plenty of people that I don't feel I can't relate to at all and that obviously impacts on what you do in different ways as well.*

Katie, too, appears to have a good relationship with her supervisory team but does recognise that this is not always the case. She talks of another student's experience:

> *I do think I'm very lucky because going back to talking with the other students, there's one. She has three in her team and they all disagree with each other and I think that makes it very difficult and now what's*

> *happened is that they've all, she has fallen out with them and they have fallen out with her, which really doesn't help.*

It is interesting that Katie describes herself as *'lucky'* to have a supportive supervisory team who are in agreement with each other. In a professional environment, one would expect a team to present a united front and it is noteworthy that this is not necessary the expectation in an academic environment. It is almost as if there is an acceptance amongst students that academics are individual and independent and able to behave highly autonomously. In fact, despite the QAA (2011) recommendations that encourage supervisory teams, Dr Richards referred to tensions within supervisory teams and revealed how perceptions of status can not only affect the relationship between student and supervisor but also the relationship between the supervisory team:

> *There was one I had a lot of concerns about in the beginning because I felt that the other supervisor was sort of having a constant, not a constant battle with me but she always wanted to. She was really conscious about not being seen as an underdog. Now I don't see a second supervisor as an underdog as I think you're all equal but I think she has got this issue about status so I think she was much keener and she would also almost sort of over egg what she was doing just to demonstrate that she wasn't there just for the ride sort of thing and that's fine as long as that doesn't affect the student.*

Lydia, an international student, has not had a positive experience with her first supervisor. On three occasions, she describes how she is *'not quite happy'* with his supervision and the quality of his feedback. However, she also describes her lack of awareness or confidence about how to deal with the situation:

> *I'm not quite happy with his supervision and I don't know what to do about it except … I talked to the Research Director, and told him that. And other students as well are on my side, telling me, 'you should do*

> *something about it, it's really not an issue, you are paying a lot for*
> *supervision.' I said, 'OK'*

Lydia appears to have needed the support of her fellow students in order to gain the confidence to approach the Research Director about the issue. Interestingly, other students have also pointed out to her that she is the customer in this situation. However, having summoned up the confidence to approach the Research Director, it seems as if the academic tribe has closed ranks and, rather than replacing her supervisor, the Research Director persuades her to *'give him a second chance'* and agrees to oversee her work himself. Lydia has clearly struggled to stand up for herself, even though she has the MR of an academic background and has seemed, in other parts of our interview, to be less in awe of academics than other international students. This is the only stage of our interview where Lydia becomes hesitant and less assured of herself. The repeated use of *'erm'* and *'er'* in the following extract appears to demonstrate that she is not comfortable with this solution, but does not feel empowered to argue with somebody with the status and elevated subject position of Research Director. The following quote seems to indicate that it can be quite difficult to exit the supervisory relationship, even when the relationship is breaking down, which is quite surprising given how the importance of this relationship is acknowledged in the literature as vital to successful completion. This seems to support views in the literature that international students are positioned within a discourse of deficiency (Koehne, 2004; Ryan and Carroll, 2005), where they are considered as Other and suffer from a loss of voice (Koehne, 2004). Lydia says:

> *Erm, I talked a couple of days ago with our Research Director and*
> *asked him er if I could change my supervisor, so, he told me to give*
> *him a second chance …*

The acknowledged importance of the supervisory relationship also made it interesting to discover how some students had been allocated their supervisors. For example, when I asked Ruby how her supervisory team was chosen, she replied that '*they were pretty much chosen for me'.* In fact, she went on to say that she was asked who would be her first choice of supervisors and was then asked '*What if I told you neither of those people could supervise you?'* At this point, she recalls beginning to feel as if she needed to agree to suggested supervisors or she may lose her offer of a PhD place:

> *And at that point I thought she was saying, you know neither of them people could supervise you, you're out sort of thing and so I just said well I don't care, I'll have anyone as long as you let me do it sort of thing..*

She then refers to two of her peers who had been working in the institution for a term before embarking on their PhDs. She says that they have expressed relief that they have had some time to acquaint themselves with possible supervisors as *'they would have just accepted whoever they got in the initial stage and that's what happened to me.'*

An initial comparison between Ruby and Katie's route into PhD study appears to demonstrate the lack of consistency in the application process within the same institution. Ruby appears to have found the process rigorous and daunting, whereas Katie describes a rather casual process as she tells me that:

> *X and Y, they were writing proposals for research and they were writing one about Z and so they know me and knew I wasn't in full time*

employment so they asked me if I was interested and if I'd want to apply to do a PHD. Which I did, the project itself was accepted and then I was accepted as the person and that's how I ended up doing this PHD.

Although, on the surface, their description of events appear to demonstrate large inconsistencies within the application process, interpretation using their Members Resources (Fairclough, 2001) allows us perhaps to uncover another explanation for the apparent differences. Ruby is a fresh undergraduate, with no experience of the working world and a strong desire to make something of herself and to impress her friends and family. Katie, however, has been away from academic life for a long time, has had a successful career and a family and already knew her supervisors as friends. If Ruby were an international student, it would be tempting to attribute her willingness to have her supervisors imposed upon her to her cultural characteristics. However, it seems that Ruby felt that she would miss out on the opportunity to do a PhD if she did not accept her supervisors, regardless of who they were. The fact that she had a real desire to do the PhD and felt it could be taken away from her immediately sets power parameters, placing Ruby in an inferior position vis-à-vis her supervisors and even other students. The nature of the selection process was quite different for Katie who was hand-picked for the doctorate, meaning that her relationship with her supervisors is different from the start.

In terms of the nature of his relationship, Changsai says:

It is not like teacher and student. Sometimes it is like brother or uncle. I think his character, he is very soft. When you talk to him, it is like I told you, like you talk with your brother, your uncle. He is not distant.

However, it is interesting to note that Professor Evans has a totally different view of their relationship, describing Changsai as *'quite a challenge'* and using nouns such as *'detachment'* and *'formality'*, which are in stark contrast to Changsai's description of a *'brother'* or *'uncle'* who is *'very soft'*:

> *Changsai is quite a challenge actually. And he is certainly a person where I haven't broken down the human relationship to the level which I have done with other students. There is a detachment, there's a formality there and he's in and out of here like a rabbit. I never get the sense that he's comfortable sitting down and talking about his subject.*

There appear to be differences in cultural understandings here which again indicates the importance of both supervisors and students being open about the process and their expectations of each other at the start of the PhD journey (Burns *et al*., 1999; Green and Usher, 2003; Deuchar, 2008).

Supervisors appear to have varying views on how personal or formal the supervisory relationship should be, echoing discussion in the literature which shows that students and supervisors are not always comfortable with a personal relationship (Janta, Lugosi and Brown, 2014) and some prefer to be *'academically close'* (Wright and Lodwick, 1989:50). On this subject, Professor Wood says:

> *I've enjoyed them all personally, some more than others. I think that's important and it may well be that like attracts like or whatever … I'm not sure. I think the personal relationship is important. I would find it hard to work with somebody for three years if I didn't actually like them. … we got on very very well. It certainly varies but I think the personal is important if they are going to spend three years of their lives doing one thing, and you are going to be the sounding board for that period of time. If you cringe when somebody walks in your office, you know, I think you have a problem.*

His comment that *'like attracts like*' causes an interesting issue for international students as very few supervisors share their culture, considering the paucity of female or black academics in senior positions (Figueroa-Domecq, Pritchard, Segovia-Perez, Morgan and Villace-Molinero, 2015; Guardian, 2017).

Despite his misgivings regarding his relationship with Changsai, Professor Evans goes on to describe the importance of the personal relationship or *'courtship'*:

> *I suppose … I talk to people … I meet people all over the world who want to do PhDs and I talk to them in general terms. I talk to them in terms of relationship building and courtship …you are actually looking for a supervisor in a way … it's almost a dating process … you have to get to know them, and you have to build up a level of trust and, as important as the subject expertise is the relationship building. So, I think the most successful PhD relationships have been ones were personally we have been able to be fairly open and direct in terms of what we said.*

Dr Price reiterates this personal and emotional relationship:

> *I find it can be quite emotionally draining, it's quite intense (…) I mean, you do move across the bounds of being a supervisor into being a friend.*

As in the exploratory conversations in the first phase of my research, several of the students and supervisors referred to the importance of trust within the relationship and, more specifically, how that allows for constructive criticism to take place. This supports Deuchar's (2008) findings that students value a critical friend. For example, Lydia says:

> *Of course, yeah, the feedback and that would make trust. If I received two or three fantastic feedbacks, I would trust that person. And if I*

> *receive something, what, feedback 'it is fine' or 'explore the issues',*
> *which I already know how to do, or 'publish the papers' or something*
> *like that, I can't trust this person, that's the problem.*

This need for trust makes it all the more concerning that, as I stated earlier in the chapter students sometimes have no control over who their supervisors are.

Professor Evans agrees that trust and the capacity to be critical is important. However, he differentiates between a *'formal'* and '*informal*' relationship, making an assumption that all students will share his views of what constitutes an appropriate informality in the relationship. He does not consider the fact that many international students are reserved and have cultural MR which would preclude this level of informality:

> *You can't generalise, but I do try to build up the informal thing cos I*
> *think that's important … because I think the big bonus of that sort of*
> *relationship is that you can then introduce gentle criticism without them*
> *feeling threatened or without the whole loss of face or whatever. And*
> *I think that's, I think, the real benefit. You can say, you can actually,*
> *almost teasingly say, look, this actually doesn't work, does it?*
> *Whereas, if you had a much more formal relationship, that would be*
> *seen as much more directly critical of them. I think that's where the*
> *benefit of informality comes in.*

Professor Howells also cites trust as an important part of the relationship but refers to trusting the student to '*get on with what they're asked to do,*' which hints at a dictatorial (Gatfield, 2005) style of supervision, rather than any kind of mutual exchange.

Professor Hunt seems less enthusiastic about forming a personal relationship and instead describes it as *'structured and formalised'* but also *'approachable', 'friendly',*

'*participatory*' and '*mutual,*' resembling Gatfield's (2005) contractual supervisory style:

> *Um … I mean, by its very nature, it's a structured and formalised relationship. Um … I like to have an approachable, friendly, um … professional … I'd use the word professional, but that's just begging the question about what that means really … um … yeah, and also a kind of participative relationship … participatory … mutual participatory relationship.*

Again, Professor Hunt is making assumptions that his students will share the concept of an '*approachable*', '*friendly*' '*mutual participatory*' yet '*professional*' relationship. However, Aiko, one of his students, did not appear to share the view that the relationship was mutual or participatory:

> *Oh … as I said, I did Master programme and the Course Leader was Dr A, so I know him quite a long time. Also, he was my Masters dissertation supervisor. But, Jack Hunt is, um, he is new. He gave me one lecture in Master course, but, um … I didn't know more than that. So, when I meet new people, I feel very nervous … so I met Jack Hunt only twice for this four months, so, when I see him I feel very nervous, and he is always curious about, um, many things, any thing, so he asks me many things. So, last meeting was, like, he asked me questions and I answered, so I felt I'm playing tennis or something.*

She implies that she was not confident to do anything but answer his questions, without feeling empowered to exchange views or challenge her supervisor, appearing to support both Otten's (2000) assertion that educators are not using their power to facilitate cultural exchange and Brydon and Fleming's (2011) view that a student needs to feel sufficiently empowered to form an effective working relationship. Despite Dr Hunt's assertions to the contrary, Aiko clearly did not feel he was approachable and friendly. This could be explained by the fact that Aiko was in an early stage of her journey

and, in fact, when asked what makes for a good supervisor, Aiko went on to

say:

> *It will be I don't need to feel nervous … and communicate. Maybe if we meet more regularly or often, we might have more chance to talk to them, it will be better.*

There was agreement amongst the supervisors that each student is an individual

and working practices need to vary in order to get the best from the relationship

(McCallin and Nayar, 2012:64). They spoke of the difference between supervising

home students, international students and students who are also full-time members

of staff. For example, Professor Evans talks about a *'casual, informal'* relationship

but recognises that this can be more difficult with certain cultures:

> *I let the relationship be demand-driven by the student. I have students who come in to me three or four times a week and I have an open door and, if they want to drop in, they want to talk to me, that's fine. If I'm busy, I'll tell them to 'f' off, probably in those terms as well, because I do have a fairly casual, informal relationship, or I try to. Doesn't always work, depends on the culture.*

It does strike me during our conversation that Professor Evans' perception of an

informal relationship is very culturally bound and that many international students

(and perhaps UK students too) would be fairly shocked if he did indeed tell them to

'f' off.

Both Dr Price and Dr Richards differentiate between their relationship with full-time

international students and full or part-time home students. Dr Price says:

> *I think that varies hugely and I think the cultural differences are the main thing for me, I think. The full-time middle eastern, Arabic students I find your relationship with them is a lot more arm's length, shall I say.*

Dr Richards once again refers to the challenges presented by the multiple selves (Reinharz, 1997) of supervisors in the relationship when supervising fellow members of staff who were also PhD students:

> *And then, there's another category of people who are members of staff who again I think you have a totally different relationship with again …I really enjoy it but I think it can be a problem. You almost have to step out of your relationship as a colleague into a supervisory relationship … I think it can work both ways. I think sometimes when you're in a situation where you're actually quite good friends with somebody, it can be hard to say 'look, you really need to be doing this' erm, and perhaps it's not my style anyway as a supervisor to be confrontational so I tend to perhaps adopt a more kind of supportive and pushing people in other ways kind of style.*

Form my own experience and talking to other colleagues in my position, I can confirm that staff members doing their PhDs can also find this situation awkward. It can be difficult to accept criticism from a colleague but, more significantly, it can be quite uncomfortable to admit that you have not achieved agreed targets, for whatever reason.

For example, Professor Howells refers to *'assessing their personality'* and *'tempering your supervision'* with no suggestion of a mutual relationship between supervisor and student:

> *I don't see the single best practice and I don't operate a single best practice … and I think the PhD supervisory process is a very good example of that, in that every student, I think, is very different and has to be treated as an individual and what you have to do is assess their*

> *personality, their capabilities, their ability, their prior knowledge, their … all kinds of stuff … and temper your supervision to that individual … or adapt your supervision to that individual. And, when you get it right, it works very well. Sometimes, I think you don't get it right and that's simply because you don't read the individual, for whatever reason, as well as you might.*

However, whilst supervisors acknowledge that each supervisory relationship is individual and that cultural differences are significant, aspects of their behaviour do not always reflect this. For example, Professor Howells claims that '*every student … has to be treated as an individual*' but goes on to talk about how difficult it is to '*modify or change*' people's views of the world without '*getting into mind games*' which implies that he would attempt to do this if he could. In fact, in the extract below, he talks about the '*direction that you point them*' and '*instructions that you give them*' to make up for their '*shortcomings*'. In another part of the interview, he has talked about '*ironing out cultural differences.*' This, and terms such as '*shortcomings*' position international students, at best, in a discourse of deficiency and, at worst, suggest implicit racism. It suggests that some academics continue to have a culturally imperialist approach (Stier, 2002; Stromquist, 2007) whereby they limit themselves to imparting knowledge to international students, with no intercultural exchange (Ryan, 2012). Whilst espousing the textbook opinion that all supervisory relationships should be different, Professor Howells intimates that he would rather that they conformed to one model. This supports Bennett and Kane's (2011) argument that there is a considerable gap between the rhetoric surrounding internationalisation and the reality. They agree with Otten (2000) that educators can be resistant to change and continue to pursue a route of '*unchallenged ethnocentric western didacticism*' (2003:391). Professor Howells says:

> *Because, actually, what you're talking about is people's own view of the world, their reality and all the rest of it, and it's very difficult to modify or to change that, I mean, probably, without getting into mind games and all the rest of it, which is ridiculous. So, you have to sort of go with that and, in terms of the direction that you point them, and the instructions that you give them and the requests that you make, you make up for whatever, um, I was going to say shortcomings, it's not a shortcoming. So, I don't think my relationship with any of my supervisees is identical and, in a way, the way that I deal with them is this view that each of them is an individual that needs certain things at certain times.*

However, some supervisors and students appeared to have more mutual relationships with opportunities to share knowledge. For example, Professor Evans talks of *'intellectual proximity'*:

> *I think the intense interaction, the sort of real immersion in the subject and the intellectual proximity you get to people is something which is really challenging and stimulating.*

Unlike Aiko earlier, Lydia describes her supervisory meetings using expressions such as *'we chat about what was going on'* and persistently uses the pronoun *'we'*, inferring that it is an exchange of equals. This may be explained by the fact, as had become apparent earlier in the interview that Lydia, perhaps because of her parents being academics, was not in awe of her supervisor.

> *Then, we meet and then we chat about what was going on, where is my progress, how I am getting on, what I should change, what problem, what wouldn't be that beneficial as I thought, had I considered something else. If my supervisor comes across something that might be good for me* [to read]*, he writes it down.*

She also uses repetition to emphasise that she has some control over the relationship when she says:

>*I request the meetings. I request the meetings*

Several authors suggest that students become less dependent and more autonomous as they progress through their journey (Hockey, 1991; Phillips and Pugh, 1987) and my findings appear to corroborate this. For example, despite earlier observations regarding her subject position within the relationship, Ruby appears to have felt increasingly empowered during the process and to have had a realisation at a certain point that she was responsible for her own learning and had to manage her supervisors. However, it should be noted that Ruby is a UK student with experience of the academic and social culture as opposed to an international student:

>*I guess in terms of supervisors day-to- day, sometimes you go ages without hearing from them at all and I think one thing that I have always thought which people don't really get about the whole supervision experience is something I read somewhere I think and it said 'You have to manage your own supervisor' and so if you want a meeting with them you have to contact them and say I need a meeting and so I set my own deadlines and so I said by this date I'm going to give you this and stuck to them and then said right I need feedback by this date you know and so sometimes at points they were busy and they don't get in touch and things like that so you have to pester then which isn't very comfortable to start with but once you start then it's alright you know and you carry on like that and that's one thing I've always thought and that was one thing that was quite important to my experience I think was actually me thinking this is my journey and I'm going to take responsibility for this journey and they're going to come along with me really you know.*

Ruby herself recognises that, initially, she felt that her subject position hindered her from seizing control of the relationship and her personal PhD journey but that she has undergone a transition of identity by this stage of her journey:

> *But I think that the relationship that I formed with them was all part of this process of me managing them, you know and me getting in touch with them and that sort of thing so it was all part of that but you know, and of course in the initial stages I mean they were always approachable but you're always intimidated by your lecturers which is what they were to me when I first started. But I just sort of saw it, I think there became a point where I was just like I want to get this done and the way I am going to have to do it, they won't give me any deadlines so I'm going to have to put my own in place and I made like a chart and showed them the chart and said 'This is my plan, do you think I can do it?' and they were like ' Well, maybe, maybe not' but I really realised it was my journey you know, it was something that I had to do by myself and they would be there to support but predominantly it was going to be about me.*

Ruby refers to her supervisory team as her *'lecturers'*, highlighting that her relationship with them in her previous life, as an undergraduate student, continued to influence her view of her subject position as a PhD student. However, in some ways, it will also have made her journey easier as she had a familiarity with staff and the system that her international peers would not have experienced.

Despite several supervisors' assertions that they strived for a mutual relationship, analysis of the interviews, as has been observed above, suggested that, in fact, they assumed a powerful gatekeeping role. For example, Professor Hunt had told me that he aimed for a mutual and participatory relationship but then contradicted himself by giving a clear indication that he was in control of the relationship when asked about arranging meetings, saying:

> *'Um, I always ask for them. They might do it otherwise but I always ask them.'*

As in the exploratory conversations, the interviews uncovered varying attitudes of supervisors as to the extent of their gatekeeping role as *'the family doctor'* (Lee, 2008:272), influencing the direction of the students' research and the conventions

300

and discourse which the students adhere to. The majority of supervisors, either blatantly or subconsciously, revealed the power they hold within the relationship.

For example, Professor Wood, when talking about the level of corrections he will make to grammar, reveals, perhaps unwittingly, his attitude to influencing the work, saying:

> *Now, most of the students I've worked with have been fairly good in the sense that I'll say to them, I don't mind going through it once like this, but when I get it back, you know, if you don't agree with my corrections on meaning or in a grammatical sense, fine, but you know, make the corrections unless you've got a really good reason for not making them.*

By describing the students as *'fairly good'*, he implies that he expects them to do as they are told. He also says it is *'fine'* for the students to disagree with him but, in fact, expects them to follow his instructions and make the corrections *'unless you've got a really good reason for not making them.'* It is unlikely that an international student would have a good reason for not making them or would have the confidence to challenge their supervisor.

Professor Howells describes how levels of direction differ according to the ability of the student but appears to describe quite an interventionist approach, using the terms *'intervene', 'send them off'* and *'they're not able to do that':*

> *It also is part of the function of the individual student in terms of their ability. I mean, some students, you point them in the direction of something and they come back having completed the whole thing and you hardly have to intervene at all. Other students, you send them off to do something and it becomes quite apparent that they're not able to do that, so you then break it down into smaller tasks and start to*

> *see them more frequently, because you are checking on their progress*
> *as they go through it.*

Professor Howells also appears to feel some ownership of students' theses when

he uses the pronoun '*I*' in the following extract:

> *So, those four that I've completed more or less all completed*
> *simultaneously.*

This attitude is perhaps not surprising when he mentions the influence that he and

his colleagues have over the topics studied at doctoral level in his institution:

> *What we have tended to do, although we have taken on a lot of*
> *students, we've tended to be fairly selective and prescriptive in terms*
> *of the topics we will supervise. . Um … so there is a very deliberate*
> *attempt to develop the body of knowledge, contribute to the body of*
> *knowledge and, in particular, support some of the theoretical stuff with*
> *some more empirical evidence.*
>
> *We think your CV's great, we'd like to take you here but you're not*
> *really proposing to research an area that we're interested in. If you*
> *want to come here, look at our website and select a topic that's more*
> *related to what we're doing. In other cases, it's been modified slightly*
> *to fit more our interests.*

In fact, he goes as far as to say that the institution imposes topics in much the same

way as sponsors, by being '*selective and prescriptive*' and making *'a very deliberate*

attempt to develop the body of knowledge.' This echoes Tribe's (2010:15) concept

of '*departmentalism*' whereby departments support particular streams of research.

In this way, research is organised with institutions and departments and norms are

set out for what is to be studied, how it is studied and even who is studying it. In

other words, institutions and supervisors are shaping the nature of tourism and

hospitality knowledge at doctoral level, rather than encouraging creativity and

alternative worldviews. This is particularly concerning when one reflects upon the largely white, male, middle-class, Eurocentric composition of UK higher education that has been referred to earlier.

Whilst Lee (2008) recognises that supervisors can be gatekeeper to both the discipline and the final piece of work, Dr Price mentions the risks inherent in taking too much ownership of a student's work:

> *When I first started I was given some really good advice – never take credit for people's failures and never take credit for people's successes. Now, I think that's really good advice but it's hard, particularly at PhD level. I mean, when people fail at PhD level, there's an implicit criticism of the team – and it's hard to distance yourself, I think. Everybody enjoys success but it's when things go wrong, the relationship can become very difficult. So, you can't take credit for successes cos it's their PhD, all you do is help them over the line, I think. But, I find it's hard not to get wrapped up in the problem cases.*

In terms of influence, Professor Evans criticises relationships whereby supervisors try to impose their '*world outlook*' on students. He is one of the few supervisors to have made any reference to reflexive epistemology, supporting Hall's (2004) view that tourism academics are traditionally reluctant to engage in reflexivity and self-examination in terms of their research practices. However, his use of the expression *'I am very much willing to let them go that way'* appears to indicate that he still feels he has the ultimate decision regarding the direction a student's work takes. As with Professor Wood earlier, he seems unaware that international students are not equipped to challenge the dominant orthodoxies when he says *'Providing they can justify it and they are very very conscious of why they are not adopting other approaches, I am very much willing to let them go that way if they want to.'*:

> *I am not going to tell them what to do, I am going to comment on what they are proposing to do and maybe steer them in directions, but it's very much up to them to drive that relationship. I've seen PhD relationships where the supervisor tries to impose his own, or her own, values or beliefs totally on the student and the student is very passive. I don't think I'd like to work in that sort of relationship … let's put it that way .., so, from a negative point of view, I don't think that's very good. I have no prescribed methodological agenda. I wouldn't try to impose my world outlook, if you like, on anybody else and sort of let them ally that to the functions appropriate to them that is practical and achievable. Providing they can justify it and they are very very conscious of why they are not adopting other approaches, I am very much willing to let them go that way if they want to.*

Despite claiming to let them go their own way, later in the interview Professor Evans reveals the gatekeeper role he assumes in the relationship, with the use of expressions such as *'I want to be kept informed', 'I want to see everything at every stage, however small it is'* and *'I don't want any surprises'*:

> *My view of what they're doing is that I want to be kept informed on a regular basis, on their writing, on whatever else they are doing. I want to see stuff on a very regular basis. My mantra is I don't want any surprises, so I want to see everything at every stage, however small it is.*

Dr Price appears to be a bit more self-aware and honest than some in terms of his influence over the shape of a student's PhD:

> *I think it's an issue whose PhD is it but you can't help but, there is a hidden hand of the supervisor in there – and sometimes not so hidden… I mean, I don't believe in a PhD by formula, I think every PhD should be different. … In situations where there's an ability to influence it, I think I probably do end up guiding people down a more qualitative route.*

It is tempting to conclude that students are being over-directed and even suppressed by their supervisors. However, some of the students appear happy to receive direction as they lack confidence in their ability to express their ideas in English. For example, Hye says:

> *I want to get some of that kind of feedback as well but … yeah maybe … I don't know which one is my job of PhD and which one I can get from … advice from my supervisor. That is a kind of sensitive issue … I don't know which one is the right or not. Maybe my expectation is too high from my supervisor to get the advice, maybe their way of treating the student, to give us direction, just leave us to follow the direction and wait for me to find and, um, when I actually submit and they change things.*

However, Hye goes on to explain how she is uncertain how much direction she can expect, using expressions such as *'I don't know which one is my job.'* She reveals that she is uncertain about the etiquette of the relationship, which leaves her feeling marginalised and disempowered (Brydon and Fleming, 2011). She clearly indicates that her supervisor is in control when she uses expressions such as *'I know they are busy and I feel like I shouldn't interrupt',* 'how *many times* **they** *want to have meetings'* and *'inform what* **they** *prefer':*

> *Yeah, I agree of that one, more regular meeting and if I don't contact for long, they feel like I'm not really in contact with them, I don't really inform them, so it's like a kind of take in the wrong way each other, so, yeah, this kind of regular meeting and also inform what they prefer.*

These comments support Burns *et al.* (1999) who state the importance of discussions regarding the roles and expectations within the supervisory relationship, which is particularly important for international students where the academic is pivotal to the internationalisation process. Aiko also refers to a lack of explicitness and cultural differences in expectations when she says:

> *I came from Master programme and they treat PhD students very differently and … here PhD students call their supervisor just Jack or Alan but I don't get used to that kind of way. In Japanese university, it's not allowed to call…Yes, I still don't know what to call them.*

It is interesting that Professor Hunt, Aiko's supervisor, acknowledged that these issues over expectations existed but, despite his apparent cultural awareness, he had not made his expectations explicit to Aiko:

> *Culturally, of course there are all sorts of issues in terms of … people's expectations, expectations of the relationship between the supervisor and the student, that is in terms of the formality or not between them, the expectations in terms of how much contact they're going to have, how many classes they are going to get, expectations about how they're going to learn… so, I mean, yes, there are a lot of cultural issues really between different students.*

Dr Richards confirms that there can also be disagreement amongst supervisory teams as to expectations, which can lead to confusion for students:

> *I think with some relationships other people had said a completely different message to her and then that's not fair on the student because they get confused and they don't know where the hell they're going and they just go round and round in circles.*

Changsai talks about adjusting to his supervisor's expectations along his journey and indicates that he feels he has to fit into the '*expectations*' or '*boundaries*' of his supervisor, thereby conforming to his dominant discourse. This seems to suggest that he fully accepts that his white, male, middle-aged supervisor will not examine his own ways of seeing (Pritchard and Morgan, 2007; Ryan and Carroll, 2007) and that international incomers must adapt Haigh's (2002:51). He says:

> *Initially, I needed to know what he expect from me and how much I can fit to his expectation and also I don't know what's his boundary and things like that but now, after conflicted several times of his boundary, now I know what he likes … because my supervisor, he has kind of principles, so it's not flexible …So, after time go through, I know what he likes and his boundary.*

It appears that the powerful role of supervisors is not limited to international students. Ruby, a UK student, highlights the fact that the influence of her supervisors has continued, even after she has finished the PhD and is a new member of the academic staff:

> *I went into this sort of spiral of being like right I've got to achieve these things you know, and in a lot of ways it's like it's almost like they're someone else's dreams in a lot of ways, you know you get here and people keep telling you 'Oh this would a really great thing for you to do' and you, so you start doing all those things that other people tell you are a great thing to do and you have stopped thinking about what you wanted to do …*

Although she does not specifically refer to her supervisors in this extract, she says *'you get here'*, which one can assume is University, and that *'**people** keep telling you'* and, again, we assume that these people are members of the academic tribe, such as her supervisors. Their influence is clear in the use of terms such as *'they're someone else's dreams,'* *'things that other people tell you are a great thing to do'* and *'you have stopped thinking about what you wanted to do.'* In the next part of the interview, Ruby confirms that her MR means her *'self-worth is dependent on pleasing other people'* and she is frustrated as she feels unable to meet her supervisors' expectations at the same time as carrying out her teaching duties satisfactorily:

Since I started teaching because I can't keep my supervisors happy or my old supervisors now by doing publications because I've got students banging on my door and I've six modules to cover or seven modules to cover now and you know, so it gets frustrating then because it's like, you're being pulled in two different directions, you can't do everything for everybody and I think that's something that if your self-worth is dependent on pleasing other people, you're never going to be happy are you because you're not going to be able please everyone because you want to please your supervisors and you need to keep your students happy because they're the ones who are at your door so it is hard really and sort of made me reassess a few things in my life.

Again, it is interesting to note the use of the interrogative form, '*you know?*', which assumes that Ruby and I, as a fellow PhD student and lecturer, share the same Members Resources and therefore would have a common view of the PhD experience. To an extent, this is true as I, too, am juggling my priorities at work, with the PhD being put aside when my teaching commitments are intense. However, I attribute her desire to please her supervisors to her MR and her view of them as her former lecturers. Although, as I commented earlier, I feel embarrassed when I don't manage to hit a deadline, I have never felt the need to 'please' my supervisors who are colleagues and friends. Although Ruby talks of wanting to please her supervisors, I notice a change in the language she uses to refer to them at this point in the interview. Having just talked about them as '*supportive*' and '*similar*' to her, she now moves back to referring to them as '*they*' and using negative, if not hostile, metaphors, such as '*snatch it all away*', emphasising the power and control she still believes academics have over her working life:

I haven't really had time and that's really frustrated me because it's like they trained me up to be a researcher and then it's like they snatch it all away.

In addition to the power they wield regarding the process and product of the PhD, it became apparent during the interviews that, as suggested by Green and Usher (2003), supervisors perform a wider gatekeeping role to networks such as conferences and publications. For example, when talking about attending conferences, Lydia says:

> *And then all the feedback I can get from the plenaries from people, it's very valuable. And then I feel more confident I am doing the right thing … if I'm presenting in front of many people who are experts and they say, 'well, that's good, but why shouldn't you consider this, why shouldn't you consider that?', so, through that, I am somehow accepted in all the … all the arena of tourism academics.*

Earlier comments appear to have demonstrated that Lydia is not in awe of academics but the use of terminology such as *'accepted … in all the arena'* and *'experts'* indicate that she acknowledges that academics belong to a tribe which she is not yet a part of and whose approval she seeks.

Another area where supervisors appear to yield power is publications and Hye recognises that supervisors vary in their attitude towards students publishing:

> *I did actually, but I had some problem with my supervisor in the end. Most of them, they encouraged by supervisor to publish their conference paper but I think some of them, they are not.*

Lydia, again perhaps revealing her familiarity with academia, recognises that some supervisors encourage students to publish to increase their own output, but is resisting these demands:

> *Er, well I am encouraged by my first supervisor because I think he needs the publications so, he is encouraging me a lot – 'Have you contacted him, have you contacted him? Have you done this? I can't right now. I need some time and then I am going to publish.*

Indeed, many of the supervisors are quite honest about enhancing their CVs through publishing their students' work but have quite different views on it. Professor Howells admits that it is *'cynical'* but confirms that publications are a gain from supervising:

> *Output to put in the RAE … which is a dreadful thing to say and a cynical thing to say. In very pragmatic terms, one of the reasons for supervising PhDs is to get publishable output, it is definitely one of the motivations for doing it.*

Dr Richards, however, expresses disapproval at this approach:

> *So I think that's where other people's agendas come into it and I think people who are more desperate for publications and building up their list sometimes use their research students for that purpose and I don't think it's appropriate. But then my agenda is sometimes different to sometimes different to other peoples because some people will see the fact that they get put on conference papers or articles with their research students, they would then claim that alongside their publications and if they are desperate for publications that's an advantage for them.*

She has an established research profile of her own, which probably explains her attitude and may well explain Changsai's comment that professors do not encourage their students to publish:

> *It seems like lecturers encourage PhD students to publish conference papers but Professor level supervisors, they do not encourage.*

Dr Price, however, defends his approach to publishing and suggests that it is both a reward for the supervisor and an aid to the student:

> *I think the interesting thing is, there's an expectation that part of the kind of quid pro quo you get for supervising, is that you will publish so that your CV is improved as well as the students' CV and, I think, there's a potential that the student sees that as a bit of a parasitic arrangement. But I actually think that it can be and should be to the student's benefit because I actually think getting published is a completely different learning curve.*

Professor Howells further reveals his gatekeeping role as a judge of quality when he states that he only allows people to publish if he considers their work to be of sufficient quality. Here, he is taking a normalising role (Foucault, 1981) and legitimising certain parts of the canon of knowledge (Tribe, 2010). He also appears to claim ownership of the work with the use of *'we'* throughout:

> *So, it's not about slicing the PhD or the data as thin as you can to get as many as you can, it's more about quality. Um … but I mean that's always a fine judgement. I mean, I think, I've got a couple of students whose pilot work is so good, I'm hoping we'll publish articles on the basis of that. But … would we publish a literature review? No. Would we publish pilot data? Probably not, in most cases. We might get 2 or 3 papers out of the total PhD study, but only if they're there to be written.*

This chapter thus far has established the powerful role which is held by supervisors in the PhD process. It is widely recognised in existing literature that both true internationalisation of higher education and a Critical Turn in tourism studies involve doctoral students, amongst others, feeling empowered and confident to challenge the dominant discourse and the gatekeepers to that discourse. My findings have already uncovered the fact that spaces for intercultural exchange with peers and

academics are limited, in terms of physical spaces and research communities within universities. This section goes on to explore the effect of students' Members' Resources and access to appropriate discourses on the opportunities for intercultural exchange. This involves exploring their ability to challenge their supervisors and the attitude of those gatekeepers towards preserving the norms and limiting accepted discourses and ways of seeing.

Firstly, it was apparent that some of the students and supervisors were appreciative of opportunities to exchange knowledge. Changsai commented *'my colleagues, we study abroad PhD – 1of us in America, 1 in Australia – because we like to see the different kinds of education in different countries'* and Lydia echoed this when she said *'I think it's good to look on things from a different perspective.'* It is not clear whether Lydia means from an international perspective or disciplinary perspective but, either way, she acknowledges opportunities to exchange knowledge. Supervisors too acknowledged that this opportunity for knowledge exchange was one of the benefits of PhD supervision. For example, Professor Hunt says:

> *Me? Oh, I gain loads, yeah, absolutely. I think it's one of the nicest aspects of my job really. I get to speak to students on a one-to-one basis … I get to listen to their interesting ideas, I get to share their reading, I get to share their development of knowledge.*

However, it is not clear whether Professor Hunt is referring to both international and home students here, as it is not the view of their relationship that was given by Aiko, his international supervisee, earlier in the chapter.

Professor Wood endorses Professor Hunt's view, implying a meaningful exchange of ideas with the terms *'sharing'* and *'bandying ideas about'*:

> *It's a surrogate sort of thing, but, if somebody is good and doing a good piece of work, you benefit immensely by getting that knowledge before anybody else and kind of sharing it … But, I mean, I benefited an awful lot because she was digging out the literature that I probably, being lazy, wouldn't have dug out. She was pulling it together and we were bandying ideas about.*

Professor Evans agrees, commenting:

> *I think the intense interaction, the sort of real immersion in the subject and the intellectual proximity you get to people is something which is really challenging and stimulating.*

Dr Richards talks more specifically about the learning about diverse cultures:

> *But I think I learnt, you know I've had Libyan students, Somali student, Egyptian student and I think I have learnt a lot about sort of their culture, their countries in terms of the research that they've actually done …*

However, it is also clear that, despite the willingness of some academics, this mutual exchange is limited. This can be partly explained by institutional constraints such as resources and time pressures. As we saw in the findings of phase one, academic staff have various demands on their time and are under pressure to achieve timely completions. In this era of '*fast supervision for fast times'* (Green and Usher, 2003:44), it is understandable that opportunities for deeper discussion and exchange may be limited. Both supervisors and students seemed very aware of these time constraints, with comments from supervisors such as '*completing students in three years is quite difficult. It seems like a long period of time, but it's not a long time, in reality'* and '*where things go wrong, they tend to go wrong for*

organisational or access reasons.   The supervisor either doesn't give the supervision process priority …there are too many other things in their lives and they're just inaccessible.' Students also seem to be very aware of these competing pressures which comments such as '*when you are tied to time schedule, you can't really discuss all things', 'I think so but I don't always think that they've got lots of time to read what I have written',* and *'He is doing his own PhD so probably that's why he's more into that right now and not into my PhD.'* It seems that, if universities are going to take full advantage of internationalisation and the opportunities it offers for intercultural exchange of knowledge, they need to consider both the resources which are made available and the priority given to PhD supervision.

In addition to the time constraints mentioned above, it became apparent that there are power relations in play which mean there is little space to challenge the dominant discourse within either an institution or more widely in academia.   In fact, Dr Richards referred to one instance where a student had challenged his supervisor and the relationship had broken down:

> *The one I was talking about where I took over a student that was an intellectual clash. Their view of life was very very different, it was a fairly rigid Middle Eastern student and this huge ego of a supervisor and it just didn't work.*

Several supervisors spoke of PhD models for the UK and their institution, with Professor Hunt stating:

> *Well, I always, um, start off with kind of a couple of induction sessions about how things work, what expectations there are, how PhDs in the UK, particularly work. I mean there is a bit of a UK model to PhDs, I suppose, as opposed to the American model. Um … but … and then*

> *cultural differences do appear between students and so those cultural differences require, I guess, strategies to try to encourage students to work within the UK model.*

This notion of a '*UK model'* within which students should work highlights the significance of institutionalism (Tribe, 2010) and of the role of supervisor as gatekeeper '*in terms of the development of knowledge fields*' (Becher and Trowler, 2001:85). Supervisors are clearly setting the '*parameters in which individuals are encouraged to work if they wish to be at the centre of issues in their discipline*' (Spender (1981:186) which has huge implications for the potential re-shaping of the canon of tourism knowledge.

This, and extracts elsewhere in the interview with Professor Howells regarding '*washing out cultural differences'* appear to corroborate Barron and Zeegers' (2006) argument that normalisation is used as a technique which leads to marginalised groups (international students, in this case) taking up hegemonic discourses which are either imposed upon them or they do not have the linguistic structures to resist. They are therefore denied opportunities to bring alternative ways of seeing into tourism knowledge.

Professor Hunt suggests that it is not always a case of imposing discourses or ideas on students but that they are, in fact, reluctant to challenge these norms:

> *Students always pick up what you like and what you're about (laughs) and they say, 'that was great'.*

He echoes the views of some other supervisors who maintain that they would like students to challenge them more. They are aware that they are reluctant to challenge the norms and many appear to attribute it to their culture and subject

315

position. However, in their core role as a facilitator of both knowledge creation and internationalisation (Teekens, 2003), they do not appear to have any strategies to give international students the voice and the confidence to challenge the existing norms. In the extract below, Dr Richards talks about international students:

> *But with the full time international students, they treat you with a very high degree of respect and sometimes that can be a bit of a problem, because sometimes you want them to challenge things and they won't So sometimes you say something and they just sit there and they smile or, and you want, particularly, as the work progresses you want there to be more of a discussion about what they've done, why they've done it that way, what that literature means for the bigger picture and things like that and sometimes they don't question it or they don't question you.*

Professor Howells appears to agree, making generalisations, once again, about international students as a homogenous Other who are *'too respectful of the authority figure.'* Again, he lays out a blueprint for an ideal relationship but, although my findings suggest that this is not happening, he does not have any strategies to bring it about:

> *I guess it's partly to do with international students who come from particular cultures … there is an issue about the extent to which PhD students can be too respectful of the authority figure and the power relationship and obviously the supervisor has a huge amount of power in the relationship … but I'm firmly of the view that the best research gets done by researchers who are genuinely interested in the topic that they are researching and, what they need to be doing is the research that interests them and not the research that interests the professor or the supervisor… so you actually don't want too much respect … I mean, you don't want the student to be so respectful that they don't think for themselves, that defeats the whole object of the exercise. Which is why, I think, you've got to establish a relationship based on trust, partly to counteract what can be an over-respectful attitude towards the authority figure, the expert.*

Professor Wood is of the same opinion but does appear to differentiate between international students, rather than categorising them all as the Other:

> *I think they vary because they're coming from different backgrounds as well, backgrounds where it's much more didactic. Maybe a Chinese student or maybe a middle eastern student where their professors are seen as being the fonts of all knowledge and they just impart it whereas I think in the western, UK system, your supervisor is seen yes, as an expert but not somebody whose word is law, I think. … so I think that causes genuine problems cos if you're so used to saying this is how it is, when you're given the freedom to question things, it can be quite a challenge and quite threatening, I think. So I think the cultural differences are very big.*

Professor Wood goes on to make sweeping generalisations by nationality, even admitting it is a cliché:

> *It's harder working with some than others. I mean, the Asiatic students by and large … I mean, the cliché is somewhat true … they are very hard workers but they do follow conventional wisdom and it's rare to find one that will, not disagree with you, but will branch off on their own. I've had a couple, one a Laotian girl, teaching in Hong Kong, who studied an area I worked in … and a Chinese guy in Canada … and they both sort of said, well, no, I want to do this and I'm thinking about doing it in this way, and I want to explore this, whatever … Whereas, the others are, I want to do this, how do I do it? And then, they'll do it very well and very successfully but it's not as exciting, it's generally more formulaic and less exciting to work with.*

Aiko confirmed this *'over-respectful attitude'* and commented that when she disagreed with her supervisors regarding her project, she fully intended to pursue her own route but was not intending to tell them face-to-face:

> *No, I didn't. Um, I'm not sure I will tell them but I definitely will do my own research topic, so I will send document.*

She says the reason she prefers email is *'For me, cultural. And a personal thing, feeling nervous.'*

It is interesting that the supervisors only appear to recognise this *'over-respectful attitude towards to the authority figure'* in international students and not in home students, once again problematizing international students (Kelly and Moogan, 2012). However, Ruby confirmed that this reluctance to challenge was not confined to international students. She appears to recognise that her supervisors are gatekeepers or the *'judges of normality'* (Foucault, cited in Owen, 1994:181) and acknowledges they *'probably do influence it a great deal'*:

> *I guess they do influence it quite a lot but then I wouldn't like to think that it all came from them you know … I guess in a way if I had ended up being supervised by a different supervisor who was more quantitative, mentioning no names, then I could have ended up probably completely different because you at the end of the day, you need to please them don't you really, and when you hand in your drafts it's to them and they say what they like about it and what they don't and so I guess they probably do influence it a great deal and it would be quite hard if they disagreed with what you were saying to fight your corner you know and say 'right well I'm going to do it this way'.*

Her admission that it would be quite hard to disagree with your supervisors and *'to fight your corner'* highlights not only the power that supervisors have within the relationship and the knowledge that is being created but also her reluctance to challenge them, even though she has the linguistic capability to do so. Moreover, Ruby's view that *'you need to please them don't you really'* again appears to link back to her background, where we see a lack of self-esteem and a need for approval from academics who she regards as occupying a far higher subject position than herself. She uses the expression *'don't you'* as she is speaking to me, again

demonstrating that she assumes a commonality of values between her and myself, as fellow PhD students. Interestingly, as a confident academic in my 'day job', I have felt out of my comfort zone and have found it difficult to challenge my supervisors at times, particularly in the earlier stages of my journey (Phillips and Pugh, 1987).

As has been seen elsewhere in this thesis, the supervisory relationship is a very individualised one. Throughout the interviews, it occurred to me that students' capacity to challenge the 'norms' and the dominant discourse is, to a large extent, governed by individual supervisors' attitudes to issues such as reflexivity and positionality within research. If a supervisor, as a judge of normality, is part of the so-called Critical Turn and willing to accept reflexivity as part of academic normality, this will influence a student's capacity to introduce their own worldviews and ways of seeing.

Many authors have recognised the importance of our embodied characteristics in tourism research (Hall, 2004; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Furthermore, Trahar (2011:146) suggests that intercultural understanding relies upon knowing your 'self', thinking outside your 'tribe' and empathising with 'others'. However, it is also acknowledged that *'the self is generally ignored (or often banished) in tourism research* (Tribe, 2006:364). It was clear during the interviews that some students, especially Ruby, were very aware of the effects of their backgrounds and embodied characteristics on their research experience whereas others were less reflexive. During the interviews, supervisors seemed very firm in their views that culture played a large part in students' approach to the supervisory relationship and their ability to challenge the norms. Therefore, I was keen to explore whether they

319

encouraged their students to recognise these cultural differences and their positionality within their research, particularly as my study embraces the role of embodied characteristics or Members Resources in our experiences and our research. Furthermore, it is recognised that only by embracing '*multiple worldviews and cultural differences*' (Pritchard & Morgan (2007:23) will we have a radical reform of the orthodoxy of tourism knowledge and a 'new' tourism knowledge, which includes a more '*diverse situatedness*' (Botterill & Gale, 2005:5).

Although, as seen earlier in the chapter, two supervisors were both aware of the 'model' or 'norm' for their institution, they appeared to take a different approach to positionality, possibly as a result of their own research views and entanglements. Despite having spoken earlier about his efforts to treat each student as individual with different worldviews, Professor Howells appears to contradict himself below where he talks of a process *'designed to filter that out'* and *'creating a research culture that washes out any cultural differences'*:

> *In a way, you could argue that the process is designed to filter that out because I think they might well come with quite strong cultural characteristics, in terms of their view of education in general terms and so forth, but actually, one of the things that happens is the literature review process is a fairly standard process that they all go through … and … I think we kind of wash out the cultural difference between the students. There are still some cultural differences … but … what we try to create is a research culture that … washes out any cultural differences there are in the students, so they're all on the same wavelength … and I don't know how successful we are in that.*

Professor Howells does not make it clear whose '*wavelength*' he is talking about but, presumable, it is the existing dominant hegemony. The view that it is possible to '*wash out*' cultural differences by going through either the upgrade or literature

review process is quite shocking, in that it assumes that students can go through a

process whereby their embodied characteristics will cease to influence their way of

thinking. Professor Howells goes on to say:

> *So, in many ways, the upgrade process is fairly standardised and, again, that tends to sort of impose a '[Name of institution] norm' on behaviour that means, whether they're Russian, Caribbean or from the Middle East or Far East, doesn't make an awful lot of difference, I don't think, anyway.*

It is quite astonishing that he thinks students' culture '*doesn't make an awful lot of*

difference' and this implies that, in fact, rather than *'washing out'* any cultural

differences, students are actually encouraged to bury them and not to make them

explicit in their research and to write a PhD which complies with the 'norm' for that

institution.

> This was not the case for all supervisors, but they did seem to acknowledge that they were unusual in their approach. For example, on the subject of encouraging students to incorporate their worldview into their PhDs, Professor Hunt recognises that he is challenging the institutional norm himself. This is perhaps not surprising if one considers his MR. He is an acknowledged elder of the tribe (Tribe, 2010) but is also a member of the critical turn in tourism studies (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson and Collins, 2005) within which attempts are being made to deconstruct the '*the dominant processes involved in the so-called making of knowledge'* in tourism studies (Harris, Wilson, Ateljevic, 2007:41). He says:
>
> *I certainly do. That would be highly distinctive to me, for example and not part of the (Institution) model, in a sense. A lot of my students … if you talk to a lot of the students here, a lot of my students will say I talked to so and so, and they said, why are you doing that and why are you doing that? So, there's a little bit of tension there between the way I like to approach things and perhaps the way the School does. I think perhaps the School does it in much more of kind of, this is the way you do a PhD, it's quite positivistic, not much reflexivity in it at all really.*

Dr Price, who works at a different institution but shares the MR of Professor Hunt, appears to consider that his institution is prepared to challenge academic convention, using expressions such as *'operating in a little bit of bubble'* and *'overwhelmingly not the norm.'* He enters into the debate of the PhD as product or process (Park, 2005), saying that rather than producing an end product, *'we actually challenge people to at least open the chapter which says epistemology in the books'*:

> *We do ask a lot of our students because I examine quite a lot at other places and I see people doing a positivist PhD and they've never questioned anything, they just produce an end product and you examine it on its own terms and it passes. I think here we actually challenge people to at least open the chapter which says epistemology in the books and I kind of think at other places you can totally almost ignore it. I do think that we are operating in a little bit of bubble at times here in tourism cos I think the individuals that are here, we're so in to doing things a little bit differently, we think that's the norm but it's overwhelmingly not the norm.*

He actively encourages his students to position themselves within their research but does recognise that some students may not be capable of doing it:

> *And giving people the confidence to say, it's OK to write in the first person, it's ok to be situated, you know. It's not like I say you have to be situated, it's horses for courses. I've got one who wants to do it but I just think, it's going to be too difficult. She hasn't quite got the intellectual tools for some of it and her writing needs some development so I'm just thinking she could get it a lot easier by going down the route of least resistance.*

7.3.4.3. External examiners

It is acknowledged in the literature that, despite QAA guidelines, there is a lack of consistency amongst External Examiners and opinions of what constitutes a PhD

(Jackson and Tinkler, 2001; Denicolo, 2004). This is important in the interests of equality of student experience and outcome but also introduces another layer of power into the PhD journey. An external examiner is the ultimate gatekeeper who decides whether someone is welcomed into or excluded from the tourism academic community (Becher and Trowler, 2001). This highlights the importance of choosing an examining team who share or appreciate the approaches or worldviews of the student which is potentially challenging when one considers that the tourism tribe and its elder statesmen has traditionally been comprised of mainly white, middle-class, Anglophone, male, western academics (Botterill and Gale, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). As was mentioned earlier, 87.5% of tourism professors in the UK are male (Figueroa-Domecq *et al*., 2015) and no black academics have worked in senior management in any British university for the last three years (Guardian, 2017). The inconsistency in the examination process also highlights the key role that supervisors have in accessing these *'elders of the tribe'* (Tribe, 2006) when *'the field of tourism studies is partly influenced by the relationships that exist within the research community, rather than depending solely on so-called objective academic merit'* (Hall 2004:143).

Two of the students demonstrated that they had an awareness that they needed to choose like-minded examiners carefully. Katie acknowledged the inconsistencies in the process when she said:

> *You need to think carefully about your examiners, one external, one internal, who you think is kind of along your lines, who would be interested and basically someone who's not going to give you a really hard time.*

Lydia also acknowledged that she had to play the academic game by quoting her examiner extensively. Again, this may result from her knowledge of her parents as academics:

And then, if I found somebody, some of the academics, I think, wow, hmm, I'll ask him to be my External or something like that. Why not? He knows about this, he told me that, I quoted him … hmm … perfect.

Confirming Green and Usher's (2003) view that supervisors are responsible for ensuring that a thesis meets the norms of the discipline as defined by disciplinary gatekeepers, supervisors are very aware of the gatekeeping role that External Examiners have and seemed to have a sense of responsibility to either help choose sympathetic examiners or guide the student to conform to the examiner's norms. For example, Professor Evans says:

I am always very conscious of methodology when I discuss, say, the External examiners. I would never sort of … I try to be comfortable that the person who is Examiner is at least going to have a sympathetic ear for the methodology, rather than just be totally dismissive, which some can be.

Dr Richards concurs:

But in terms of how the overall product is going to be, look and is going to pan out, and also I think being aware of what externals look for as well and what they expect to see within a PHD.

Dr Price supports this view and shows the importance of being part of the academic tribe and knowing examiners personally when choosing them. This not only demonstrates the powerful role of the examiners but, once again, highlights the key

role of the supervisor and how well networked they are within the academic

community (Hall, 2004):

> *I think it's hugely important, especially when people are doing something different and, what happened with that individual was it was a feminist approach and we picked the wrong kind of feminist as an examiner. It was on someone's recommendation and I think maybe the lesson there is that you have to make sure you've got some experience of the examiner, either have you examined with them, chaired an examination when they've been there, do you know them outside of the examining process. Kind of, do you have feeling for them as a person, I think I tend to go for that now.*

Dr Price also explains how External Examiners and institutions can prevent students

from challenging the norm, perhaps because *'original research can be dangerous*

in that it can undermine previously clearly held beliefs and careers' (Lee, 2008:272):

> *I mean you still get examiners asking people to take writing in the first person out of a PhD and it just drives you round the bend because you're just thinking, well, they're operating very different standards, we're trying to get our students to do something different. I think we're opening, trying to open our students' minds to different things but there's a consequence to that. When they go back to their different institutions, those institutions are living and breathing positivist and quantitative stuff so you've got to think, well is their PhD going to be kind of seen as a second class PhD cos it's all about interviewing. You kind of think well there are consequences for these people's lives and careers.*

However, despite his protestations that academics need to be more open to new

ways of thinking, he then goes on to admit that he circumvents the issue by hand-

picking examiners:

> *But I think that you've got to be sensible and pick an examiner who's OK with that cos there's plenty of people who don't like it.*

He also talks of his experience as Chair or an examination where he clearly thinks the examiners were trying to impose their own norms but he was unable to challenge them:

> *I had an experience the other week as a Chair when I thought the examiners were completely out of order asking somebody to do things because I felt they were examining a PhD that they would have written not the PhD the student had written and I think that's a big issue.*

Dr Price goes on to talk about the balance of power within the examining team and how the elders of the tribe can pull rank over less experienced examiners:

> *One of mine who had a 2 year re-write came as a bit of a surprise. I think she came a bit unstuck – and it was a learning curve for me – it was a long time ago and it was learning curve for me about External Examiners. We had one who was very inexperienced and we had one who had a very definite view. And I think what happened was the inexperienced one got completely railroaded by the other person and we ended up with a bad outcome. I didn't think the thesis was that bad.*

It is clear from the interviews, then, that supervisors in particular are fully aware of the inconsistencies between External Examiners, and the power that they wield in terms of the shape of the knowledge being produced in PhDs and the conventions and discourse within which that knowledge is expressed. It also highlights the inconsistencies in the examination process as different examiners have different parameters which they deem acceptable and different criteria of doctorateness (Denicolo and Park, 2010). These criteria are rarely made explicit which presents a challenge for home students and possibly an even greater one for international students who are new to the UK academic culture. External examiners become, therefore, the ultimate gatekeeper in a student's journey towards completing their

rite of passage into academia and '*judges of normality*' (Foucault, 1981) as to what is deemed to be legitimate tourism knowledge. However, either en route to that final goal or immediately upon completion of the journey, students will encounter another set of gatekeepers, namely journal editors.

7.3.4.4. Journal editors

Firstly, as was seen earlier in the chapter, there were mixed views towards the value of publishing. However, journals are also obligatory passage points and therefore influence regimes of truth and maintain dominant discourses (Tribe, 2010). All the participants seemed aware of the need to conform to the academic norms for journals, supporting Coles *et al* (2006:304) view of journal editors and referees as '*sentinels demarcating and watching over the proper extent of disciplinary boundaries*.'

Hye acknowledged this and spoke of the need to '*fit the journal format.*' Interestingly, she also seemed to recognise the gatekeeping role of editors as she referred to them as '*experts*' who would '*evaluate*' her research:

> *And, also, this time, you can learn how to do … how to write the paper, to fit the conference format and the journal format and also you can review what you have done for your research and your research will be evaluated by someone who is expert.*

On the other hand, Lydia was quite cynical about the process and refers to '*hunting*' editors:

> *I don't want to, not waste my time, but I have other things to do which are more important right now than hunting editors and publishers and, right now, I don't feel like doing this.*

Lydia's use of *'hunting'* seems to allude to the fact that you had to chase editors and produce an article that they will approve of. Dr Price also hinted at this when he spoke of the role of the supervisor in helping to *'package'* the work appropriately in the correct language. My findings have demonstrated that both home and international students find academic language challenging but this comment highlights the increased challenges for non-native English speakers in accessing key journals (Tribe, 2010):

> *Erm, and I think there is a way of packaging your research for a journal and I think it's too much to expect a newly qualified PhD person to write on their own. I mean, if they do, then great, they can kind of fly on their own but I don't think you can – especially if you want to try to hit the top end of the journals, I think, again, I think that's where a supervisor can perhaps come into his or her own, I think you can really add value to somebody's research by knowing how the journal editors and journal reviewers will see it, how they will read it. You know, so if you present it as being part of a PhD which is ongoing, then people might look at it in a certain way, it's how you package it, it's the language you use.*

The language that Ruby uses when referring to interactions with journal editors appears to demonstrate an awareness that they are authority figures who belong to a different academic tribe from herself. She repeatedly refers to them as *'they'* and talks of *'doing things the way they want you to':*

> *Well I mean, the stuff that I've published so far, there's been the journal article, that was fine, that went through because that was like a contextual paper so they accepted that one. … I like to keep things honest really which is maybe not the right way to be you know, because you think, sometimes you should just do things the way they want you to.*

328

At one point in the interview, Ruby is even more explicit regarding the role of gatekeepers in the publishing process, supporting the view that journal editors, have rigid practices and demands which are not conducive to giving voice alternative practices (Barron and Zeegers, 2006:79):

> *So, on the basis of the conversations that I've had at conferences and meeting academics, I still find that there's very much a sort of rejection of doing things differently and I do think that is going to be a hurdle for me in terms of academic world … it's like I've said before I think if you did things normally and if you've conformed, you're in a better position in a lot of ways and I never wanted to do that because that's not the PHD I wanted to write and I'm glad I didn't. It's like, why not accept that there are different ways of doing things so I think it will be an issue and you have to think carefully about where you send stuff.*

It is interesting in the extract above that Ruby talks about *'doing things normally'* and *'conforming'*, indicating where she positions herself in relation to the rest of the academic world of Tourism Studies. In fact, later in the interview, she refers to her research as *'totally wacky'*, again indicating that she considers herself to be positioned outside of the dominant group in Tourism Studies. The fact she states that it *'is going to be a hurdle for me in terms of academic world''* and *'I think if you did things normally and if you've conformed, you're in a better position in a lot of ways'* demonstrate that she is aware of the need to publish in certain journals to progress (Tribe, 2010).

Although the discussion about the role of journal editors was limited in our interviews, perhaps because many of the students had not yet published, it was apparent that both supervisors and students were aware of the constraints around publishing in academic journals. Once again, this highlights the powerful role that

journal editors play in shaping both the type of knowledge produced, the methodologies used and the academic conventions in which that knowledge is expressed. Academic journals are key channels for the evolution of tourism knowledge and tourism scholars are judged by their ability to publish in leading journals (McKercher, 2014) yet the predominantly white, male composition of these powerful editorial boards is rarely questioned (Pritchard and Morgan, 2017).

7.4. Summary

This chapter has explored the concept of the PhD both as a transitional personal journey and a rite of passage into the academic arena. It has identified that it is an individual journey which varies for each traveller, according to their members' resources such as personal circumstances, background, culture and identity. However, it has also examined in further depth some of the constraints that exist around the experience and explored how these various constraints are affecting the opportunities which exist within the doctoral process for creativity and intercultural knowledge exchange which, it has been argued, are at the core of both the doctoral process and internationalisation.

The first important finding which should be noted is that both international students and home students experience many of the same feelings during their journeys. Despite the fact that the literature tends to treat them separately, 'othering' international students and imposing a discourse of deficit on them (Haigh, 2014), my findings support the view of Carroll and Ryan (2007:27) that international students are just *'canaries in the mine.'* Feelings of isolation and lack of

empowerment may be exacerbated for international students but this research has shown that they present a real challenge for UK students too.

It seems to me that doctoral education is governed by a structure of rights and a regime of truth (Foucault, 1980) within UK Higher Education. Students' access to this structure of rights appears to be influenced in part by their perceptions of identity and their access to appropriate language and discoursal structures. In keeping with the findings from the first phase of the research, this chapter has found that the supervisory relationship is at the heart of the experience. Supervisors undoubtedly wield a great deal of power in their role as gatekeepers, some more overtly than others, and particularly in the case of international students, where it is acknowledged that academics should have a key role to play in bringing about internationalisation (Teekens, 2003). My findings appear to corroborate the critical linguists' view that power holders within institutions not only impose conventions on discourse types but they then police these conventions and use them to maintain their dominance within both institutions and societies (Fairclough, 2001). However, other powerful gatekeepers within the process also emerged, such as sponsors and external examiners. The role of sponsors in imposing topics was particularly interesting in light of the debate in the literature regarding the role of the PhD as a vehicle of knowledge production. It appeared that the sponsored students were, arguably, producing mode 2 knowledge (Gibbons *et al.,* 1994) and non-sponsored students had more influence over the type of knowledge they produced.

However, it should be noted that the hidden power held by these gatekeepers is not the only factor which inhibits the knowledge exchange and opportunities to challenge existing orthodoxies. It came to light that spaces for internationalisation,

and therefore intercultural exchange, were limited by other factors. Firstly, students experience intense feelings of both mental and physical isolation. They are often located away from academics and supervisors, even when willing to engage in in-depth discussions, are restricted by competing demands on their time and pressure to bring about timely completions and undertake all their other academic commitments. Secondly, language is a constraint, in terms of students' ability to converse on an informal level with peers or in a more meaningful discussion. Also, the academic discoursal structures and conventions which are maintained by gatekeepers mean that many students, both UK and international, are not able to express themselves as creatively as they would like.

In summary, whereas the doctoral environment should be an ideal stage for foregrounding alternative modes of enquiry and challenging traditional knowledge creation within tourism studies, the in-depth interviews uncovered a range of factors which limit these opportunities for both staff and students. It seems that, if universities are going to take full advantages of the opportunities which the internationalisation of higher education presents, they will have to instigate measures to address these constraints and to create spaces for this internationalisation to take place. Chapter 8 will make suggestions as to some possible initiatives that could be implemented.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

8.1.   Introduction

8.2.   Revisiting aim and objectives of the study

8.3.   Overview of study

8.4.   Key findings of the study

8.5.   Key contributions of the study

8.6.   Implications of the study

8.6.1. Implications for Higher Education Institutions

8.6.2. Implications for the Tourism Academy

8.7.   Challenges, limitations and recommendations for future research

8.7.1. Recommendations for future research

8.8.   Final thoughts

8.1. Introduction

This chapter summarises my own research journey and reflects on the research process. The chapter revisits the aim and objectives, presents the key findings and contributions and outlines the implications of the findings and makes recommendations for future study. The chapter moves on to discuss the challenges and limitations of the study and concludes with a passage reflecting on my final thoughts at the end of my (very) long, and sometimes tortuous, journey.

8.2. Revisiting aim and objectives of the study

This study has explored the factors that affect the PhD journey in the current internationalised climate of Higher Education. It has paid particular attention to the potential for intercultural knowledge exchange in doctoral studies and the constraints that exist around the process. The research explored the experiences of those involved in the PhD journey through the following aim and objectives:

Aim

To investigate the opportunities and constraints surrounding the PhD journey and the creation of tourism knowledge at doctoral level in the internationalised environment of contemporary UK Higher Education.

Objectives

Objective 1:

- To explore the concepts of internationalisation, the role of the PhD and the PhD journey in UK Higher Education through a critical review of the literature;

Objective 2:

- To investigate the factors influencing the PhD experience of UK and international students and supervisors in tourism studies in the contemporary internationalised climate of UK Higher Education;

Objective 3:

- Through a critical language approach, to explore the constraints surrounding the PhD journey and the provision of spaces for intercultural knowledge exchange;

Objective 4:

- To provide recommendations to enhance the doctoral student experience and take advantage of the opportunities provided by internationalisation in doctoral education.

8.3. Overview of study

My results have clearly shown that the PhD is a transitional and highly personal journey, affected by many factors. However, my findings have also raised issues about what constitutes a PhD or doctorateness and shown that the PhD is in a period of transition. The increasing focus on skills training and training researchers

and knowledge workers appears to be one of several constraints affecting both the nature of the doctoral process and the eventual outcome and how it is judged.

Other constraints which were revealed to be affecting the doctoral journey include the power of gatekeepers such as supervisors, sponsors and external examiners who impose conventions and police them. These conventions, coupled with feelings of isolation and language difficulties, lead to a lack of spaces for internationalisation to occur.

The result seems to be a lack of creativity within the process and wasted opportunities for intercultural knowledge exchange. My research has shown that PhD students, both home and international, continue to feel marginalised and an environment exists where their voices remain marginalised within the tourism academy, resulting in a diminishing role for the PhD in tourism knowledge creation.

The conclusion from my study when I look beyond the internationalisation experience is a knowledge canon even more rooted in the dominant ways of seeing. The triumph of white, anglophone, masculine voices and research agendas has been secured and reinforced with very little effort. Spaces seemingly all set up for intercultural knowledge sharing have been transformed into sterile encounters where students conform to dominant practices and processes and in many instances, these are themselves morphing into skills training agendas. There is a sense of missed opportunities in this whole process, for the students themselves, both home and international, the departments, supervisors, the institutions and the way we know and understand tourism. Having given a very general overview of the conclusion of my study, the next section will discuss the key findings in detail.

8.4. Key findings of the study

As with much qualitative and emergent research, this study is not conclusion oriented and probably raises as many questions as it answers. However, I shall

attempt to summarise some of questions that have been raised and some of the conclusions I have drawn. As reflexive researcher, I am, however, aware that the reader may draw alternative conclusions and observations as knowledge is partial and contested (Wolcott, 2001).

The first phase of exploratory conversations revealed that the PhD journey and, ultimately the creation of knowledge, are influenced by a series of issues, some very personal such as personal and educational background, motivations, external pressures and individual supervisory relationships, as well as linguistic and cultural constraints. This means that each student's story, whilst sharing common features, is unique but, as Owler (2010) reminds us, there is little recognition of the passionate process and personal journey involved in knowledge production. This is the case because of the very anglo, masculine traditions which separate mind from body, offering Cartesian, non-emotional ways of knowing, excluding emotion and passion form what and how we know. Yet, quite clearly, these traditions do not serve us well as the PhD is a highly embodied, multi-sensory and impassioned encounter.

The findings of existing literature were corroborated in the exploratory conversations, placing the supervisory relationship at the heart of the doctoral process and revealing highly individual approaches to supervision, which, in some instances, led to confusion and dissatisfaction on the part of the students. However, the interviews also demonstrated how highly the personal nature of the relationship was valued, particularly by some supervisors, and it could be argued that it is the uniqueness of each experience which provides an opportunity for creativity in the PhD process. However, there were also subtle indications of the power dynamics which were at play in the supervisory relationship, supporting suggestions in existing

literature (Salmon, 1992; Grant, 1999; Fotovatian and Miller, 2014) that these dynamics, which suppress creativity, exist but are rarely voiced in discussions regarding academic life.

Several students appeared to perceive themselves as marginal, confirming the findings of Barron and Zeegers (2006). Issues over control and ownership of the knowledge being created and a lack of opportunity for meaningful intercultural exchange were apparent. The individual nature of the supervisory process appears to give rise to a lack of scrutiny and opportunities for power to be wielded by supervisors, exacerbated by the isolation of students which makes them more vulnerable. Whereas calls are being made for the Academy of Tourism Studies to embrace hitherto marginalised voices (Botterill and Gale, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 2007) and for universities to encourage the sharing of intercultural perspectives and knowledge, the findings of the first phase of this studied called into question whether we are, in fact, creating spaces for internationalisation and creativity.

Whilst it was apparent that the supervisory relationship was at the heart of the PhD experience, students also highlighted other issues which they considered important. It became clear that PhD students were on a transitional journey with multiple identities and roles in life. During our conversations, it emerged that their backgrounds and external pressures such as funding and family commitments were of great significance during their journey but these challenges are often overlooked both in the literature and by supervisors and institutions. In addition, the conversations revealed that home students, being very much in the minority in the tourism and hospitality postgraduate community, are also experiencing feelings of

isolation but there is little existing research regarding the home student experience of internationalisation, particularly at doctoral level. It seems, then, that institutions need to address some of the issues facing the postgraduate community in their responses to the internationalisation agenda.

The second phase of research built upon some of the key themes revealed in phase one. It explored in further depth how various constraints around the PhD process, such as isolation, language and powerful gatekeepers, are affecting the opportunities which exist within the doctoral process for creativity and intercultural knowledge exchange which, it has been argued, are at the core of both the doctoral process and internationalisation.

The first key finding of this phase of the study was that doctoral education is governed by a structure of rights or hierarchy and a regime of truth (Foucault, 1980) within UK Higher Education which appears to support Tribe's (2006) view that there are key sites of power and gatekeepers. These include sponsors, external examiners, journal editors and, perhaps most significantly, supervisors, who play a key role in both the doctoral journey and in facilitating internationalisation in general. My findings corroborate the critical linguists' view that power holders within institutions not only impose conventions on academic discourse but they then police these conventions and use them to maintain their dominance within institutions (Fairclough, 2001). This means that doctoral students can feel very marginalised if they are not able to access these discourses and readily converse or write in academic discourse. Again, it is interesting that these feelings are not confined to international students. Both students and supervisors confirmed that UK students

can struggle to operate in the 'Academese' which is required by the academic gatekeepers.

The findings uncovered implicit prejudices such as sexism and racism within UK Higher Education. It has been established that Tourism Studies and universities in general are dominated by males and this was reflected in my sample of supervisors as there were very few female supervisors in the three case study institutions. The student sample, however, included many females and there was no evidence that their ways of seeing and embodied characteristics were being foregrounded in their research.

Whilst I am not suggesting that any individuals within the study exhibited explicit racism, there was evidence throughout of imperialist worldviews and norms. Findings confirmed that supervisors are taking a culturally imperialist viewpoint and presenting as fact a very Anglo centric, westernised view of the world (Ryan, 2000) and research practice. They focussed on imparting knowledge to international students, with no intercultural exchange rather than encouraging a multicultural world view within their work.

The powerful role of External Examiners and the inconsistencies in the examination process was also apparent in the study. The choice of examiners is crucial as they are the *judges of normality'* (Foucault, 1981) as to what is deemed to be legitimate tourism knowledge but different examiners have different criteria of doctorateness and conventions which they consider acceptable (Denicolo and Park, 2010). The fact that there are no explicit criteria to gain a PhD and the expectations of examiners are not made explicit either presents a challenge for home students and

an even greater one for international students who are new to the UK academic culture and unaware of any of the cultural assumptions within it. External examiners have, therefore, a huge impact on the student experience and the shape and legitimatisation of the knowledge produced in the PhD.

Another key finding to be noted is that home and international students share many of the same feelings during their journeys, despite the ''othering' and discourse of deficit surrounding international students in both the literature and the views of many supervisors. Interviews revealed intense feelings of both mental and physical isolation experienced by both home and international students and both are isolated, interestingly, by each other and the system. This can be brought about by both the physical spaces they are allocated which are often away from the academic staff. Interviews also identified a lack of peer interaction, particularly between home and international students and lack of an active research culture, resulting in limited spaces for internationalisation, and therefore intercultural exchange. In addition, even when willing to engage in in-depth discussions, supervisors are restricted by competing demands on their time and pressure to bring about timely completions and undertake all their other academic commitments. These feelings of isolation and lack of empowerment may be exacerbated for international students but, echoing the view of Carroll and Ryan (2007:27) that international students are just *'canaries in the mine,'* this research has shown that they present a real challenge for UK students too.

Finally, an important finding of the study was that, for many, the creation of knowledge is no longer the sole purpose of the doctorate (Green and Usher, 2003). Many of students regarded the PhD as a personal journey where the focus was on

transferable and research skills rather that the end product or knowledge creation. This focus on skills training rather than a contribution to tourism knowledge has implications as, if the PhD is no longer about extending knowledge, the dominant views will remain entrenched in the canon of tourism knowledge.

In summary, whereas the doctoral environment should be a perfect arena for sharing diverse worldviews and challenging traditional knowledge creation within tourism studies, the in-depth interviews uncovered a range of factors which limit these opportunities for both staff and students. It seems that, if universities are going to take full advantages of the opportunities which the internationalisation of Higher Education presents, they will have to instigate measures to address these constraints and to create spaces for this internationalisation to take place.

8.5.   Key contributions of the study

My study has contributed to the reflection and debate about what constitutes a PhD and it therefore seems appropriate to discuss my contributions in line with The UK Council for Graduate Education's (1997) description of doctorateness as involving *'mastery of the subject; mastery of analytical breadth (where methods, techniques, contexts and data are concerned) and mastery of depth (the contribution itself, judged to be competent and original and of high quality).'*

In terms of mastery of the subject and consistent with objective one of my study, have undertaken a comprehensive review of literature surrounding the concepts of

internationalisation, the role of the PhD and the PhD journey and identified gaps in the research in these areas.

In terms of mastery of analytical breadth, there have been few attempts in tourism studies to apply understandings of discourses and discursive practices to tourism higher education.   Tribe (2006) emphasised the important role of critical theory in exposing the power of ideology present in tourism research. In addition, there has been a reluctance to acknowledge influence of embodied characteristics in tourism research (Hall, 2004). Using a critical language approach, this study is pioneering in that it explores members' resources and gives new insights into issues of language and power in the tourism PhD process. It is one of the first studies in tourism studies to go to the heart of the opportunities for knowledge creation provided by the internationalisation of doctoral studies and to encourage academics to reflect upon the nature of the tourism knowledge and the power relations at play in its creation.

In terms of mastery of depth, the study contributes to the body of research in several areas. Firstly, there is very little published research on the doctoral experience (John and Denicolo, 2013). It has been noted that we need an understanding of the complex challenges faced by doctoral students on a transnational journey to improve the students experience, remain competitive (Emery and Metcalfe, 2009; Rizvi, 2010) and in order to encourage and facilitate exchange of cultural intellectual ideas (Ryan, 2012). Much of the research that does exist is either in the form of large-scale quantitative surveys into internationalisation or from a supervisor perspective of the supervisory process. Small-scale qualitative studies do exist but

often take place within the researcher's own institution and focus on students of one nationality. My study addresses this gap in research by focussing on students in the three institutions with the largest number of Tourism PhD students in the UK and giving voice to their multiple experiences of the journey. It concentrates, in particular, on the transnational and intercultural nature of the journey and the challenges and opportunities that this presents.

Secondly, there is little research into home/student interaction and, in particular, home students' experiences of the PhD journey. This is an important area of study as both home and UK students play an equal role in facilitating internationalisation (Sawir, 2013). This study makes an invaluable contribution to the body of knowledge by exploring in depth the home students' experiences in an internationalised Higher Education environment and reveals that they share many of the same feelings and concerns as international students.

Thirdly, there is a paucity of research in to the manner in which international students are engaged as valuable contributors to internationalisation on campuses (Urban and Palmer, 2014). This research is pioneering as it is the first in-depth study to contribute significantly to both theory and practice by investigating the extent to which intercultural research and knowledge exchange is being achieved at doctoral level (John & Denicolo, 2013) and making practical recommendations in section 8.7. as to initiatives that could be introduced to create spaces for internationalisation in doctoral education.

Finally, and crucially, there is little attention given to hidden power in universities, especially in the doctoral experience. My study is original and courageous in

exposing some of the power structures which exist in the academic community. It particularly focuses on the individualised nature of the supervisory relationship and the opportunity for power to be yielded within this relationship. By giving voice to a variety of students, my study has attempted to *'speak truth of power and facilitate the speech of the powerless'* (Tribe, 2006:376).

8.6.   Implications of the study

This study has implications for both Higher Education Institutions and the Tourism Academy as a whole.

8.6.1. Implications for Higher Education Institutions

Firstly, universities should introduce initiatives to facilitate spaces for internationalisation and, therefore, cultural intellectual knowledge exchange to take place. These might include re-thinking the location of doctoral students, attempting to avoid ghettoization of PhD students and thereby according them a higher status within the academic hierarchy. Spaces for informal conversations between staff and students should also be created. This could be as simple as a coffee area where students may bump into staff. The research showed that, whilst communication difficulties can be attributed in part to a lack of confidence in English, particularly in the eyes of international students, they are also the result of the perceived academic hierarchy by students. If they were to encounter staff on an informal, regular basis, some of these barriers may be overcome.

Secondly, more vibrant, active research communities are needed within universities in attempt to improve both peer interaction and staff and student interaction. Whilst it has been acknowledged that achieving this can be difficult, particularly for less established research institutions, it is vital that initiatives such as internal conferences, seminars, discussions and informal gatherings are encouraged. However, they need to be framed in a way (and at a time) that will encourage full-time students, academic staff and part-time students (who may also be staff members) to attend. In addition, universities should actively seek to provide teaching opportunities for PhD students and supervisors should encourage students to engage with these opportunities, even if they are unpaid. This would lead to a new identity and an increase in status for the students and, even if temporary, membership of a new tribe and would give them the opportunity to share their knowledge with undergraduates.

Thirdly, it has been noted that many supervisors do not lack the will but are prevented from *'intellectual meanderings'* (Green & Usher, 2003:44) with students by the increased demands upon their time. This study recommends that the time allocation for supervisors is increased and that we should encourage a move away from fast supervision. This does not mean that feedback and responses to emails should not be prompt but supervisors and students should have thinking spaces or intellectual spaces for internationalisation to take place. Whilst acknowledging the economic pressures on Higher Education, the study also reminds universities of findings in the literature highlighting the importance of improving the doctoral student experience in order to attract PhD students to the UK in an increasingly competitive marketplace.

Universities should re-visit their strategies for providing both pastoral and language support for PhD students. Currently, there is a heavy focus on providing academic support for international undergraduates in many institutions. It is also sometimes assumed that PhD students are more mature and have a close relationship with their supervisors. However, PhD students are a significant cohort who are treading a very lonely path beset with hurdles and would benefit from opportunities for social contact in addition to the practical support that could be provided. This might include clubs or societies that were supported by the universities.

Institutions should provide inter-cultural awareness training for their staff. This study has found that, although there is some hostility towards the internationalisation agenda, many supervisors are very willing to engage with it. However, they do not have the capacity or strategies to operate in a cross-cultural environment and would benefit from some training in this area. Implicit racism and the dominance of western worldviews occurs when people remain blind to their own academic culture (Cortazzi and Jin, 1997) and intercultural training would encourage supervisors to step consciously outside of their cultures.

8.6.2. Implications for the Tourism Academy

Whist the study has revealed that not all doctoral students wish to take a new approach to tourism research, tourism academics should encourage those who do to be explicit about their embodied characteristics and how they influence their approaches to research. It is time to move away from the rhetoric about encouraging hitherto marginalised voices and for the elders to move aside and really listen to this generation and their worldviews (Tribe, 2010).

Existing power structures need to be explicitly acknowledged and challenged. In particular, it is time to challenge the academic discourse and conventions that are, by their very nature, exclusive. As my study reveals, academic discourse is not just inaccessible to international students, it is inaccessible to UK students, many members of staff and, indeed, the industry. It has been suggested that there are 2 tiers of tourism knowledge being created, one in academia and one in industry. Whilst this study acknowledges the need for a PhD to make a contribution to knowledge, with the increased focus on the role of the PhD in the knowledge economy and transferable skills, is there still a need for the thesis to be expressed in academic language and framed in academic conventions? I suggest elsewhere in this study that this may just be a way for the gatekeepers to the tribe to control '*what is acceptable or unacceptable in being represented as tourism knowledge*' (Hall, 2004:142). If the shape of tourism knowledge is to change and embrace previously marginalised groups, I suggest that the Academy needs to consider the exclusivity of current academic practices.

Finally, the findings of this study have implications for the PhD examining process, by providing another example of the power of gatekeepers. In a Higher Education environment dominated by performativity and accountability at every other level of study, the PhD, surprisingly, has no marking criteria but is, instead, subject to unwritten rules in terms of academic convention. It appears that different examiners use slightly different rules to play the game and it appears to be either chance or reliant on the choice of their supervisors as to which rules our examiners play by. Whilst not wishing to curb creativity within the process, this study highlights the fact that this leaves students very much at the mercy of gatekeepers again and I would urge the Academy to give some consideration to this.

8.7.   Challenges, limitations and recommendations for future research

As is documented elsewhere, I faced many challenges whilst conducting my research. However, perhaps the most significant academic challenge was the fact that I was, in essence, researching my own tribe. Whilst I had the identity of a PhD student during the research, there was no escaping the fact that I am also an academic and was investigating the practices and experiences of my colleagues. It has been noted that tourism scholars are reluctant to examine internal power structures yet I found myself doing exactly that. I am aware, therefore, that this exploration may well '*raise hackles amongst this powerful group'* (Lee, 2008: 269) and have, at times, felt uncomfortable with that thought.

This study has to be considered as a snapshot in time. A more longitudinal study may have given a deeper insight into members' resources or embodied characteristics of the participants. It would have allowed me to track their personal journeys and identify changes in identity and attitudes along the way.

There was no inclusion of a part-time student who was a member of staff in the second phase of in-depth interviews. There is a growing body of students like myself and very little research into their experiences and the particular challenges they face. I do include my own perspectives in my second phase of analysis in an attempt to address this limitation but, on reflection, would have liked to explore this issue in more detail.

8.7.1. Recommendations for further research

Further research is needed into the experiences of part-time students, who are also members of staff. These constitute an under-researched but significant body of students. My research suggests that they share some of the same experiences as other students but this is a very important group to understand because, as academics and students, they occupy a unique position and can give key insights into both the PhD process and its potential for internationalisation.

In addition, research is needed into the supervisory relationship between these academics who are part-time students and their supervisors, who are also their colleagues. My findings revealed that this relationship could bring complex issues and difficulties which are rarely discussed in existing literature but are worthy of further research.

As stated above, a more longitudinal study, perhaps involving biographical research would give a clearer idea of members' resources and how they affect the journey. It is acknowledged that the PhD is a personal journey and that knowledge production is a passionate process and it would be interesting to explore more deeply the extent to which members' resources are personal issues impact the journey and are reflected within the PhD produced. Observational research could also be conducted to observe the interactions between supervisors and students in discussions. Whereas my study was informed by the perspective of Critical Language Study, observational research such as this would allow critical discourse analysis to be employed as a methodology. It would also allow for a deeper understanding of the relationship between supervisors and students and would be particularly useful in

relation to international students, who were not always as forthcoming as the home students in an interview situation.

My findings hinted at the role that gender plays in the doctoral experience, both in terms of the personal issues which may impact more heavily on female students, such as caring for the family, but also in terms of the wider role of gender in the power relations within academia. Further research is warranted into the role that gender plays in students' personal journeys and their feelings of isolation and lack of empowerment within the supervisory relationship and the wider academic community.

Finally, this study has begun to explore the experiences of academics within the internationalised doctoral environment. As key players in both the doctoral experience and as facilitators of internationalisation, further research into their perspectives and experiences would provide valuable insights and contribute to recommendations for future training in internationalisation and intercultural awareness.

8.8.   Final thoughts

As I approach the end of my doctoral journey, and in the spirit of reflexivity which informs this study, I feel it appropriate to reflect for a final time upon my experiences. It has, indeed, been a long and winding path, during which I have been presented with both intellectual and personal challenges. I am living proof of Hockey's (1991) claim that the longer your journey is, the more likely it is that external factors will

hinder completion. However, I have learned many things along my route, both academically and about myself and how my own entanglements have influenced my research. Perhaps the most ironic realisation has been that, despite my claims that it is time to challenge academic conventions and eschew academic discourses, I have not been brave enough to do this myself. I have been bold enough to write in the first person, which I appreciate can be a controversial decision. However, despite my view that 'academese' is an alien and inaccessible language, I have still followed convention by using labels and terminology such as epistemology, ontology and interpretivism. Whilst I am convinced, as a reflexive researcher, of the need to address such philosophical concepts, as a linguist, I am still of the view that language should be accessible. This discourse is not shared by many and, when these terms remain obscure and veiled, power is retained on the terms of those who insist upon their use. However, in engaging with this level of academic language, it seems I, too, am bound by academic convention and aware that I need to play the game, even if I am not always sure of the rules.

My final reflection concerns my ongoing travels as a researcher. Whilst, at this present moment in time, it is tempting to bring my travels to a halt, I feel sure that I will, in fact, continue on my journey. I am not sure where it will take me but do know that, as a result of this leg of the trip, I will be more aware of my embodied characteristics and how they impact upon my view of the world and will also be more empathetic towards the PhD students in our institution and will actively look to create spaces, both informal and formal, where views and knowledge can be shared. What is more, perhaps my transition from PhD student to fully-fledged researcher will give me the status and confidence to eventually challenge the judges of normality and their academic conventions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, K., & Cargill, M. (2003). Knowing that the other knows: using experience and reflection to enhance communication in cross-cultural postgraduate supervisory relationships.

Airey, D. (2004). From here to uncertainty. *Critical Issues in Tourism Education*, 9-15.

Aitchison, C. (2001). Theorizing Other discourses of tourism, gender and culture: Can the subaltern speak (in tourism)? *Tourist studies*, *1*(2), 133-147.

Ali, A., & Kohun, F. (2009). Cultural influence on social isolation in doctoral programs and doctoral attrition-A case study. *Information Systems Education Journal*, *7*(64), 1-7.

Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (2013). *The international imperative in higher education*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Amran, N. N., & Ibrahim, R. (2012). Academic rites of passage: reflection on a PhD journey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *59*, 528-534.

Arksey, H., & Knight, P. T. (1999). *Interviewing for social scientists: An introductory resource with examples*. Sage.

Asmar, C. (1999). Scholarship, experience, or both? A developer's approach to cross-cultural teaching. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, *4*(1), 18-27.

Ateljevic, I., Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Collins, F. L. (2005). Getting 'entangled': Reflexivity and the 'critical turn' in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *30*(2), 9-21.

Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (2007). *The critical turn in tourism studies*. Routledge.

Atfield, R., & Kemp, P. (2008). Enhancing the International Learning Experience.

Ayikoru, M., Tribe, J., & Airey, D. (2009). Reading tourism education: Neoliberalism unveiled. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *36*(2), 191-221.

Bailey, J. J. (2000). Students as clients in a professional/client relationship. *Journal of Management Education*, *24*(3), 353-365.

Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Axelsen, M. (2009). Trends in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *36*(1), 149-152.

Barbour, R. S., & Schostak, J. (2011). Interviewing and focus groups. Sage Publications Ltd.

Barnett, R., Parry, G., & Coate, K. (2001). Conceptualising curriculum change. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*(4), 435-449.

Barron, D., & Zeegers, M. (2006). Subjects of western education: Discursive practices in western postgraduate studies and the construction of international student subjectivities. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *33*(2), 77-96.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, *45*(1), 43-70.

Becher, T. (1994). *Graduate Education in Britain. Higher Education Policy Series 17*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd., 1900 Frost Rd., Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (1989). Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the cultures of disciplines. *Milton Keynes, United Kingdom*.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *35*(3), 133-148.

Becket, N., & Brookes, M. (2008). Assessing the international dimensions of degree programmes. *Enhancing the international learning experience in business and management, hospitality, leisure, sport, tourism, Threshold Press, Newbury, England*.

Behar, R. (2014). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart*. Beacon Press.

Belk, R. W. (1998). Multimedia approaches to qualitative data and representations. *Representing consumers: Voices, views and visions*, 308-338.

Bennett, R., & Kane, S. (2011). Internationalization of UK university business schools: A survey of current practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *15*(4), 351-373.

Bilecen, B. (2013). Negotiating differences: cosmopolitan experiences of international doctoral students. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(5), 667-688.

Boglea, D., Dronb, M., Eggermontc, J. & van Hentend, J.W. (2011). Doctoral degrees beyond 2010: training talented researchers for society, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 13 (2011) 35-49.

Bilecen, B. (2009). Lost in status? Temporary, permanent, potential, highly skilled: the international student mobility.

Bilecen, B. (2013). Negotiating differences: cosmopolitan experiences of international doctoral students. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(5), 667-688.

Bolsmann, C., & Miller, H. (2008). International student recruitment to universities in England: discourse, rationales and globalisation. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *6*(1), 75-88.

Botterill, D. (2001). The epistemology of a set of tourism studies. *Leisure Studies*, *20*(3), 199-214.

Botterill, D., & Gale, T. (2005). Postgraduate and PhD education. *An international handbook of tourism education*, 469-480.

Botterill, D., Haven, C., & Gale, T. (2002). A survey of doctoral theses accepted by universities in the UK and Ireland for studies related to tourism, 1990-1999. *Tourist Studies*, *2*(3), 283-311.

Botterill, D., & Platenkamp, V. (2004). The international classroom of tourism studies: Opening Pandora's Box. In *Association of Tourism in Higher Education annual conference, Critical Issues in Tourism Education, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College* (pp. 1-3).

Bradenburg, U., and de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education, 62* (Winter), 15-16.

Brew, A. (2001). Conceptions of research: A phenomenographic study. *Studies in higher education*, *26*(3), 271-285.

Brown, L. (2008). Language and anxiety: An ethnographic study of international postgraduate students. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, *21*(2), 75-95.

Brown, L. (2009). International education: a force for peace and cross-cultural understanding? *Journal of peace education*, *6*(2), 209-224.

Brown, L., & Holloway, I. (2008). The adjustment journey of international postgraduate students at an English university An ethnographic study. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *7*(2), 232-249.

Brydon, K., & Fleming, J. (2011). The journey around my PhD: Pitfalls, insights and diamonds. *Social work education*, *30*(8), 995-1011.

Burgess, R. G. (1994). *Postgraduate education and training in the social sciences: Processes and products* (No. 19). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Burns, R., Lamm, R., & Lewis, R. (1999). Orientations to higher degree supervision: A study of supervisors and students in education. *Supervision of postgraduate research in education*, 55-74.

Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism*. Routledge.

Buttery, E. A., Richter, E. M., & Leal Filho, W. (2005). An overview of the elements that influence efficiency in postgraduate supervisory practice arrangements. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *19*(1), 7-26.

Carroll, J., & Ryan, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching international students: Improving learning for all*. Routledge.

Caruana, V., & Hanstock, J. (2005, September). Internationalising the Curriculum, At home, or far away? Making connections through a holistic approach based on inclusivity. In *at BU Graduates as Global Citizens Conference, Sept, Bournemouth*.

Chiang, K. H. (2003). Learning experiences of doctoral students in UK universities. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *23*(1/2), 4-32.

Clark, R., & Ivanic, R. (1997). **The politics of writing.** London: Routledge**.**

Cogan, J.J. 1998. "Internationalization through networking and curricular infusion". In *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum*, Edited by: MESTENHAUSER, J.A. and ELLINGIOE, B.J. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (1994). Educational research methodology. *Athens: Metaixmio*.

Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2006). Tourism and post-disciplinary enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *9*(4-5), 293-319.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1997). Communication for learning across cultures. *Overseas students in higher education: Issues in teaching and learning*, 76-90.

Cowan, R., & Foray, D. (1997). The economics of codification and the diffusion of knowledge. *Industrial and corporate change*, *6*(3), 595-622.

Cox, R. 1988. *Postgraduate Research Training: review of literature and data sources. The Characteristics of the Training Process and Those Undergoing the Research Training*, London: Institute of Education.

Crawford, L. (2003). PhD journey: some shared experiences. Adult Learning Australia Annual Conference 2003. http://ala.asn.au/cpnf/2003/crawford2.pdf. [accessed 23 April 2016].

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage.

Cryer, P. (1998). Beyond Codes of Practice: dilemmas in supervising postgraduate research students. *Quality in higher education*, *4*(3), 229-234.

Daly, A. J., & Brown, J. C. (2004). Enhancing classroom success for international students through the ExcelL Intercultural Skills Program.

De Beer, M., & Mason, R. B. (2009). Using a blended approach to facilitate postgraduate supervision. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *46*(2), 213-226.

De Valero, Y. F. (2001). Departmental factors affecting time-to-degree and completion rates of doctoral students at one land-grant research institution. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(3), 341-367.

De Vita, G. (2007). Taking stock: An appraisal of the literature on internationalising HE learning. *Internationalising higher education*, 154-167.

De Vita, G., & Case, P. (2003). Rethinking the internationalisation agenda in UK higher education. *Journal of further and higher education*, *27*(4), 383-398.

De Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education*, *15*(1), 2-3.

Decrop, A. (2004). Trustworthiness in qualitative tourism research. *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 156-169.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2000). Doctoral Students' Access to Research Cultures-are some more unequal than others? *Studies in higher education*, *25*(2), 149-165.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P., & Parry, O. (1997). Supervising the PhD. *A guide to success*.

Denicolo, P. (2004). Doctoral supervision of colleagues: Peeling off the veneer of satisfaction and competence. *Studies in Higher Education*, *29*(6), 693-707.

Denicolo, P., & Park, C. (2010). Doctorateness–an Elusive Concept? Gloucester: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education.

Denzin, NK & Lincoln, YS (eds) (2003) The Landscape of Qualitative Research. Theories and issues.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The Sage handbook of qualitative research. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication*, 695-728.

Deuchar, R. (2008). Facilitator, director or critical friend? Contradiction and congruence in doctoral supervision styles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *13*(4), 489-500.

Diamond, P., & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1986). Postgraduate research: some changing personal constructs in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *5*(2), 161-175.

DTZ. (2011). *Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education phase 2 (PMI2) Final evaluation.* London, UK.

Eggleston, J., & Delamont, S. (1983). Supervision of students for research degrees. *Birmingham: BERA*.

Eisner, E. W. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational researcher*, *26*(6), 4-10.

Ellis, C. S., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject.

Emery, F., & Metcalfe, J. (2009). Promoting the UK doctorate: opportunities and challenges.

Emilsson, U. M., & Johnsson, E. (2007). Supervision of supervisors: On developing supervision in postgraduate education. *High Education Research & Development*, *26*(2), 163-179.

Fairclough, N. (1992) Discourse and Social Change, Polity Press, London.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.

Fairclough, N. (2014). *Critical language awareness*. Routledge.

Faulkner, V. (2001). Making multicultural education 'real'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*(4), 473-485.

Fielden, J. (2008). *The practice of internationalisation: managing international activities in UK universities*. UK Higher Education International Unit.

Figueroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Pérez, M., Morgan, N., & Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *52*, 87-103.

Firth, A., & Martens, E. (2008). Transforming supervisors? A critique of post-liberal approaches to research supervision. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *13*(3), 279-289.

Fotovatian, S., & Miller, J. (2014). Constructing an institutional identity in university tea rooms: the international PhD student experience. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *33*(2), 286-297.

Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, *10*(2), 7-30.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Pantheon.

Gardner, S. K. (2007). "I heard it through the grapevine": Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education*, *54*(5), 723-740.

Gardner, S. K., & Gopaul, B. (2012). The part-time doctoral student experience. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *7*(12), 63-78.

Gatfield, T. (2005). An investigation into PhD supervisory management styles: Development of a dynamic conceptual model and its managerial implications. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(3), 311-325.

George, E. S. (2006). Positioning higher education for the knowledge based economy. *Higher Education*, *52*(4), 589-610.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. Sage.

Gill, P., & Burnard, P. (2008). The student-supervisor relationship in the PhD/Doctoral process. *British Journal of Nursing*, *17*(10), 668-672.
Gillham, B. (2005). *Research Interviewing: The range of techniques: A practical guide*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Gillingham, D. (2008) 'A questionnaire for measuring internationalisation degree.' [online] Available from <www.coventry.ac.uk> (accessed 20.07.09)

Goodall Jr, H. L. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. AltaMira Press.

Grant, B. (1999, July). Walking on a rackety bridge: mapping supervision. In *HERDSA Annual International Conference* (pp. 12-15).

Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world*. Sage.

Green, P., & Usher, R. (2003). Fast supervision: Changing supervisory practice in changing times. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *25*(1), 37-50.

Guba, E. G. (1978). Toward a Methodology of Naturalistic Inquiry in Educational Evaluation. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, 8.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Sage.

Gundara, J. (1997). Intercultural issues and doctoral studies. In *Working for a Doctorate: A Guide for the humanities and social sciences* (pp. 131-151). Routledge, London.

Gray, D. E. (2013). *Doing research in the real world*. Sage.

Habermas, J. (1978). Knowledge and human interests.

Hadjioannou, X., Shelton, N. R., Fu, D., & Dhanarattigannon, J. (2007). The road to a doctoral degree: Co-travelers through a perilous passage. *College Student Journal*, *41*(1), 160.

Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalisation of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for a small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *26*(1), 49-66.

Haigh, M. (2008). Internationalisation, planetary citizenship and Higher Education Inc. *Compare*, *38*(4), 427-440.

Haigh, M. (2014). From Internationalisation to Education for Global Citizenship: a Multi-Layered History. *Higher Education Quarterly, 68*(1), 6-27.

Hall, M. (2004). Reflexivity and tourism research. *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 137-155.

Hall, C. M., Williams, A. M., & Lew, A. A. (2014). Tourism conceptualizations, disciplinarity, institutions, and issues. *The Wiley Blackwell companion to tourism*, 3-24.

Halliday, F. (1999). The chimera of the 'International University'. *International Affairs*, *75*(1), 99-120.

Halse, C., & Malfroy, J. (2010). Retheorizing doctoral supervision as professional work. *Studies in Higher Education*, *35*(1), 79-92.

Hanna, D. E., & Latcham, C. (2002). Beyond national borders: Transforming higher education institutions. Journal of Studies in International Education, 6(2), 115-133

Harman, G. (2005). Internationalization of Australian higher education: A critical review of literature and research. In *Internationalizing higher education* (pp. 119-140). Springer Netherlands.

Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Ateljevic, I. (2007). Structural entanglements and the strategy of audiencing as a reflexive technique. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 41-56.

Harrison, N., & Peacock, N. (2007). Understanding the UK student response to internationalisation. *UKCOSA Worldviews*.

Haynes, K., Metcalfe, J., & Videler, T. (2009). *What Do Researchers Do?: First Destinations of Doctoral Graduates by Subject*. CRAC.

Henderson, K. A. (1991). *Dimensions of choice: A Qualitative Approach to Recreation, Parks and Leisure Researc,* State College, PA:Venture.

HESA (2014), Students in Higher Education 2013-14 (accessed online 29/07/2015)

HESA (2017) https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/students (accessed 5/07/2017).

Hockey, J. (1991). The social science PhD: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, *16*(3), 319-332.

Holliday, A. (2002). Doing and Writing qualitative research Sage Publication, ULIS.

Holligan, C. (2005). Fact and fiction: A case history of doctoral supervision. *Educational Research*, *47*(3), 267-278.

Hollinshead, K. (2007). Worldmaking'and the transformation of place and culture: The enlargement of Meethan's analysis of tourism and global change. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 165-193.

Holloway, I, & Brown, L. (2016). *Essentials of a qualitative doctorate*. Routledge.

Howson (2014), Drop in foreign student numbers: are UK universities too complacent? The Guardian (www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog.) (accessed 17/8/15)

Humberstone, B. (2004). Standpoint research. *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 119.

Jamal, T. & Everett, S., (2007). *The critical turn in tourism studies*. Routledge.

Jamal, T., & Hollinshead, K. (2001). Tourism and the forbidden zone: The underserved power of qualitative inquiry. *Tourism management*, *22*(1), 63-82.

Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design. *Handbook of qualitative research.*, 379-399.

Janta, H., Lugosi, P., & Brown, L. (2014). Coping with loneliness: A netnographic study of doctoral students. *Journal of further and Higher Education*, *38*(4), 553-571.

Jazvac-Martek, M., Chen, S., & McAlpine, L. (2011). Tracking the doctoral student experience over time: Cultivating agency in diverse spaces. In *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators* (pp. 17-36). Springer Netherlands.

Jogaratnam, G., Chon, K., McCleary, K., Mena, M., & Yoo, J. (2005). An analysis of institutional contributors to three major academic tourism journals: 1992–2001. *Tourism Management*, *26*(5), 641-648.

John, T., & Denicolo, P. (2013). Doctoral Education: A review of the literature monitoring the doctoral student experience in selected OECD countries (mainly UK). *Springer Science Reviews*, *1*(1-2), 41-49.

Johnston, S. (1997) 'Examining the examiners: an analysis of examiners' reports on doctorial theses', *Studies in Higher Education,* vol.22, no.3, pp. 333-347.

Jones, E., & Brown, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Internationalising higher education*. Routledge.

Kandiko, C. (2013). Global: Taking a global view of the student experience. *University World News 265,* [*http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130328120529307*](http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130328120529307),)last accessed 21 August 2015)

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 260-273.

Kelly, P., & Moogan, Y. (2012). Culture shock and higher education performance: Implications for teaching. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *66*(1), 24-46.

Kemp, N., Archer, W., Gilligan, C. and Humfrey, C. (2008) *The UK's Competitive Advantage: The Market for International Research Students*, London: UK Higher Education International Unit.

Killick, D. (2006). Worldwide Horizon: Cross Cultural Capability and Global Perspectives: Guidelines for Curriculum.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, *33*(2003), 2-3.

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalisation–for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *17*(3), 84-90.

Koehne, N. (2004). Positioning international education and international students: Multiple discourses and discursive practices. In *AARE conference,"Doing the Public Good: Positioning Education Research", Melbourne, Australia*.

Koehne, N. (2005). (Re) construction: Ways international students talk about their identity. *Australian Journal of Education*, *49*(1), 104-119.

Leask, B. (1999) Internationalisation of the curriculum: key challenges and strategies. Paper presented at The State of the An in Internationalising the Curriculum: International Perspectives. Australian International Education Conference.

Leask, B. (2003). *Venturing into the unknown: A framework and strategies to assist international and Australian students to learn from each other* (Doctoral dissertation, Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia).

Leask, B. (2005). Internationalisation of the Curriculum. *Teaching international students. Improving learning for all*, 119-29.

Leask, B. (2008). Internationalisation, globalisation and curriculum innovation. *Researching international pedagogies: Sustainable practice for teaching and learning in higher education*, 9-26.

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines—imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(2), 103-118.

Lee, A. (2008). How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision. *Studies in Higher Education*, *33*(3), 267-281.

Lee, A., & Green, B. (2009). Supervision as metaphor. *Studies in Higher Education*, *34*(6), 615-630.

Lennon, K., & Whitford, M. (1994). Knowing the difference. *Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology*.

Leonard, D., Pelletier, C., & Morley, L. (2003). *The Experiences of International Students in UK Higher Education: a review of unpublished research*. UKCOSA: The Council for International Education.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). Sage

Lo Bianco, J., Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (1999). *Striving for the Third Place: Intercultural Competence through Language Education*.

Luke, A. (2010). Educating the other: Standpoint and theory in the 'Internationalization'of higher education. *Global inequalities and higher education: Whose interests are we serving*, 43-65.

Luker, P. (2008) The internationalisation of higher education: shifting the paradigm. In: Shiel, C. & McKenzie, A. (eds) (2008) *The Global University: the role of senior managers.* London: Development Education Association.

Lunn J. (2006). Global perspectives in higher education subject analysis: Tourism and hospitality. London: Royal Geographical Society with IBG

Lunn, J. (2008). Global perspectives in higher education: Taking the agenda forward in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *12*(3), 231-254.

Mair, H (2013) The challenge of a critical approach to rural tourism in Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (Eds.). *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (Vol. 22). Routledge.

Manathunga, C. (2005). Early warning signs in postgraduate research education: A different approach to ensuring timely completions. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *10*(2), 219-233.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2014). *Designing qualitative research*. Sage publications.

Marginson, S. (2015). UK International Education:global position and national prospects, UKCISA, London.

Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Sawir, E., & Forbes-Mewett, H. (2010). *International student security*. Cambridge University Press.

Matthiesen, J. K., & Binder, M. (2009). *How to Survive Your Doctorate: What Others Don't Tell You (Open UP Study Skills)*. Open University.

McAlpine, L., & Norton, J. (2006). Reframing our approach to doctoral programs: An integrative framework for action and research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *25*(1), 3-17.

McCallin, A., & Nayar, S. (2012). Postgraduate research supervision: A critical review of current practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 63-74.

McCormack, C. (2004). Tensions between student and institutional conceptions of postgraduate research. *Studies in Higher Education, 29*(3), 319-334.

McKercher, B. (2005). A case for ranking tourism journals. *Tourism Management*, *26*(5), 649-651.

McNicoll, Y. R., Burney, S., & Luff, A. R. (2008). Enhancing faculty culture to meet student needs: Internationalising the curriculum. *Quality & Standards in Higher Education: Making a Difference*, 68.

Middlehurst, R., & Woodfield, S. (2007). Responding to the internationalisation agenda: implications for institutional strategy.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage.

Miller, T., Birch, M., Mauthner, M., & Jessop, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research*. Sage.

Miller, N. & Brimicombe, A. (2010). Mapping research journeys across complex terrain with heavy baggage. *Studies in Continuing Education,* 26 (3): 405-417.

Minnick, A. F., Norman, L. D., Donaghey, B., Fisher, L. W., & McKirgan, I. M. (2010). Defining and describing capacity issues in US doctoral nursing research programs. *Nursing Outlook*, *58*(1), 36-43.

Morrison, D. (2003). The Search for the holy e-learning recipe-learning channels & strategy. *Training Zone (UK)*.

Mullins, G. & Kiley, M. (2002) 'It's a PhD, not a Nobel Prize; how experienced examiners assess research theses', *Studies in Higher Education,* vol. 27, no.4, pp.369-386.

Noy, C. (2007). The language (s) of the tourist experience: An autoethnography of the poetic tourist. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 349-370.

OECD (Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation). (2011). *Education at a glance: Who studies abroad and where.* Available: http://www.oecd-library.org/education/education-at-a-glance-2011/who-studies-abroad-and-where_eag-2011-25-en (accessed 28 October 2015)

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(1), 12-26.

Owler, K. (2010). A 'problem'to be managed? Completing a PhD in the arts and humanities. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, *9*(3), 289-304.

Ozerdem, O. (2006). Internationalisation: a gap between rhetoric and practice. *Retrieved January*, *22*, 2008.

Page, S. J. (2005). Academic ranking exercises: Do they achieve anything meaningful?—A personal view. *Tourism Management*, *26*(5), 663-666.

Pan, S. Y. (2011). Education abroad, human capital development, and national competitiveness: China's brain gain strategies. *Frontiers of Education in China*, *6*(1), 106-138.

Park, C. (2005). New variant PhD: The changing nature of the doctorate in the UK. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *27*(2), 189-207.

Parker, R. (2009). A learning community approach to doctoral education in the social sciences. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 43-54.

Patton, Q. M. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. *California EU: Sage Publications Inc*.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research and methods: Integrating theory and practice.

Pearson, M., & Brew, A. (2002). Research training and supervision development. *Studies in Higher education*, *27*(2), 135-150.

Pechlaner, H., Zehrer, A., Matzler, K., & Abfalter, D. (2004). A ranking of international tourism and hospitality journals. *Journal of Travel Research*, *42*(4), 328-332.

Percy, A. (2014) Studying a PhD: don't suffer in silence, Guardian Professional

Pernecky, T. (2007). Immersing in ontology and the research process: Constructivism the foundation for exploring the (in) credible OBE. *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies*, 211-226.

Phillimore, J., & Goodson, L. (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies* (Vol. 14). Psychology Press.

Phillips, E., & Pugh, D. (2010). *How to get a PhD: A handbook for students and their supervisors*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Pole, C. (2000). Technicians and scholars in pursuit of the PhD: some reflections on doctoral study. *Research papers in education*, *15*(1), 95-111.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. Sage.

Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). De-centring tourism's intellectual universe, or traversing the dialogue between change and tradition. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 11-28.

Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2017). Tourism's lost leaders: Analysing gender and performance. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *63*, 34-47.

QAA (2011). The UK Doctorate: a guide for current and prospective candidates. Available at: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctorate-guide.pdf (accessed 20.7.2013)

QAA (2015) Characterstics statement: doctoral degrees, Available at: http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Doctoral-Degree-Characteristics-15.pdf (accessed 24.6.17)

Reinharz, S. (1997). Who am I? The need for a variety of selves in the field. *Reflexivity and voice*, 3-20.

Ren, C., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A critical inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *37*(4), 885-904.

Richardson, L., Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Handbook of qualitative research. *Writing: A method of inquiry*, 923-948.
Riley, R. W., & Love, L. L. (2000). The state of qualitative tourism research. *Annals of tourism research*, *27*(1), 164-187.

Rizvi, F. (2005, March). International education and the production of cosmopolitan identities. In *Transnational Seminar Series*.

Rizvi, F. (2010). International students and doctoral studies in transnational spaces. *The Routledge doctoral supervisor's companion: Supporting effective research in education and the social sciences*, 158-170.

Roberts, G. G. (2002). SET for success: the supply of people with science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills: the report of Sir Gareth Roberts' review.

Rudd, E., & Simpson, R. (1975). *The Highest Education: A Study of Graduate Education in Britain*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Led., 9 Park Street, Boston, MA 02108.

Rudzki, R. E. (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, *29*(4), 421-441.

Russell Group (2010) Staying on Top: the Challenge of Sustaining World-Class Higher Education in the UK. London: The Russell Group. http://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/uploads/Staying-on-Top-The-challenge-of-sustaining-world-class-higher-education-in-the-UK.pdf, last accessed 21 August 2015.

Ryan, J. (2000). *A guide to teaching international students*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Ryan, J. (2012). Internationalisation of doctoral education: Possibilities for new knowledge and understandings. *Australian Universities' Review,* 54 (1), 55-64).

Ryan, J., & Viete, R. (2009). Respectful interactions: Learning with international students in the English-speaking academy. *Teaching in Higher education*, *14*(3), 303-314.

Salmon, P. (1992). *Achieving a PhD--Ten Students' Ex*

Sawir, E. (2013). Internationalisation of higher education curriculum: the contribution of international students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *11*(3), 359-378.

Schoorinan, D. (1999). The pedagogical implications of diverse conceptualizations of internationalization: A US based case study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *3*(2), 19-46.

Scott, P. (2011). Universities are all "Internationalising" now. *The Guardian*, *7*.

Seale, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Social research methods: A reader*. Psychology Press.

Sheldon, P., Fesenmaier, D. R., & Tribe, J. (2013). The tourism education futures initiative. *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Hospitality Education*, 155.

Shiel, C. (2008), "*Introduction*", in Atfield, R. and Kemp, P. (Eds), *Enhancing the International Learning Experience in Business and Management, Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, Tourism*, Threshold Press, Newbury, pp. v-xiiiv

Shiel, C., & McKenzie, A. (2008). *The Global University: The role of senior managers*. Bournemouth University.

Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(2), 185-201.

Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(2), 185-201.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education--or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Routledge.

Small, J. (2004). Memory-work. *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 255.

Smith, A., Bradshaw, T., Burnett, K., Docherty, D., Purcell, W., & Worthington, S. (2010). One step beyond: Making the most of postgraduate education. *London: BIS*.

Somekh, B. (2005). *Action Research: A Methodology For Change And Development: a methodology for change and development*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Somekh, B., & Lewin, C. (Eds.). (2011). *Theory and methods in social research*. Sage.

Spender, D. (1981). Men's Studies Modified the Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines.

Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1993). Breaking out again: Feminist epistemology and ontology.

Stier, J. (2002), "Internationalization in higher education: unexplored possibilities and unavoidable challenges", paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, University of Lisbon, 11-14 September 2002.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, *53*(1), 81-105.

Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (2000). Defining globalization and assessing its implications on knowledge and education. *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*, 3-26.

Swain, M. B. (2004). (Dis) embodied experience and power dynamics in tourism research. *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 102.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, *33*(47), 74.

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy for internationalisation: Lessons and practice from four universities. *Journal of studies in international education*, *8*(2), 149-171.

Teekens, H. (2003). The requirement to develop specific skills for teaching in an intercultural setting. *Journal of studies in international education*, *7*(1), 108-119.

Tennant, M. (2004). Doctoring the knowledge worker. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *26*(3), 431-441.

The Guardian (2017) British Universities employ no back academics in top roles, figures show.

Thompson, D. R., Kirkman, S., Watson, R., & Stewart, S. (2005). Improving research supervision in nursing. *Nurse education today*, *25*(4), 283-290.

Tian, M. and Lowe, J., 2008. Internationalisation, multicultural campuses and Inter-cultural understanding:Myth and reality in British Universities. 高等教育研究 (Research in Higher Education), 29, pp. 53-62

Tinkler, P., & Jackson, C. (2000). Examining the doctorate: institutional policy and the PhD examination process in Britain. *Studies in higher education*, *25*(2), 167-180.

Tonkin, H., & Edwards, J. (1981). *The World in the Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the 21st Century. Education and the World View, II*. Change Magazine Press, 271 North Avenue, New Rochelle, NY 10801.

Trahar, S. (2010). *Developing cultural capability in international higher education: a narrative inquiry*. Routledge.

Trahar, S., & Hyland, F. (2011). Experiences and perceptions of internationalisation in higher education in the UK. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *30*(5), 623-633.

Tribe, J. (2003). The RAE-ification of tourism research in the UK. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *5*(3), 225-234.

Tribe, J. (2005). New tourism research. Taylor & Francis.

Tribe, J. (2006). The truth about tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, *33*(2), 360-381.

Tribe, J. (2007). Critical tourism: Rules and resistance. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*, 29-40.

Tribe, J. (2010). Tribes, territories and networks in the tourism academy. *Annals of tourism research*, *37*(1), 7-33.

Trotter, J. (2003). Researching, studying or jumping through hoops? Reflections on a PhD. *Social Work Education*, *22*(1), 59-70.

Turner, G., & McAlpine, L. (2011). Doctoral experience as researcher preparation: Activities, passion, status. *International Journal for Researcher Development*, *2*(1), 46-60.

Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

UK Council for Graduate Education, Frayling, C., & Burgess, R. G. (1997). *Practice-based doctorates in the creative and performing arts and design*. UK Council for Graduate Education.

UK GRAD Programme, & Shinton, S. (2004). *What Do PhDs Do?: 2004 Analysis of First Destinations for PhD Graduates*. UK GRAD Programme/Graduate Prospects.

UKCISA (2017), Briefing on international students. https://institutions.ukcisa.org.uk/Info-for-universities-colleges--schools/Publications--research/resources/94/UKCISA-Briefing-on-international-students (accessed 14.7.2017)

UKCISA (2011) ????

UKCOSA (2004), Broadening our Horizons. https://institutions.ukcisa.org.uk/Info-for-universities-colleges--schools/Publications--research/resources/90/Broadening-Our-Horizons-Survey-2004. (accessed 3/06/2010).

Urban, E. L., & Palmer, L. B. (2014). International students as a resource for internationalization of higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *18*(4), 305-324.

Veal, A. J. (2011). Research methods for research and tourism: A practical guide. *Harlow: Prentice Hall*.

Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Routledge.

Vitae (2013), 'What do researchers do? Early career progression of doctoral graduates.'

Vitae Researcher Development Framework available at https://www.vitae.ac.uk/researchers-professional-development/about-the-vitae-researcher-development-framework (accessed 12.15.17)

Volet, S. E., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for intercultural learning. *Higher Education Research and Development, 17*(1).

Walker (1997) ?????

Walker, P. (2014). International Student Policies in UK Higher Education from Colonialism to the Coalition Developments and Consequences. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *18*(4), 325-344.

Walsh, M. (2001). *Research made real: A guide for students*. Nelson Thornes.

Ward, C. A. (2001). *The impact of international students on domestic students and host institutions: A literature review*. Export Education Policy Project, Ministry of Education.

Warwick, P., & Moogan, Y. J. (2013). A comparative study of perceptions of internationalisation strategies in UK universities. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(1), 102-123.

Weaver, M., Vickerstaff, A., & Sullivan, M. (2008). Case study: designing a full-time masters programme for a culturally diverse student population.

Webb, G. 2005. "Internationalization of curriculum". In *Teaching International Students*, Edited by: Carroll, J. and Ryan, J. London: Routledge.

Weiss, H. B., & Greene, J. C. (1992). An empowerment partnership for family support and education programs and evaluations. *Family Science Review*, *5*(1), 2.

Wilson, A. (1980). Group sessions for postgraduate students. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *8*(2), 237-241.

Wilson, A. (1987). The social science PhD: the ESRC enquiry on submission rates. *London: ESRC*.

Wisker, G. (2001). Cross-cultural research supervision, and research at a distance: Issues for postgraduate students and supervisors. *SEDA PAPER*, 119-136.

Wisker, G. (2012). *The good supervisor: Supervising postgraduate and undergraduate research for doctoral theses and dissertations*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wisker, G., Robinson, G., & Shacham, M. (2007). Postgraduate research success: Communities of practice involving cohorts, guardian supervisors and online communities. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *44*(3), 301-320.

Wolcott, H. F. (2001). Writing Up Qualitative Research. 2. utg.

Xiao, H., & Smith, S. L. (2006). The making of tourism research: Insights from a social sciences journal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(2), 490-507.

Yemini, M. (2015). Internationalisation discourse hits the tipping point: A new definition is needed. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *19*(1), 19-22.

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2005). Integration and adaptation: Approaches to the student retention and achievement puzzle. *Active Learning in higher education*, *6*(1), 46-59.

Zimitat, C. (2008). 13 Student Perceptions of the Internationalisation of the Undergraduate Curriculum. *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students*, 135.

APPENDIX 1 – PHASE ONE INTERVIEW THEMES

STUDENTS

- Background/educational background
- Funding/sponsorship
- motivations for undertaking PhD
- Career plans
- area of study
- supervisory relationship – meetings, guidance, what makes a good relationship
- research training
- expectations of PhD
- interaction with other PhD students
- highs and lows
- language support
- choice of topic
- contribution to knowledge
- conferences/publications

SUPERVISORS

- number of supervisions
- mix of students
- regularity of meetings
- format of meetings
- training for supervisors
- gains from experience
- qualities of good relationship
- team supervision
- highs and lows for students
- conferences/publishing
- language issues
- cultural issues

APPENDIX 2 – THEMES FROM PHASE TWO INTERVIEWS

STUDENTS

- background, upbringing, journey to PhD
- why you did PhD?. What you thought you would gain?
- has expectation changed now?
- why Tourism & why this institution?
- how were you supervisors chosen/allocated?
- how did you choose topic?
- how did you choose methodology?
- supervisory relationship – frequency of meetings/who requests them?. What makes a good relationship?. Personal issues.
- Research methods training
- Language support
- relationship with peers
- highs and lows
- personal issues
- interaction with staff
- publishing/conferences
- choice of External Examiners
- skills gained from PhD
- Knowledge?. Expert?
- Most valuable thing you have learned?
- What doors will PhD open?

SUPERVISORS

- how long have you been supervising PhDs?
- how many have you supervised?
- International/UK?
- frequency of meetings
- who requests them
- structure of meetings
- traits of a good supervisory relationship
- gains from being supervisor
- challenges of supervising
- choice/influence over topics
- influence over methodology
- sponsored students – implications

- influence of students' cultural background
- Language issues
- conferences/publications

APPENDIX 3 - PHASE 1 INTERVIEW WITH THEO

Just to explain what I'm here for, I'm just starting my fieldwork. As I said in my e-mail, I'm doing my PhD on the PhD experience, basically, for students and supervisors.

I just started in January, so …

Excellent. I'm hoping to get a cross-section of people who've just started, about to finish, different nationalities, full-time, part-time, all of that … But I also want to look at how internationalisation is changing the PhD experience, so talking to people from all over the world is exactly what I want to do. And the sort of PhD part is, what knowledge is being created … Today really is, I'm coming here, Surrey & UWIC and I'm hoping to meet as many students as possible in the next few weeks and then go forward with a smaller group of maybe 8 students and their supervisors from different institutions who might be prepared for me to track them through a year.

Tourism?

Yes, tourism and hospitality. I just wanted to chat today about three areas – your background and your reasons for doing your PhD, how your experience is so far and then, it might be too soon for you to answer much about this yet, but what you think you are contributing to the body of knowledge.

So, you are from Greece? What is you educational background? How did you come here?

I've been here for a long time. I did my first degree here, my masters here and now my PhD.

All here?

No. I did my first degree in Caledonian, my masters here and my PhD here.

All in Glasgow?

I would have left but I was asking about supervisors and they said Professor X and I was, like, I'm staying!

So, **that's why you stayed, because of your supervisor?**

Yeah

Are you sponsored?

No, I am self-funded at the moment and I have a part-time job, but it's OK. I mean next year, I will do tutorials or something like that, so I'm not going to need to …

You're a full-time student?

Yeah

Why did you want to do a PhD?

Because I've always been a geek. No, I mean like my father has a tourism business and all that but I've never wanted to get into that. I like writing and I like teaching. I've taught in colleges and I'm doing tutorials so I decided I should just stay in academia – if they'll have me.

Right, so partly because you enjoy it and partly because ..

And maybe a vanity thing, because I want to be called doctor …

You are the second person who has said that today – and I've only spoken to 2 people.

No, it's like, if you left your house and everything you knew for six or seven years, you want to have something to show for it.

Do you know what career plans you might have?

I want to finish my PhD, teach a bit and then maybe find a permanent post somewhere.

In academia?

Yeah, of course.

Do you have any work experience or did you come straight from school through that?

Well, I've worked as a rep, Club 18-30, not very academic, nothing I'm proud of. I don't even put it on my CV. I mean, so far I went for teaching jobs and things like that, what's the point in putting it down?

That's true, it's not very relevant.

Basically, you have been a student?

Yeah, just summer jobs.

Great, that's your background then. A bit more about your experience. What area are you studying? What's your subject?

I'm doing volunteer holidays. More or less, I want to see if there's like motivation patterns, how they end up being volunteer resorts. I mean there is a thing, it's called Volunteer Project Lifecycle and it means that first there is a maverick volunteer and they see need and they try to cover it, the need grows and they need more people and it becomes more organised so institutions like we take for granted, like hospitals, universities, charities, started like that and they end up being huge commercial organisations and corporations. So, plus there is also like a Tourism Destination Lifecycle, identified by Professor Butler of course, and I am trying to see if there is such a thing as a Volunteer Tourism Project Lifecycle, when does a charity become a business, is it inevitable, how, under which circumstances? Why do people go, is it altruism, do they do it for their own needs, is there such a thing as altruism? And things like that.

Sounds complicated and sounds interesting. So, X is obviously your supervisor. How often do you meet him?

Oh, when he is in the country, he's a very popular man, very in demand. But, no, he is very helpful and I mean the only difference is that you are out of the nest with the PhD. There's no Mother Goose anymore, you have to do your own thing and show what you have and ask questions. Whereas, Masters had more direction, more help. It's about motivating yourself, more or less, because there are no deadlines, no short-term deadlines.

So, when you do meet him, do you request the meetings or does he? Or a combination of the two?

He tells me, I'll be in the country or I'll be around and I say, ok we should meet. I haven't turned down an opportunity yet, so ..

Great. And what happens in the meetings. Do you give him written work or do you just talk at the moment?

Well, when I have something ready, I hand it over and it comes back really red. We chat about ideas
…

How would you describe your relationship with X?

Er, first of all, when I grow up, I want to be like him.

So, you admire him?

Of course. And it's kind of awe, like a shock and awe factor. One minute you read the book and the next you meet the person in the room.

I know the feeling. I am meeting him this afternoon for the first time
Is he very supportive of your ideas?

He's a very nice man.

Does he give you ideas? Does he feed you ideas or does he give you pointers?

I think he tries to push me to the right direction without, like, spoon-feeding me.

He doesn't spoon-feed you though?

No

What do you think makes for a good relationship with your supervisor? What would you look for in a relationship?

First, you have to have a lot of respect for your supervisor. Um, if you think your supervisor has been there and done it, you feel more secure. If you don't respect your supervisor enough, you can have some doubts. But if you get some advice from someone who has been there, done it and has the t-shirt to prove it, you are OK.

So, respect. What about his attitude to you, is that important?

I like the fact that he doesn't like, he is Mr International Tourism and he is very down- to-earth and he chats like a friend and a normal person, I really like that

Did you have any Research Training?

Research Methods, that's in November. I started in January, so I haven't had that yet.

Do you think you need it? Are you waiting for that?

Of course, of course. Cos, you know, it's a Masters in Research Methods … which you pay for, so ..

What were your expectations or your hopes when you started your PhD? How did you expect it to be and is it like that?

I had no expectations. I thought it was going to be this huge bogeyman and it is. And you learn one new thing about yourself everyday.

Do you have much contact with the other PhD students here?

The problem is, they are very busy people. And I need to become much more devoted and as dedicated as them if I want to finish. Cos like, my flatmate's just finished his masters. She is just hanging around until she goes home and it's very difficult. So, I'm trying to find a flat very near to

the university, so even if I don't have any motivation, it's only like crossing the street rather than walking for 10 or 15 minutes. So, yeah, I'm trying to artificially create a good studying environment.

So, at the moment, you don't have a lot of contact with the other PhD students?

Well, no, I don't know why, maybe because I think there's a nucleus of Thai, Malaysian and they hang out together and maybe they have a different kind of lifestyle and … I don't know …

So, who do you hang out with?

I've got my flatmate and I've got other people from the university volleyball team.

So, is there a formal research student group or anything?

We have a representative is Lia, another Greek girl, but she is leaving. So, I don't know, I don't go to functions and things like that cos I work in a bar so I never had a chance to socialise. Hopefully when I stop working at the bar, I will be able to be more sociable, but at the moment, no … you have to pay the bills.

(Tape runs out at this stage without me noticing. Start talking about Masters degree & international classroom. Kostas says could have passed his Masters from Powerpoint and that the level of teaching is reduced in order to get the international student income)

The university doesn't want work to go the external that's ready bad quality because it doesn't reflect good on the university. So, but at PG level, I think it's very easy.

But, you think doing a PhD, you don't get that same kind of spoon-feeding.

You shouldn't. You shouldn't, because you're there, like, to like, under an emblem of the university, you are there to do your best. You should be prepared. I don' t know, like, if I came in here and I couldn't understand the language, I had problems struggling, I wouldn't expect anyone to give me a PhD or someone to help raise my level. It's something you have to do yourself. It's not like university level where the university gives you extra time in the exams and things like that, it's a PhD. You are playing with the big boys. That's what I think … I don't know.

Have there been any real highs or real lows for you so far?

Well, so far that colloquium was like the highlight last week. It was nice to kind of take out this soup I have in my head, present it to people and they say, well, that's very interesting. Yeah, that was nice. That was the highlight.

Any lows?

No, no, nothing. I guess when I start doing the Research Methods course, everyone says it's really bad, then I'm going to have a few lows, but so far, so good.

Obviously, language skills are clearly not an issue for you, are they?

No.

You don't have any problems writing either?

No, my English is better than my Greek. I've lost my Greek – I try to write complicated things in Greek, it doesn't come to me.

Do you go home very often?

No, I stay here. I like it.

Do you know though, if you did need it, is there any extra academic support available to you?

If I needed it, I don't know. I mean, what kind of support?

Language support, if you needed it?

Well, I would never go for it anyway, so I have never looked at that. I'm sure there would be something in place for international students – support groups and excursions and things like that. I've done that years ago when I was new in Glasgow, now, what is the point?

Ok, that's brilliant, that's about your experience. Now the next thing is going to be probably a little bit more difficult for you because you've only just started. How much progress have you made so far? What have you done?

Well, first of all, I was trying to research altruism, so I was looking to biology, psychology and things like that and it turns out that the jury's still out. Now, we've decided, Professor Butler, to look at destinations, volunteer tourism destinations, and create a matrix, I mean what they have in common and see if there is a pattern there. So, I'm working on that, so that takes a long time.

So, you're looking at the literature at the moment, really.

Yes.

Why did you choose this subject?

It was my Masters.

Right, OK.

My Masters I did a forecast of demand, I mean the literature says that people who go along to these things are suffering from corporate burn-out, they are like young office professionals and they are disillusioned and they go volunteer helping and things like that. So, I tried to see young office professionals of the future, ie students, around the Glasgow area and I kind of did a forecast and now I've decided to, like, go deeper.

Any reason why volunteer holidays though? Have you been on one or did it just ..

No, I did it because nobody else has done it.

Right, that's the next bit I'm coming to really. There's not much written about it?

Not much. It's a very new subject. There's only one book, by Stephen Waring, and it's Volunteer Tourism Experiences that make a difference. But he stays on the surface, he just has a focus group in St Helena and that's it. It's a very thin book, so hopefully …

So, there's an obvious gap. Definitely knowledge to be added.

Yes, there's an obvious gap

Have you chosen a methodology yet?

Well, I am planning to, if I have the money, go abroad and do one of those. I mean after I research most of them, I plan being able to find a representative one and go and experience it myself and maybe run a focus group while there. That is the plan

Great, excellent. I was going to say, is that a new methodology, but, if there's not much work done on it, I suppose it is really.

No. It is.

So, that's obviously what you feel is your contribution to the knowledge, is it?

The thing is, volunteer tourism is relatively new and people don't know where to put it. Should we research it within the general volunteering or within the general tourism. I'm going to try to see if it can stand by itself and that will be new.

What do you think are going to be the most important skills you get at the end of your PhD?

Being able to research, and analytical thinking, things like that.

Are you hoping you'll be an expert in your field by the end?

What is an expert anyway?

Oooh, very philosophical.

No, I mean, if you sit down and say 'I'm an expert now', you have lost before you've even started. I'm sure Professor X doesn't think of himself as an expert, there's always something to learn.

But obviously, if you want to stay in academia, it's a combination of the subject knowledge and the research skills …

It's just like the things you take from the PhD, I think, like new skills, patience, being able to cope under pressure, meet deadlines, use people to your advantage, networking, things like that.

I guess I already know the answer to this question. I assume you haven't published anything yet?

No, I haven't and it's funny because like, em, we get invited to conferences and things like that and I can't go cos I don't have any results. I mean, I could go and waffle but I don't want to, I just want to have some results when I go. I don't want to take advantage of a free trip.

But you did present at the colloquium? Is that compulsory?

No, no, not compulsory. It is for you, to be able to present your work to other people because it helps you for the final bogey, bogey, viva.

And you found it useful?

Yeah, nice … and people ask you questions and you defend your way of thinking, it's nice.

Is it something you are planning to do in the future, conference presenting?

Er, I mean, first of all I want to have results, something tangible, and, if everything goes well, maybe with the help of Professor X, maybe I can like publish or like find something, but I don't know at the moment.

I've got one more question. I'm going to 3 different institutions and then I want to end up with a small group of students to track. Would you be prepared to be one of those?

Well, I'm here so yeah.

The idea I would come up about every 6 months and repeat the same kind of process. In the meantime, I would hope to be in contact be e-mail and, if something happened to you that you were really excited or depressed about, you might share it with me?

No problem. I can't pretend I'm busy.

You're looking like a likely candidate, as someone who's just started.

I don't mind being a guinea pig.

We all need guinea pigs for our research.

I know, I need them too, so it's good karma.

APPENDIX 4 – PHASE 1 INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR RICHARD BROWN

What I'm looking at basically is the PhD experience in Tourism and Hospitality Studies but really how the growth in international students is changing that.

(knock at the door) Oh, Jack, this is Emma, who you are meeting later …

And how internationalisation is changing the … well, from your point, the pedagogy of supervision. And then, finally, the most important bit, I suppose that I'm not really onto yet is knowledge creation and which fctors are influencing the knowledge that's being created and disseminated in Tourism Studies, if that makes sense?

Uh huh.

Right, so these are just preliminary conversations really and I'm hoping, after this, to get a group of about 8 to 10 students and supervisors who might be prepared to be 'tracked' for 12 to 18 months.

Yep.

So, really it's just a bit about your experience of supervision and that kind of thing. So, I guess you've supervised a lot of PhD students?

Yes, I have, over quite a long period of time. Do you want to know how many? I would guess it's about 20, but over … I would think … 'cos I've not been an academic all my working life. I started off as an academic and I supervised some then and then I had a gap for about 13 years and then I came back to it, so I guess … I've certainly done between 15 and 20 in this second time.

Right, would that be here?

I've supervised one at another university, who I inherited from a colleague who died so I have had one elsewhere, yes.

OK great. Um, is that UK and international?

Students? Yes, the majority, I would guess, have been international.

Great. How many are you supervising at the moment?

Um, I have just, er, it might actually be as many as *(walks over to filing cabinet to check)* , as many as 10. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 … it was 8, but one had his viva last week. So, it is 7.

7, great. And how often do you meet your PhD students?

It varies. I don't think there is …there's certainly not one answer I can give, even for any one student. But I do have a mixture of full-time and part-time … some of them are actually living abroad. So, at one extreme for example, I do have a student in Hong Kong who I have only met once, and he is coming up for submission and I met him because I happened to be in Hong Kong for something else and we managed to meet. He was a student I inherited – he had seen his other supervisor far more at the beginning cos he was here but he then went back to Hong Kong. So, that's at one extreme. At another extreme, I have students who I would see at least once a month, possibly once a fortnight … but it is very varied.

Mm, hmm. With the Hong Kong one, obviously you communicated some way, by e-mail?

Yes, yes.

And that's obviously worked out fine?

Um, I hope it has. I think it's deeply unsatisfactory and I certainly wouldn't want to take on another one like that. As it happens, I've had another one I've been supervising who lives in Japan, is a teacher at a university in Japan. Now, with him the experience has been totally different because he has made a point of coming to the UK twice a year, for about a week. Then, in that week when he's been here, we've had fairly intensive meetings. And then, what is more, we've met up at least once a year at a conference somewhere, um, and so we've actually … I would think we've had as much supervisory experience face-to-face with him as you would with a full-time.

Yeah, right great.

So, what do you do in those meetings? Do you request those meetings or do they?

It's a mixture. When they first start, I request the meetings. When they get going, they request the meetings, but, if I haven't heard from them for a little while, I send a reminder and say 'we ought to meet'. I use a little pro-forma, which does just guide the meeting … it's mine, there's not a school-wide approach. You can have that if you want. There's no rocket science about it but I do … we identify what the key activity stage is and then I write a rough report and then what actions I am doing and what actions the student is doing and that forms the basis for the next meeting. So, the agenda is partly driven by that, so when we get to the next meeting, it will start off with where are you up to and what is it we agreed you would be doing? That sort of thing … there is … I mean this may come up in a question later … we do also have a formal review system, which happens once a year. You ought to get the paperwork on that … are you seeing Kerry?

No.

Kerry is our … she run the PhD programme … she will be able to let you have the forms that formally we complete and the students complete once a year which then do take you through a more structure set of headings.

It's not one of my questions actually but do you have, within the School, any kind of training for PhD supervisors?

We do, in the sense that you can't supervise on your own until you have supervised, with someone else, someone to completion. So, the training is a little bit 'sitting by Nellie' but it is now a bit more than 'sitting by Nellie' because all newly appointed tutors and lecturers have to do a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice as part of their probationary period and that includes Research Supervision.

Right.

So, five years ago, it was just sitting by Nellie. It ain't anymore, you've actually got to go through a programme and, if you let me know if you want it, I can get you details of that programme.

Great, thank you. What kind of relationship do you like to have with your PhD students?

Um, reasonably informal. They're adults … I don't see it as my job to tell them what to do … in fact, I won't tell them what to do. It's their job to come to me and tell me what they want to do and I say, 'That's a good idea' or, 'That's a daft idea'. But, no, reasonably informal relationship.

OK great. What do you think you gain, if anything, from the experience?

What do **I** gain? Um, I would think, at this end of my career, I gain increasingly little, unless I have particularly … No, I have actually been blessed with some extraordinarily good PhD students who I've gained a lot from in the sense that their knowledge of the subject areas that they're looking at is better than mine, so I've actually learned from them.. I've also learned things from them methodologically. But, they are the exception … most are actually really quite a … well, it's simply like most things, it is hard work. And, some are enormously hard work … I mean you get the satisfaction of getting them through but it's an odd kind of satisfaction.

More a relief is it?

Yeah

OK. What do think makes for a good supervisory relationship?

That's a very very difficult question. What is my immediate answer to that? *(Long pause)* I would think it is a relationship where the supervisor sets the broad boundaries of the game in which they are operating, in agreement with the student. Now, that may be the broad boundaries of qualitative versus quantitative or both … so it may have a methodological steer to it in agreement with the student … on subject area, on research question, on research objectives. So, in other words, the supervisor has set these and, within the first six months, it becomes clear roughly what territory the student's operating in, but then the student actually populates within those boundaries from their own reading and their own expertise. I mean, I certainly make the case … make it clear to all the students I supervise, that, after a relatively short period of time, they will know infinitely more about the subject they are researching than I will. And, in most cases, they will know far more about the methodological approach they are adopting than I do, so don't come to me for 'how do I do this and how do I do that?' because they should be in advance of me, because that is what they are particularly specialising in and, if I can instil that in to them, I am reasonably content.

And does that usually work?

Yes, it does with good PhD students. Good PhD students are actually a delight to supervise because they are stimulating but you know, the good ones are, um, I don't think, at present, the majority.

Right OK. Do you find international students will adopt that approach immediately or do they need a little more coaxing? Or can't you generalise?

It's difficult to generalise. Erm … I just need to look round at some of the names … I've had some difficult British PhD students and I've had some that have been a delight to supervise and I've had some difficult overseas students and some that have been a delight to supervise. Um, I think the worst kind … I find the most frustrating … is students who really haven't got a clue what they want to do and, when you try to give them a steer, they actually don't want to take any steer. They're the ones I find very very difficult indeed because you then end up with a piece of work that needs huge amount of work on it. I'm not sure that's terribly coherent but …

I know what you mean, I think. That's about all my questions really on the general supervisory experience. Oh, do you use … you obviously do use second supervisors?

Some we do, some we don't. I would guess about … and increasingly in the school, we do have second supervisors, we have for all PhDs .. . but I have quite a few going through who I am the sole supervisor … yeah, it's a mixture.

So, when you have two, how does that work out? Do you all meet together or does the student go to either of you?

Different approaches and you should ask Jack Hunt about this … he has a different approach. When I second supervise, I try to arrange a meeting … sorry, when I am the main supervisor and I have somebody supervising with me … I am the principal supervisor … I try for the three of us to meet. It doesn't always work and you have to accept that the second supervisor can't be there. But, I do try, in the pattern of the year, that the second supervisor is involved in the process. I am second supervisor to a few of Jack's … Jack tends to treat me as a bit more of a longstop. So, in other words, all the supervisory meetings are with Jack and his student and then, from time to time, they kind of come to me to give a report on what they're doing, to get a second opinion. Now, he may be doing that with me because I'm an experienced supervisor … it may be that, if he had an inexperienced supervisor, he would involve them in the team, in the way that I do.

Have you ever had any conflict between you and your second supervisor, in the advice you're giving to a student?

No, I can't recall … and I've supervised with a lot of different people … I can't recall any conflicts, no.

Great, I think that's about it for that section. The next bit is about Y. I'm meeting her this afternoon. How long have you been supervising her?

Far too long! She's actually … I was hoping she would have submitted in May *(goes to filing cabinet to check)* … er, let me have a look at one fo her forms … since October 2002.

Right, so she's been here a while, then?

Yes,

And she's from Korea?

Yes.

So, how often do you meet her for example – is it fairly regular?

Yes, she has been a fairly regular fixture, at least once a month. There's been some gaps recently because, basically, what she's doing now is just putting together some final touches to her final chapters. Um, there have also been some gaps with her because of illness. And, also, a bit of background to her … she did actually start off with a second supervisor, who left … um, so we brought in … well, Mel was the main supervisor … no, it was a little bit unfortunate … I was the main supervisor because I was a qualified supervisor. The person who had a knowledge of the subject area she was looking at was the second supervisor … and I was on the ticket so that the second supervisor could gain her credentials … she then left, so leaving me as the supervisor and I brought in then a second supervisor because, by then, it was clear, methodologically, where Y was going, so I brought somebody on to the team who, methodologically, was close to what Y wanted to do. And I think that has worked very well.

I'm only using her as an example 'cos I'm going to meet her later. On knowledge creation really now, do you know why she chose the subject she chose?

The only thing I can say … I mean, no doubt, if I dug through her file, I could dig up some more things … what she's looking at is the effect that interpretation has on the way in which people behave at heritage sites, in relation to sustainability. So, in other words, does the fact that they go to an interpretation site have any influence on the attitudes or on their behaviour that they maintain towards sustainable tourism, which is an interesting topic. She comes at it, originally, as a biologist and she actually has an interest in biology and has an interest in the environment and that's how she came to go down that route. And I think, unusually, in the case of Y, she has stayed roughly on the same track all the way through … that it's something to do with, here are the people, here's sustainability at a site, does going through an interpretation loop have some benefits and impacts on sustainable behaviour? Now, it's shifted about a bit in exactly what she was doing and where she was doing in and what theoretically, she was drawing on in terms of behaviour and behaviour patterns, but, that as a theme ahs been with her all the way through.

So, how without going into too much detail … I don't know anything about that area …how is she building on existing knowledge? Is it her methodology or the facts she is finding out or both?

Um, yes … she has actually … she has done a very very comprehensive review of the literature and has actually identified some important factors that she has pulled together into a research instrument which she implemented. Um, I don't know that, methodologically, it is breaking new ground … I mean, other people have done that sort of work before. I think the factors she is looking at are packaged in a rather different way, so there's a little bit of methodological thinking that lies behind it. But, I guess the real contribution to knowledge is that understanding of the ways in which interpretation centres influence what people do. I think there's actually some new material in there.

OK Great. Do you think she's had highs and lows in her research?

Aw! The highs and lows, I'm not sure she's had … she's had a lot of lows, poor girl. Certainly, she's had a reasonable amount of illness which has been very unfortunate … in fact, two winters … and that's why she's a little bit behind … she basically took a few months off, um, because .. whether it

was something to do with the weather, she picked up bugs and she had, you know, long long periods of illness. I think also she's been through some fairly major crises in the work in that she's one of these students who wants to try and cover everything so hence her work goes out and out and out and gets broader and broader and broader, rather than … as I've told her many many times … what you need to do is bring it down and down and down and make it get narrower and narrower and narrower. And that's led to a lot of conflicts in her in trying to deal with that, which came to a bit of a head at the time of her upgrade from M.Phil to PhD because the upgrade was also of exactly the same view, 'You are just trying to do too much here. You can't possibly measure all these variables. You'll have an instrument that simply ain't fit for purpose.' And then she did do a bit of restructuring but, still, it is a huge topic she's looking at.

Is she basing it here in the UK?

Yes, yes, she's looking at two heritage coast information centres.

OK, great. Do you encourage your students to present at conferences and publish and that kind of thing?

Yes, yes. Except in the case of Y, I keep telling her 'No you can't. You've got to get the chapters written. I don't want you to write different things, just get down and finish this off. Then start writing papers.' But, yes they do, a lot of them do. A lot of them get very good work published.

Do you kind of help them with that?

Yes, yes.

OK, last bit, I promise. Do you find, with international students, there's problems with language?

Yes. I mean, with Y, there's huge problems. As you will find talking to her. Um, she has such a pronounced accent that she's one of the very few students that I sometimes have difficulty understanding what she's saying. Translate that into her writing and there's a real problem and it's … one of the things that's holding her up a bit on finishing her thesis … we have a system here where students can get support from the Language Centre but, after a while you have to pay for it, you know, to do the proof reading. Now, in the end, quite honestly, I have to unpick a lot of her work, unpick a lot of the language in order to understand what she's saying. So, yes, I have a lot of difficulty.

And, do you do that? Do you correct work for students in general?

I do, because, otherwise, I can't understand it. I can't understand what I'm reading, I mean, some of my colleagues may be able to … let me show you *(opens filing cabinet)* Yes, here we are, this is a typical thing that she is getting back … every page has got … 'In this next section, observed design strategy is presented to develop the selecting procedure of the most effective methods…' it goes on and on and on … every page is like that. But I can't even concentrate if it's written in poor English, um, of course what I should do is to say 'I'm not going to read this until you get it all properly proof-read' but I recognise that students can't actually afford that, so you end up doing that.

You said she's quite difficult to understand. If you're having a supervisory meeting with her, can that cause a problem?

Yes. Yes. I'll give you an example. One of the heritage coasts she's looking at, one of the special things about that coast … and one of the things that's a very important part of her thesis… is, you know, the special things at heritage sites they are trying to protect or to educate the public about … and that's got an important bearing upon how people behave when they've been through some form of interpretation, so it's a crucial bit. Well, she was looking at a site that is famous for fossils, well, for two meetings, I didn't know what… she kept saying 'possils' … and I had no idea. I thought it was something in the literature that I'd not heard of and, after the third meeting, it suddenly dawned on me she was looking at fossils, not possils, but she still says possils.

Oh dear, so, OK, fairly significant problems can arise there?

Yes.

How about culturally? Do you think … either Y or international students … their view of the world affects how they approach their PhD?

Yes. I think one of the things and, I guess Y is an example of this and so are others is that they think their supervisors … me in this case … is a fountain of all knowledge and that you know everything. And, it's a long time to try and persuade them that you don't and that they are the expert and that they must become the expert in their field. You know, my knowledge of statistics goes so far, as it happens I suspect Y's knowledge of statistics is better than mine but I doubt if she would really know that. And it's quite a long time … you know, getting them to have the confidence to say 'I think this is the best way of doing this, for these reasons', rather than saying to me, 'Well, what shall I do now?'

Right, and do you think, in the final instance, it's their way of doing it that comes through, or do they take so much advice from you that it becomes more your way of doing it?

One or two, they've actually been my PhDs, rather than theirs … but that is certainly not true of Y. Y has actually got stuff in there which … there are avenues that I wouldn't have dreamt of going down. So, to that extent, she's, you know, it is very much her work.

Thank you. I suppose the next question is, would you be prepared to meet again?

Yes.

(Tape off, then re-start conversation)

I mean, recently, I've had a PhD student die. Just a couple of weeks after submitting her dissertation, she died. She was an overseas student and that has an interesting little bearing on the process that you go through. As it happens, she was looking at … and the reason she's in my mind … she was looking at the experience of international students studying in British universities. Anyway, sorry, the thought's just gone through my head.

APPENDIX 5 – PHASE 2 INTERVIEW WITH KATIE

Emma: First of all can you just tell me a bit about yourself really, about your upbringing, your background, school and then how you came eventually to do a PHD?
Katie: I was born in Manchester and we moved to South Devon when I was four, so I went to primary school there and I went to grammar school, obviously which is seven years including Sixth Form. Then I was going to be a Lawyer I thought but I didn't get the grades so I ended up in the ?? Wales and I haven't Wales since so I did a BA in Public Administration, that was four years and in that year was the time I worked for Sports Council so from that experience I decided I wanted to go into Sport and Leisure which is then why I did the Sport and Leisure Management MA in Cyncoed in 1992 and while I was doing that I did some volunteering with ?? and eventually I ended up working for them so that's how I got into the Visual Impairment sector.
Emma: How did you end up doing a PHD?
Katie: Oh well, I kind of had a career after having my second children, thought I was getting a bit stale and was very happy about how things were working where I was. I just started doing some driving for two visually impaired people who were professionals, so that was just ticking me over for a bit and UWIC through X and Y, they were writing proposals for research and they were writing one about Visual Impairment and Tourism and so they know me and knew I wasn't in full time employment so they asked me if I was interested and if I'd want to apply to do a PHD. Which I did, the project itself was accepted and then I was accepted as the person and that's how I ended up doing this PHD.
Emma: Ok thank you.
Katie: I should mention that I got a Bursary.
Emma: That was my next question.
Katie: Oh right ok.
Emma: You got a UWIC Bursary.
Katie: I got a UWIC Bursary
Emma: That's a real Bursary
Katie: Yeah
Emma: Ok good. What was the appeal of doing a PHD. What did you think you were going to gain from doing a PHD before you started?
Katie: Well initially I think, because I only had a very short time to actually go for it, as it were I thought it's something different, it's something new. It's in the subject that I know about, the visual impairment side but not the tourism side and it would be a new challenge and maybe it could open new doors at the end and it actually turned out to be challenging in lots of ways but I think it will still help visually impaired people not just me.
Emma: Right, so you did have that kind of motivation as well to try and help visually impaired people. That's very good. Good, well I have got, my next question is, has that expectation changed now?
Katie: I do think it is going to open more doors for me. I don't know which door yet but it's made me realise that my heart still is in disability, because I was questioning that when I finished work. I do still feel passionate about blind, partially sighted people and whether I go back in that or into another disability organisation but yeah I really do feel and I feel much more in power of myself to be a bit more confident and believe more that what I do know should help ??
Emma: Good, ok great. We might come back in a bit to what skills you've gained and you've said now really the kind of knowledge ??. So my next two questions you've sort of answered now, it was why Tourism and why UWIC but you've kind of answered those, personal contacts?
Katie: Personal contacts and coincidence really yeah, because Y, they came to the ?? Council for the Blind a couple of times when we were looking at, I think it was Tourism actually, we were going to do some Awareness Training with the Tourist Board, which we did do and unfortunately just fizzled out. So it is quite interesting to see how far, has Tourism got any further than that and in some ways but still a long way to go.
Emma: How long have you been the famous PHD now?
Katie: Since September 2007.
Emma: Nearly three years.
Katie: Yeah
Emma: Yeah ok, I know we know the answer to this but for the benefit of the tape as we say, who are your supervisors and how did you choose then or did they choose you or what?
Katie: Right so it's a professional X and Yand Zand at the very beginning it wasP. Then of course she left then didn't she to..... So I have three supervisors which I think is a very lucky

position as well to be in, and basically X and Yhad chosen me because that was their area of research and what they were bidding for and everything and then we chose P.

Emma: Ok, for any particular reason?

Katie: I mean her research is very much about people and about sort of tackling other people's misconceptions about old people, it's the same here. A lot of visually impaired people are older people. And also she is very straight with you and from what I understand her writing's very practical like mine. I don't have quite such a flowing language as, and Y too and that's obviously years of experience but, yeah I think it makes a good combination.

Emma: Good. So did Y and X suggest Z or did you already know her? Not that I'm particularly picking on Z but I'm quite interested in the concept of multi supervisory teams?

Katie: Well of course I met Z through going to the conference last year and they sort of suggested her as well so I guess again it was a mixture of the two really.

Emma: Ok and you have had a, has the relationship, I mean we are going to look at the relationship in a minute, but has the relationship changed since you had P in the team or did, was she not here long enough really?

Katie: She wasn't here long enough I don't think. No, I mean initially you see, Z did the upgrade when she wasn't my supervisor so again I kind of had a chance to talk to somebody else who didn't know about it at the time and she seems very interested and that helped obviously. Yeah so I'm quite happy to ask for help.

Emma: Good. I was going to ask you how you chose your topic but you've pretty much told me that. How did you choose your methodology? Was that part of proposal as well or was that something you chose?

Katie: Gosh I'm trying to think now. Well really because I had to find opinions about participation in Tourism and I think because I already know the networks and the people involved, focus groups just seemed like the obvious thing to do, with groups of people. And I knew which organisations to go to and then to actually find the right people's experiences, I think Y suggested you know, interviews with, just interviews with people, he didn't say whether it would be structured or semi structured and I just went away and thought how am I going to do this? Am I just going to speak with older people or younger people or a mixture or whatever and I thought well what about family, because there's not much research on family participation either. So I kind of went to them with that and said 'How about if we choose families with at least one visually impaired person in that family'. And they said 'Yeah go for it'.

Emma: Very difficult to hear what is being said as two voices speaking at once. Something said about the topic.

Katie: Yeah I think so. I mean that's the method, I mean the actual epistemology part of it, I think really as it's about disability it has to be disability research because it's all about, you know I think this has become a bit of a cliché now, but about their voices, about hearing their voices and it's not about treating people as second class citizens and not as objects either. It's about them as people and then because of the methods then, it is interpreting the results and I think there is a bit of ?? in there as well. Yeah so I have kind of worked that out myself I think, because when you kind of read around it you start to see what you should be doing, and because quite a few people have said 'Disability should be researched in this particular way', you know 'It should have these kind of outcomes' and everything. I think the only thing that has held me back a bit is that I'm not a disabled person, you know, and I kind of feel a bit, you know, what are other people going to think about that.

So in that respect that links in with being reflective then and bringing in my own work experiences so I'm not generalising about what that person feels and does, I've actually seen people and the variety of reaction and motivations and things.

Emma: It's turning in a viva now look, you passed, well done!

Emma: Anyway, let's go back to your supervisors.

Katie: Ok yes.

Emma: How often do you meet your supervisors?

Katie: Umm, initially it was probably once a month and then sort of every three formally and I would say from just in my final year it has been more like every month. But at the same time because we've got email I think that makes a big difference because if it's just something little you can just email a question or if it's just a case of writing or producing something, then it's not always necessary to actually meet, it's just have the deadlines, you've got a timetable and then when there's lots of work to be talked about then we'll sit down. I mean there have been a few occasions when I've felt I needed to sit down with them because of all the things going on and you kind of just think I just need to talk to them face to face.

Emma: So do you request those meetings? You say you've got a timetable, who put that timetable together?
Katie: Umm, kind of did it together really. I think they wait for me to say. I am actually very kind of deadline person, always have been, because if I don't put a date in the diary then I kind of just ignore it, so like recently now, I've got to try and do a chapter a week.
Emma: Right?
Katie: I know, I know but if I don't have that I'll just carry on and I'll just keep reading so it kind of impacts my studies I guess.
Emma: So you're quite keen on that deadline driven approach?
Katie: Yes I am but that's me that might not be other people.
Emma: And do you find your supervisors respond to that? Are they quite deadline driven as well?
Katie: Umm, yeah I think so but I don't always think that they've got lots of time to read what I have written, because I have sent them one chapter and they've not given me anything from that yet and I kind of needed that to try and do the discussion chapter.
Emma: Right, so that's holding you back then?
Katie: That held me back but the actual task for my interview was very difficult I thought, so a combination again of the two. I mean I appreciate it's a juggling act
Emma: So what happens in your meetings? I mean has that changed over the three years, what you actually do when you get together?
Katie: No I don't think so. I mean I take in an agenda with me.
Emma: Very good.
Katie: Well I email them and suggest things we need to talk about and then I just run through it really and they say what they say and I say what I say, come to an agreement. I mean most of it is obviously about the work but I have also been given personal support for various things, you know, some confidence building and stuff that's gone on.
Emma: Does that help?
Katie: Yeah because you sit, don't know whether it's a PHD thing or a personal thing, again it's probably a mixture , you kind of sit there stewing over what you're reading and what you've found out and you're thinking about what am I, what am I doing, what do I believe in? And you just need someone to tell you, 'Well this has happened to other people' or 'That's right' or you know 'Don't worry about it'.
Emma: So that jumps me forward a few questions but we can go back to them anyway.
So is it your supervisory team who you rely on for that reassurance? I mean, do you think...?
Katie: Yeah I do.
Emma: Is there kind of other academic community amongst the research students or anything like that?
Katie: Umm we have a chat, yeah. I mean we're quite close downstairs but I think when you're with other students you just, it can be quite negative. And then you start to hear somebody else's and you start to think 'Oh gosh they've done all that, there's no way I'm at that stage yet' or, and I should be, and then you know, sometimes 'yeah you know, don't worry about it you'll be fine' or whatever. I mean someone just came down now, a staff member and she said it was really nice to talk to me. Completely different ends and it's nice for me to say 'Well I've learn from this. I would definitely suggest you do this' you know like writing straightaway. But that's always been my problem, and having a little journal, and little tips like that. Student tips.
Emma: Yeah but did you get any of those when you started?
Katie: Yeah someone did mention doing a journal. I think it was Y actually. It's not a diary as such but it's just little notes I write in and then I refer back to them and just have a flick through my book and think oh I forgot all about that. That's really handy.
Emma: Have you had an incident yet where you've said 'I think I might do such and such' and they've basically said 'That's not a great idea because....' or has it all been quite.
Katie: No
Emma: No, it's all been....
Katie: No it's all been very mutual yeah.
Emma: Very good.
Katie: I do think I'm very lucky because going back to talking with the other students, there's one. She has three in her team and they all disagree with each other and I think that makes it very difficult and now what's happened is that they've all, she has fallen out with them and they have fallen out with her, which really doesn't help.
Emma: That's not very supportive is it?
Katie: No definitely not.

Emma: So you've been quick lucky.

Katie: I've been very lucky.

Emma: Your three, obviously I know them and they work as a team don't they which is great.

Katie: Yeah

Emma: Yeah, no that's good. So what do you think does make a good supervisory relationship? I mean, have you got, would you say you've got a relationship with the three of them or you've got individual relationships with the three?

Katie: Well I've definitely got it with the three of them and I think because I know X and Y I have had to make sure that there is this demarcation line between them being my supervisors and friends and I'm very conscious of that. So, one to one is much easier to talk to them.   With Z you see, I haven't known her for that long but obviously that's developing.   But I feel quite happy to talk to her because we've had a few on our own when it's not been able for the other two to be there and she's been really good.   Because there was that time when my step dad died and you know she was really, she gave me something personal back.

Emma: Yeah

Katie: You know, and I thought that was really nice.

Emma: Do you think that's quite important as well, that you've got that. I know with Y and X you've got a different relationship and as you say you've got to have a line there but to have that personal support, do you think that's important that they understand what's going on, because I didn't ask you that and I should have. I know anyway, you've got two children, you've lots of, you've got responsibilities outside of here that some of the other students don't have. Do you think it's important that your supervisors are aware of that and understand, your step father and everything?

Katie: Yeah I do think so. I mean you don't want to milk it either because you know, people have varying responsibilities and what have you but it actually took me a long time to get into a routine because my husband has a very pressured job too so we're trying to work out things and you know and one child then starts half a day nursery and all these sorts of things and they do actually make a big impact on things. So it's only since January that I've had a proper routine to study in, you know and then as soon, I don't know again this might be different, as soon as I get home my head is somewhere else and I can't, I just can't work at home so I come here whenever I can really. But they are, they are very good like that. I probably, I don't think X and Y aren't very pushy, I think that's why D is quite good in this group because she's a bit more 'How you getting on, have you done that chapter yet?'. Whereas I think X and Y are very diplomatic and, but I can tell now because I haven't been writing as much that they are starting to say 'You know, we can't help you unless you write something'.   But they do it in this very diplomatic way which obviously I appreciate but it's quite nice to have Z actually telling you, how you doing. But again I've been quite open to say I'm not having a good week this week and that's fine. That seems to be fine.

Emma: Do you think you're, you said you make a, I don't know what the verb is, demarcate, demarcate between your personal relationship and your professional relationship. Is that difficult? Or would you find that quite easy to do?

Katie: Initially I found it difficult. I worry a lot about what other people perceive.

Emma: I see, from the outside, the whole thing.

Katie: Yeah and I kind of think 'I hope they're not giving me any special treatment' you know and I don't think they are but I wonder what other people think you see, because older people are very cynical, especially in institutions.   So that kind of worried me in the beginning but it doesn't anymore because when we are here, we do just do professional stuff and because obviously they're here in their capacity and I'm here in mine.   And then when we do meet, it's usually with the kids so we're just doing something else, you know and that's got to be streamline.

Emma: Yeah that's fairly straightforward.

Katie: But I said at the very beginning, I said you know, 'We will definitely have to'.

Emma: Yeah

Katie: I mean I've had to do it in my own professional experience when I had students that I knew and I was their supervisor and the only reason I know the word 'demarcation' is because we had to do that in our professional role as well.

Emma: Very good. Ok good one. I just had something else in my mind and I've forgotten it now, oh it doesn't matter, we'll go back to it. No that's fine.   So we've done 'What do you think makes a good supervisory relationship?' Did you do the Research Methods course?

Katie: They hadn't started when I started, until 2008.

Emma: So you didn't have anything. So you didn't have any research methods training?

Katie: No.

Emma: Do you think that was a disadvantage?

Katie: Oh yeah I do, I do. I think that the thought of doing assignments, you'd think 'Oh god that's just going to be a nightmare' but I think it's working really well for them because what they write they can use in their chapters and also in their first year they are actually starting to formulate their understanding. And then the other side of it is, they're all getting together as new students so they've got that kind of bonding going on and you know, they're developing. Yeah so I have missed it. I mean I could, Y said to me 'Why don't you just go along to sit in on the new course?' But of course it ended up being on a Friday which is the one day I couldn't do.

Emma: Right.

Katie: Because that was the day I was at home with my child so I couldn't really access it.

Emma: So yeah so you don't have, I mean I know you say you get on well with the, mostly men, isn't it in your class?

Katie: Yeah, yeah.

Emma: But you don't have kind of community that you all started at the same time and you're all at the same stage and all that kind of business?

Katie: Well there's three of us, we're at the same stage and that's quite nice. And there are some people coming to the end as well. I don't know whether the other element is that you know, a lot of them are from overseas as well and they do all get together to eat and everything. And I have been asked to join them which I have done a couple of times which is really nice isn't it. So that's been good.

Emma: That was another question really because obviously you are in there amongst a lot of international students aren't you?

Katie: Yeah, yeah.

Emma: How do you find that?

Katie: Absolutely fine. I mean I've learnt so much and been braved enough to ask certain questions like ' Why can you have more than one wife', you know and we've had a group of us all sitting there and it was absolutely, it was great you know and it actually dispelled some of the myths I had about them you know. O is from Ghana, he's fantastic, you know and then when we had this Chinese visitor here we learnt a lot from him. Yeah so that's not bothered me at all. The language doesn't bother me because I'm used to being around Welsh so it's just another language around the place and they're very kind, they're really very kind. They have helped me with my computer, they've tried to give me tea to cure my cough but no, it's really good. Some are friendlier than others you know, but on the whole, it's yeah.

Emma: So would you say that's a positive you'll take from the supervisory?

Katie: Oh yeah.

Emma: Is that something you probably wouldn't have encountered otherwise?

Katie: I probably wouldn't have had that no. It's definitely a positive.

Emma: Oh that's good.

Katie: More places to go on holiday now.

Emma: That wasn't even on my list! Good, right this is a big one!

Katie: Oh god!

Emma: What are the high and low points of your PHD experience so far? Shall we start high or shall we start low?

Katie: Oh gosh. Well let's do high then because I'm smiling.

Emma: Yeah let's start high then I'll bring you right down before we finish!

Katie: I would say, do you know it's actually quite difficult. No, it has been really good to be learning and reading all these amazing things, extending my vocabulary. I don't know whether my writing's any better yet but I think probably the main thing for me is that because my subject is about disabled people that I think the whole thing even without you reading anything, it's raising awareness amongst students, even amongst staff and in that way I think it's very much a living thing. So I've enjoyed that part of it. I have enjoyed meeting new people, Josie here in the cafe and you know getting to know people like yourself better and what have you. And I think when I have produced something I am very happy and elated that it's done, you know fantastic. I think achievements wise, I mean I think again I've better very lucky I've won two prizes so that kind of boosts your confidence for a bit and then you come back down again. Yeah I think, yeah in that respect I think it's been ok.

I think my problems have been, because I've been in the voluntary sector for so long, trying to become an academic, it's taken me a while to actually call myself an academic and what that entails. It's a bit of an education into academia, completely different to any way of studying.

Emma: In what way?

Katie: I don't know I think it's the way people think and talk, it's very in depth, it's quite heavy. Because in the end I just want people to understand what I'm saying, what I'm writing, you know,

because I read all these journals and articles and what have you and it's great stuff but some of it I don't understand and I need to understand it, so, and I do appreciate that you have to do them in certain styles for certain people but that would be a down side, is when you read all this magnificent stuff you kind of think 'I don't know if I can aspire to that'.   So you're putting yourself on a bit of a downward slope as it were because you think you know, 'I can't achieve that kind ??'

Emma: But you did say at the beginning that young people should be able to understand it so it is aspiring to it or is it?

Katie: Well exactly. I mean, this isn't just about academia it's about yourself, it really is about yourself and I know again that's a bit of a cliché but it really is a journey about self belief, confidence, your own ability, how much you can still learn. I mean I'm in my early 40's, you know, my brain's gone through a lot already, so it's, you know, when you get to that point when you actually click from everything that you've read about certain things that is fantastic but getting to that moment is really hard work, really hard work.

 I think the lows have really been more effected by my own personal life. Getting into a routine and all that, not seeing your kids as much, don't know whether that's a good or a bad thing! You know, not being a family very much at the moment, you know, I've already mentioned about my step dad. So those do actually bear a lot on how you're feeling and your capacity to study really. But no I think, on the whole I would probably give it seven out of ten.

Emma: Seven out of ten, that's not bad!

Katie: Yeah I probably would.

Emma: You'll be on the ten by the time you get back.

Katie: And I think the Academic Associate thing was a good idea. I think it's more geared to people who are freer to go to those activities.   I enjoyed the thing last year.   I couldn't go this time. So I think that helps a lot of people.   But it seems to be that certain departments are more active than others.

Emma: Yeah, what about interaction with staff here. I mean, how have you found that, honestly?

Katie: I've found that quite difficult.

Emma: In what ways?

Katie: I think it's the space that everybody's in. We're downstairs; the staff are upstairs behind closed doors.   There's been a few times where I've walked past and had a look and then if there's nobody there, well that's alright, if there's people in there you think 'Shall I, shan't I? I mean, maybe the undergraduate students don't mind so much because that's just part of what they do but you kind of wonder, are you missing out on what somebody else knows, what their interest is and everything.   Because, to be honest, at the beginning you're taken round everybody but you don't really remember what their interests are.   But I think things like the conference, I think that's helped because obviously I know people like yourself a bit better but there still is that physical space problem I think.   But it's nice, you know, meeting people in the corridor and what have you, and in the canteen and stuff.   I think the new building might help that.

Emma: I think it will, the intention is it will, I hope it will.   Good thank you. I've only got two left.   Are you, well I kind of know the answer for you, are you encourage to publish by our staff or go to conferences?

Katie: Both.

Emma: Ok, is that good, bad, difficult?

Katie: Yeah I think it's good to be encouraged. I don't think you should be made to do it because in the end it's your decision.

Emma: Have you been made to?

Katie: I haven't been made to, I've been encouraged.

Emma: Strongly encourage of weakly encouraged?

Katie: Strongly encouraged yeah.   Conferences, I mean that really is just suggested that you had to go to one a year and at least the first and the second year, not necessarily the third year, because again you see, before doing a PHD you don't realise what the whole package is.   It's not just doing research, you know, it's going to various student meetings and writing articles, going to conferences and that post competition, which you don't know at the beginning, which is all brilliant, I think that should carry on, but I think you need to perhaps have a bit more awareness about exactly what you're getting in. ?? I mean I went to two conferences and I did a presentation at each one which was really good, really helpful to do that and then obviously having ??

Emma: Staff.

Katie: And I think we'll try for some more when I'm finished because obviously the thesis, it's only read by the external examiners, and then, so you want to do something after, including visual

impairment fields, I would like to get something in there too.   Yeah I think it should be encouraged, that's a bit scary.

Emma: Yeah great. You just mentioned the viver, or the external I think you just mentioned. Have you got yours in the pipeline? Externals for example, have you got ideas like that?

Katie: Yeah I've got some ideas. We did bounce about a few names.

Emma: How's that come about?   I mean, have you bounded about names, do you know anybody suitable? I'm quite interested really.

Katie: Well the thing is, I went on the Student, the Skill Training in Llandaff so, which was very useful but also a bit scary at the same time. It's the reality I think and there were obviously suggestions about what you should be thinking about, who your exams, one external, one internal, who you think is kind of along your lines, who would be interested and basically someone who's not going to give you a really hard time.   You know, if I'm doing qualitative I don't really think someone who is doing quantitative is going to be a good choice. And someone who is obviously open to the subject, because I thought, should there be a disability visual impairment person there And, I mean, the supervision team said 'No not necessarily'. But it's not set in stone yet. I mean, we've got to think of someone internal which is a bit more difficult I think. So it's in the pipeline, but I think we probably need to talk about it the next time.   But apparently now you can use this Skype, so if I did fancy someone from abroad.

Emma: So to speak.

Katie: So to speak, that could be a possibility.

Emma: Right ok, and have you got ideas or are they putting ideas to you

Katie: Well.

Emma: Because some people don't really know anybody in the world, in the field not in the world.

Katie: Well I was thinking somebody who did do some research on visually impaired people in Australia.

Emma: Oh right ok

Katie: So one of them but whether that's possible or not I don't know and whether it's absolutely needed, I'm not sure.

Emma: And as for the internal examiner, will you take the guidance of the team?

Katie: I think I'll have to because I don't really know many people who could do it. The person I suggested, I'm not really sure because they're in a completely different kind of area and I don't know whether I would want two men, would I like a women and man? I don't know whether that's a silly thing to say.

Emma: Oh no I think that dynamics can be important.

Katie: So I didn't really think about that before but I've thought about it since.

Emma: So it's still up for grabs.

Katie: Still up for grabs.

Emma: Final question.   What skills do you think you've gained from doing a PHD? Any skills, you know, whether they're knowledge based or transferable skills or, you've talked a bit about personal skill.

Katie: I suppose personal skills of better confidence, better self esteem, networking, because I haven't done that for a while, networking skill.   Some computer skills, not enough, I don't think because there's just not the time. I know that sounds a bit lame but when time is, you know, you've to make the most of every hour in twenty minutes or whatever.   I think my writing skills are improving so I'd like to say and presentation skill possibly. I know I've only done it twice but to two completely different audiences and with having feedback I think I'm really to be able to go ahead and do more.

Emma: And what about knowledge?

Katie: Knowledge, yeah.   Yeah I think being able to be more precise about what you're looking for.   I think I mentioned to you earlier about School of Scholar that you can go on, you could just be on there for hours and hours and I think the more you do, the more you start to formulate your ideas, you'll actually decide 'No that's not right and that's not relevant, this is what I want'. And then because you're reading through so much, again you start to be able to pick out what you need and how to put them together. I've actually learnt a lot about disability.   About, in way, some things about vision impairment, visually impaired people that I hadn't come across before and quite a bit about, sort of the disability movements and approaches to people with disabilities which have actually made me question how I actually did my rehab work, which to me is quite a big thing.   And I think from a Tourism point of view, obviously I've learnt a lot about Tourism because I didn't know about Tourism and how a big area it is and what is involved, all this hopeful I would never have thought that was but it kind of fits in with everything and that, all this

stuff about bodies, this theory work, I know X does a lot about it, how I can fit that with vision impaired people which I've never done before really, it's all been very functional 'You've got this vision, you told me you can do this'. I've never actually said 'How do you feel about this ?' and it's made me perhaps approach that aspect of it really.

Emma: Which of those skills do you think is most valuable to you if you like, the most important thing you've learnt?

Katie: Most valuable. Perhaps not the practical ones, I think it is the thinking ones, because I don't think you ever stop learning and I think it is quite good to think about what you've done and where you're going to go. So for example if I went back into doing rehab stuff then I think I would definitely approach it differently.

Emma: So the habit of critical thinking.

Katie: Yeah, just things have changed over the years, the movements have changed and how people are represented is changing. It's not as bad as it used to be.   And then there are some things which are as bad as they were hundreds of years ago. And in a way I think the learning skills kind of make you realise yeah you do know what you're talking about and you do know things that a lot of people don't know, and I don't mean that in a big headed way or 'I know more than you' type of thing. It's the fact that you can use that knowledge to try and make it more understandable to other people and then they can learn and apply that to their job role in society and also that you know, this is a really complex world, complex people and we've got a long way to go.

Emma: Last one. I've said the last one twice now. You've talked about it opening doors some time earlier in the interview. What doors would you like it to open for you now? Is it the same doors as when you started or has your thinking changed a bit?

Katie: No I don't think it is the same doors, because I didn't really know what they were at the beginning. A lot of people said they wanted to go into lecturing and I think I possibly would because I've always liked that aspect of things but it's whether it's in Tourism, whether it's in Disability or Visual Impairment because there is going to be a new course in September in Newport, training new rehab workers. So I feel excited about that and that must mean something. Or even going into other disability organisations, and maybe being a policy officer or you know, a project manager or something like that. So yeah I think it's given me confidence to approach something new, but still in my comfort zone in a way. I mean at the end of the day, it's just what's available at the time, you know, there's no guarantee is there and I do worry it as I will need an income, unless, still being in here I still don't know how the intricacies of how universities are run an what all the staff have to do and it's not just about teaching is it, I mean, you do all this other stuff on top. You know, so you just have to see what there is.

Emma: But you're glad you did it?

Katie: I am glad I've done it

Emma: Nearly done it.

Katie: Oh gosh. Well I think every time you hear that a student has got their PHD, I think 'Oh I really want that feeling'

Emma: Yeah it is quite motivating.

Katie: It is it, yeah.

Emma: For a short while. You don't think it's just jealously actually.

Katie: On the one hand it's like, they're dropping like flies now, you know. Where am I in that line?

Emma: You're getting there. That's brilliant, thanks Katie.

<u>END OF INTERVIEW</u>

APPENDIX 6 – PHASE 2 INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR HOWELLS

So, first of all, how long have you been supervising PhD students?

Um, good question. Um, well, not for very long, relatively speaking, I guess, because I didn't start supervising PhDs till I moved to Surrey and then I still hadn't got my own PhD, so it's probably 6 or 7 years.

So, approximately how many would you have supervised in that time?

3 to completion, I've supervised, I think 4 and I've currently got too many.

Too many? How many is too many?

1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 …9

Wow are you first supervisor for all of those?

Yes.

Wow, that's quite a lot, isn't it?

Yes.

And are they all international or a mix of international and UK?

Um … Maggie lives in Switzerland but is originally Chinese, Yvonne is Taiwanese, Leo's Greek, Senem is Cypriot, Mohammed is Egyptian, Andrea is from the Caribbean, Katya is Russian, Nu & Tatia are Thai.

Right, OK, and are they all full-time?

Um, Maggie's part time, Senem is part-time and the rest are full-time.

You've got your hands full then.

Yep.

So, how often do you meet with them?

Um … that's a really good question. It varies quite a lot … it partly varies on location, so, for instance, both Maggie and Senem are part-time, but Maggie's based in Switzerland, whereas Senem lives in Guildford. So, I see Senem perhaps every two or three weeks, 'cos she's here for other reasons. Maggie I see about once every six months but we're in fairly frequent e-mail contact. With regards to the 7 full-time students, it's largely a function of where they've got to in their PhD, in terms of whether they're engaged in the literature review, whether they're engaged in research design process, data collection process or the data analysis process. Um … but it also is part of function of the individual student in terms of their ability. I mean, some students, you point them in the direction of something and they come back having completed the whole thing and you hardly have to intervene at all, other students, you send them off to do something and it becomes quite apparent that they're not able to do that, so you then break it down into smaller tasks and start to see them more frequently, because you are checking on their progress as they go through it. So, I don't, um … I suppose on average, it's probably once a month, but, for some students, I'm probably seeing them every fortnight, for others, I'm only seeing them every 6 weeks. And, again, it, again, will depend on where they're at. One of the reasons we've got so many is we actually went through a period where we had a lot finish at the same time. So, those 4 that I've completed more or less all completed simultaneously and we made a decision that we wanted to increase the proportion of PhD students in the School and, in particular, to have co-supervision with more junior members of staff, so that they became qualified to supervise. So, it meant that people like Andrew and myself took on perhaps more than we should have done, simply because, in every case, I'm working with … well, nearly every case … I'm working with a different co-supervisor. And Andrew's also working with those same people, so

that by the end of the process, we will suddenly have a team of 10 who can supervise, on their own, as opposed to having sort of 2 or 3 who can supervise and 6 or 7 who can't.

So how many PhD students have you got in Tourism and Hospitality?

In Tourism and Hospitality, we've got over 40, which is probably one of the largest numbers of anywhere in the UK … although I think UWIC has suddenly got a very large number from somewhere.

We're creeping up … about 35, I think, but they're not all full-time.

The vast majority of ours are full-time. Most of them … certainly the ones I've mentioned have scholarships, usually from their government or, in some cases, from universities. And about half, slightly less that half … well, 4 … are actually lecturers in universities in other countries in the Hospitality area.

Right. OK, great. What do you like to happen … I know obviously it depends what they're doing at the time … but how do your meetings run normally? Do you request them, do they request them?

Um … I would guess that, in most cases, we agree specific objectives or targets for the student to achieve and we agree, in setting those targets, a timeframe and then the meeting would be scheduled for the end of that timeframe. That doesn't mean to say, necessarily, that we agree a date. I've just sent Tatya away and said, 'You need to get this done in 3 weeks time, by 7th July, or something like that.' Now, we've not set a date for the next meeting, but I know she will get it done in a fortnight and she'll come back to me on e-mail and say, 'Right, can we meet?' So, in other cases, I might say exactly the same thing to a different student and I'll have to chase them up because they won't have done it and they won't have got back to me. So, usually, we would agree a specific outcome of what we're going to do next, we would agree a timescale and, usually, I would require something in writing for us to discuss that actually demonstrated that that output had been done. So, it would either be a paper on a topic or it might be part analysis of some data or whatever. Apart from the very early stages of the PhD when there's a fair amount of, if you like, discursive thinking going on, essentially each meeting has an agenda defined by whatever a student has written. And that, whatever that student has written is the particular output that they've been assigned to do in the timeframe that was agreed at the previous meeting.

Great, so pretty structured?

Um … yes, as far as possible, in most cases.

But that's the ideal?

Yep.

What about, what do you think are the traits of a good supervisory relationship, from both ways?

Goodness me … trust, I think, um … in the sense that I think the supervisor needs to be able to trust the student to, um, get on with what they're asked to do and, if they don't know what to do, to come and ask about it and to admit that they don't know and they didn't understand and want more input. And, I suppose trust on the part of the student that the supervisor knows what they're talking about and is listening to what they have to say and understand the issues and problems, not only relating to the research itself but also their personal issues that might be affecting them and all the rest of it. Um … and the reason I say trust is that there is an inevitable issue … and I guess it's partly to do with international students who come from particular cultures … there is an issue about the extent to which PhD students can be too respectful of the authority figure and the power relationship and obviously the supervisor has a huge amount of power in the relationship. Um … but I'm firmly of the view that the best research gets done by researchers who are genuinely interested in the topic that they are researching and, what they need to be doing is the research that interests them and not the research that interests the professor or the supervisor. Um … so you actually don't want too much respect … I mean, you don't want the student to be so respectful that they don't think for themselves, that defeats the whole object of the exercise. Which is why, I think, you've got to establish a

relationship based on trust, partly to counteract what can be an over-respectful attitude towards the authority figure, the expert, um …

Have you encountered that with some of your students?

Ummm … yeah, it can take a little while to break that down and you can do that in all kinds of ways. You can do it through humour, and you can literally just tell them, you know …

Have you done that? Just tell them?

Um … sometimes, yeah. Um … I think … my experience is that … I tend to see the world in this way, so the way I would teach Management to students and the way in which I would manage is based around this idea … but I see the world in a very contingent way, I don't see the single best practice and I don't operate a single best practice … and I think the PhD supervisory process is a very good example of that, in that every student, I think, is very different and has to be treated as an individual and what you have to do is assess their personality, their capabilities, their ability, their prior knowledge, their … all kinds of stuff … and temper your supervision to that individual … or adapt your supervision to that individual. And, when you get it right, it works very well. Sometimes, I think you don't get it right and that's simply because you don't read the individual, for whatever reason, as well as you might.   Um … you know, I certainly found … whether or not we're talking about PhD supervision or other forms of supervision because, you know, we also supervise Masters level dissertations and even undergraduate dissertations … and it is too simplistic to say the world falls into two schools, but let's say for the sake of argument it does, there are some people who can't move from A to B without dotting every I and crossing every t, who, for them, the devil is in the detail and they need to be sure that they've done everything they need to do before they can move forward. And then there's other people who, for them, it's all about ideas and they don't worry about the detail, what they see is the big picture, and the notion that somehow you can make one see the big picture and the other see the detail is really very difficult. Because, actually, what you're talking about is people's own view of the world, their reality and all the rest of it, and it's very difficult to modify or to change that, I mean, probably, without getting into mind games and all the rest of it, which is ridiculous. So, you have to sort of go with that and, in terms of the direction that you point them, and the instructions that you give them and the requests that you make, you make up for whatever, um, I was going to say shortcomings, it's not a shortcoming … you make sure that the holistic people get to grips with the detail and you try to make sure that the people focussed on the detail get the holistic view of the world, by asking them specific things to do that make them do that, or try to make them do that. So, I don't think my relationship with any of my supervisees is identical and, in a way, the way that I deal with them is this view that each of them is an individual that needs certain things at certain times.

Great, thank you. What do you feel you gain from the experience of being a supervisor? Do you feel you gain anything?

Er, output to put in the RAE … which is a dreadful thing to say and a cynical thing to say. I am actually on the RAE panel in Business and Management so I see the other end of this. The one thing I learnt from being on the RAE panel last time, in 2001, that all the best research that's published in all the best journals is done by full-time researchers. It ain't done by academics in their spare time, in inverted commas. And, of course in Hospitality and Tourism, there's a fair amount of that. Certainly, before I moved to Surrey, there was a fair amount of that going on in the University of Brighton and a lot of my own research was done in my spare time. In fact, I didn't do … I got my PhD here through publication, based on all the stuff I'd previously published, not through engaging full-time, researching one topic. And, one of the reasons that we were so keen to develop the PhD programme here in Hospitality was because of my insight, from doing the 2001 RAE, that, actually, from having a strong PhD programme, it would lead to publication that would be very good. If you have someone doing research for three years, they have a sample size, they have enough thinking, they have enough time to produce that research that is significant. Um … so, in very pragmatic terms, the notion that, um … one of the reasons for supervising PhDs is to get publishable output, is definitely one of the motivations for doing it. I think, um … I think actually, though, from a less institutional perspective … a less Higher Education perspective … one of the reasons that we might be particularly interested in engaging in Hospitality research here is that Andrew Lockwood and I, in particular … and we've known each other and published together for over 20 years … in our field, have probably been reasonably influential in sort of developing theory with regards to Hospitality, what Hospitality is, what Hospitality Management is and, in particular, what Hospitality Operations

Management is, how you manage operations, and … what we have tended to do, although we have taken on a lot of students, we've tended to be fairly selective and prescriptive in terms of the topics we will supervise. And, for us, a lot of what we're doing now, is engaging in empirical research testing some of the ideas, concepts, frameworks etc that we've developed over the last 20 years, largely from a theoretical perspective and getting into and trying to understand better some of the relationships in the areas we're interested in. So, for instance, Quality Management is something that's quite high on the agenda and various aspects of Quality Management, Productivity Management and so forth. Now, it doesn't mean to say that everyone is necessarily fitting into that but I think, with slight stretching, you could say that everyone I am supervising, there's linkages. You know, they're not … I don't have a single PhD student researching a topic where there isn't some link with at least one other PhD student in one way or another. And, for us, that's about contributing to the body of knowledge and about establishing critical mass. We had … I don't know if you've ever come across him … Mike Olsen, Virginia State Polytechnic … and I've known Mike for many years and we actually had him here to talk about research 3 or 4 years ago, when he was in the UK. One of the distinctive features of what Mike did was … I think he supervised through to completion something like 60 PhDs … now, that's in the US model, which is slightly different because they have a taught programme. But, every single one of those was in the area of Strategy as applied to the Hospitality industry. And you think, can you do 60 PhDs on …? Sure, he's managed it, without any problem and what he's got, as a result of that, is a huge and significant contribution to our understanding of strategy in the context of hospitality. And, historically, because we weren't getting applications, for whatever reason, through, people tended to take anyone who wanted to research anything in the British model, simply because it was better to have a PhD than no PhDs to supervise. When we decided to sort of really go for it, one of the things we did was to actually promote our PhD programme through our website and to articulate very clearly what we were doing and the areas we were interested in. And we were in the fortunate position at Surrey, which is not necessarily the case everywhere, that we do get more applications than we can cope with, so we were selective about the people that we took and we have, therefore, been following this research agenda which not only links current students together in terms of overlaps between what they're researching but also links back to the research Andrew and I have been doing in the last 20 years, of whatever kind it may be. Um … so there is a very deliberate attempt to develop the body of knowledge, contribute to the body of knowledge and, in particular, support some of the theoretical stuff with some more empirical evidence. And, also, actually, to, um … um … how shall I put this? … and also to blow out of the water some of the spurious research that's gone on in Hospitality in the last 20 years, where, um, there's quite clearly some shortcomings both in terms of the thinking that lies behind the research and, inevitably, some of the outcomes of that research. A good example, for instance, would be the area of hotel choice, how people choose hotels, how they make decisions about buying hotel accommodation. Very largely, in my view, and I think there's lots of evidence to show that this is the case, a whole stream of research in the Hospitality area has basically been on the wrong track for the last 10 years and we haven't learnt anything new and quite a lot of that, largely because the supporting theory is actually the wrong theory for investigating that phenomenon. And, if you do the research in a different way, based on different theory, drawn from the generic literature, you'll get better answers … more valid and reliable data.

Better answers!

Better answers.

I've gone away from this now, but it doesn't matter. When you say that you are very selective about who you have, do they have their topics firmly in mind when they come or do you try to channel them to fit in with your research group or …?

Um, in order to … all students when they apply write a proposal. The proposal is fairly standard in that it is a fairly brief literature review, a statement of the research problem or question and then a proposed methodology. Different people in the School have a different view about that proposal. My view is how the hell does anyone know how to write a proposal if they've never done research? So, I use the proposal fairly loosely to tell me some fairly basic things like can this person string a sentence together, can they write in English and have they identified the 5 most important things they should have read and have they looked at research journals as opposed to just books? And those are the fairly simplistic things, because, at the end of the day, in my view, there's no way you can know what your research design will be until, you know, you've spent a year or 6 months doing the literature review. Simply because you need 6 months in detail to immerse yourself in the theory,

the previous research and the methodologies and so forth before anything sensible starts to emerge. Other people, you know, like to see more complete proposals that the student, if you like, can work to in the three years that they're here. We're less concerned about that. Um, so … the proposal tells us the topic area and in some cases, we have gone back to people and said, 'We think your CV's great, we'd like to take you here but you're not really proposing to research an area that we're interested in. If you want to come here, look at our website and select a topic that's more related to what we're doing.' In other cases, it's been close enough in what we're interested in doing for us to say yes, er … and … in some cases, without any modification, the student's got on with doing that. In other cases, it's been modified slightly to fit more our interests. Um …

You said also that quite a lot of the students are sponsored or university employees or whatever?

Yes. In some cases, their university stipulate what they must research. This is particularly true in the case of students coming to us from the Middle East and certainly from Egypt. Mohammed, for instance, is a lecturer in Food and Beverage Management and he's been told he has to research something in Food and Beverage and he's been told he has to research something in relation to Quality. And … that's OK 'cos we're interested in Quality Management and we're interested in Food and Beverage, so that's fine. As it happens, years ago , God, almost a decade ago, I had a look at the whole notion of statistical process control and whether or not it could be applied from manufacturing into the production processes in catering and it was a very typical, academic, only time to do a very small sample, and he's actually revisiting all of that. Um … and it will be a completely original contribution because it's very likely to be action research, he's likely to try it out and see if it can be made to work or not and so forth. Should be, from my point of view, quite an exciting study 'cos action research isn't something I've done particularly, but the notion of going out there and trying to implement something in a real operation and seeing if it works will be really good. And It'll be good for him 'cos it'll get him out there in real-life situations.

Is that his idea or your idea, the action research?

Um … in his case, it's more my idea. He came with no preconceptions about what he wanted to do, we pointed him in various directions and he kind of … selected SPC as the thing he wanted to look at. But I think, since no-one's doing it, there isn't an awful lot of choice about the research design. You can't investigate something that's not been done, unless, of course, you actually put it in place to see what happens. He's left with little or no choice about doing action research with regards to SPC. Um … because that's what should happen for me, the research design flows out of the research question and … for my students, in particular, the obvious research design is to do something quantitative and I hold my head and go, 'Oh no!' because I'm not a quants person but that's why we have co-supervisors and I generally have co-supervisors who are much more expert in quants than I am. I mean, most of my research is based around qualitative research, semi-structured interviewing, systems analysis, case studies or whatever, so … It's not as if we don't have lots of experts in quants, who can crunch the numbers and tell us what they mean, so …

The balance …

Yeah, and the research design flows, as I say, from the research question and sometimes, it's obvious what kind of research you have to do and sometimes, it's not but … that's why, in a way, the proposal is pretty meaningless because the proposal does ask people to say, 'Right, this is the way it's going to be researched' and, if you don't really know what the problem is and know in detail what we know already, then how can you be very prescriptive in advance as to what the research design will be. So, I've had students who, you know, do transaction cost analysis of international hotel development, had another used data envelopment analysis to look at productivity in IT, Nu, from Thailand, is going to use transaction cost analysis again, um, Mohammed's probably going to do action research, Selem is probably going to do some kind of postal survey. And Andrea will interview people, Tatya, we don't know yet. Maggie's going to use experimental research design, which will be really good – very ambitious but there you go … Leo is going to try and be crazy, I don't think he knows what he's doing, but there you go … I shouldn't name these people should I?

Don't worry, that won't come out.
Are you a big believer that the way people approach their research is based on, you know, their characteristics and cultural background and things or …?

(sighs) …

Do you kind of allow that to impinge on what they're doing?

Um … *(long pause)* … in a way, you could argue that the process is designed to filter that out because I think they might well come, um, with quite strong cultural characteristics, in terms of their view of education in general terms and so forth, but actually, one of the things that happens is the literature review process is a fairly standard process that they all go through … and … the discussion of the literature with the supervisory team is a fairly standard process that they all go through and, what we do here, in the Hospitality team, is that we meet at 4.30 every Wednesday and the team is the academics, the full-time researchers and the PhD students. Now, roughly … it never works out like this … each fortnight is a meeting of the team to talk about pedagogy … whatever that might be … and because many of our PhD students either are lecturers or might become lecturers, them coming to our meetings about teaching assessment is just as valid as us talking about it, and then the second meeting in the fortnight is a research meeting, so we basically have research seminars every fortnight, OK? Sometimes, it's staff members talking about research, very often it's a PhD researcher talking about their research, they've reached a stage when they've got something to say. They can report on the literature review, they can report on their preliminary findings or whatever … and we get the PhD students to do that to give them practice at making presentations to an audience that's friendly. Well, you know, after six months of being here, when they are engaged in a fairly standard process, which is the literature review process, and going fortnightly to team meetings where there's a particular style to these things, where people are encouraged to speak up, where it's very informal and there's lots of humour and gentle, um, mickey-taking of anybody and everybody, including me, you … I think we kind of wash out the cultural difference between the students. There are still some cultural differences, er … but we also … you know, we celebrate events, so we celebrate birthdays, we celebrate someone passing their PhD and all kinds of things. So there's a kind of … what we try to create is a research culture that … washes out any cultural differences there are in the students, so they're all on the same wavelength … and I don't know how successful we are in that. Um … but what I do know … or what I'm reasonably confident is, in terms of the actual research the students end up doing, the research design flows from what they have found out from the literature search, it's not something that's pre-conceived, 'cos we just wouldn't be able to get away with that. Most of our students, and it's very rare for it not to be the case, are registered as M.Phil students and then they have to go through an upgrade and the upgrade … at what point the upgrade is done can vary. Basically, they've certainly got to have done the literature review and they've definitely got to have a research design because, essentially, the two internal examiners at the upgrade have got to be satisfied they've got a research design that'll work. Now, in order to show the research design will work, if that means they've got to have done a pilot study, they've got to have tested the instrument in some way, they'll also have done some fieldwork. They don't necessarily have to do that but in many cases, they have. So, in many ways, the upgrade process is fairly standardised and, again, that tends to sort of impose a 'Surrey norm' on behaviour that means, whether they're Russian, Caribbean or from the Middle East or Far East, doesn't make an awful lot of difference, I don't think, anyway.

OK, great.

Students will vary on work ethic, although I think they all work reasonably hard, but I'm not sure that's necessarily a cultural characteristic I think that's just individual as much as it is … the two students I have from Thailand, I've never known 2 students just get on … they happen to be married which probably means there's lots of positive reinforcement going on, but they're just driven, to the point where I'm telling them to slow down a bit, but they're not taking the slightest bit of notice.

Are they sponsored?

Yeah, they're from the university. I mean … but there's a whole load of things … it's not just work ethic, there's also this thing about how they view the world and whether they get swamped by detail or not, or whether they're too airy-fairy … you know, it's about treating them as individuals and I'm not sure there's a huge amount of cultural difference. I mean, there is a stereotype, isn't there, that the Chinese, in particular, are very quantitative and cope with numbers and think in numbers, and that's not particularly my experience.

Right. Do you find any language difficulties with any of your students?

Not hugely no … um … quite a few of our students, not all, but, talking about my sample, the ones that I'm supervising, have actually done their Masters degree here, so they've already been here at least a year. In Andrea's case, she was actually employed as a Research Officer for two years before she decided to do her PhD. Tanya did her masters here, Senem did her Masters here, Yvonne did her Masters here. Again, an English language qualification is an entry requirement and, as I said, we tend to look at the proposal in terms of how well it's written, to see if they can write. I think written … spoken English is not too bad … there are sometimes a few issues with the written English and the ability of the students to write but then, the ability to write varies enormously with English students too. Some can write and some can't.

Do you believe in correcting as you go along, or not …?

Um … *(sighs)* It will vary from student to student. I mean, if the student's writing is reasonably good, I tend not to correct it because I know I'm not looking at the final version anyway. If the student's English isn't very good, then I will tend to correct it in order for them to learn how to write good English. So, again it varies, um … but it's also influenced by how much time I've got available at the time that I've been given something to look at. I would generally not correct the English, because I don't think that's my job, but, in some cases of certain students, you have to.

Mm, so when you say that a lot of them have done a Masters, and we were talking about how they view PhD culturally, they are quite well prepared, I assume. They will have written a dissertation, won't they, for a Masters?

Well, um, if they've done a Masters here, they'll be fairly well-prepared 'cos they'll have done a module in Research Methods, they'll have written a 20,000 word dissertation, which must include primary research, so we can be reasonably certain they know what research is all about, if we take our own students on to our PhD programme. Um … and we would … it does vary again … if they are teaching in another institution, if they are teaching Hospitality in our case, our Tourism, I suppose, you know they should know something about research just because they are teachers. You know, they must have read some stuff that's based on research. Um … but, again … um … I think, potentially, in a way, that's the thing that PhD students find most difficult, and the ones that really struggle never quite get, and that is they get a Doctorate in Philosophy and what they don't get is the philosophy bit. They don't get the idea that what they're being asked to do for 3 years is philosophise, whatever that might be, they never quite manage to … sounds pejorative … but intellectually engage with the material. They're either too pragmatic or whatever. And they just … some get that very quickly … um … Andrew had a student who he's very proud of and she's doing great work, she's very very very bright. But, the other week or month, he was saying that she suddenly got it, in the sense that the penny's clicked that it's about this kind of particular way of thinking that is to do with philosophical thinking, if you like, that it isn't a mechanistic process, that it isn't sort of painting by numbers, that it is an incredibly creative process, as well as being a very rigorous and empirical process, or potentially rigorous a empirical process, if that's the paradigm in which you operate, you know. So, that, I think, is the most difficult thing and, um, I think that's the most difficult thing to supervise, too, in terms of it's very difficult … you can kind of lead the students to water, almost … but I haven't yet found a way of turning on the switch where they suddenly … I mean, I know it happens, I've seen it happen but quite how it happens, I'm not entirely sure about, in terms of the supervisory process. Um, in some cases … I literally have discussion with the student and say, 'What does a PhD stand for, what's the Ph for? And what does that mean?' But, even doing that doesn't necessarily turn the switch on in their head. I mean, they just can't get to grips with it, in the minority of cases. And I might have 2 or 3 who might be struggling with that at the moment … and, until that little switch goes on, they will always struggle, all the way through their PhD.

You used the word 'creativity' there – do you think there's plenty of scope still for creativity within the PhD?

(long pause) I … mmmm …well, yeah … *(another long pause)* There is and there isn't, in the sense that, I've already said that, for me, most of my students would go through a process whereby, if you like, the review of the literature led to an understanding of what we know and what we don't know. You would then logically say that what we need to research is stuff that we don't know. That then becomes the research question or the research problem. Having defined that, it's then very often

the case that it becomes fairly obvious what methodology is required in order to investigate that research question. So, it's a very logical, very deductive process, that leads to a very specific outcome, and so forth. But I think there is scope for creativity, in the sense that … students can not only simply follow that logical deductive process that I've described, but they can also make breakthroughs in coming up with some original thinking in terms of theory development and make a contribution to theory, and often, at the end, when a PhD is examined, one of the examiners will say, 'And what is the contribution to theory of this work?' And, in some cases, there can be theoretical insight, theoretical originality, which may often arise out of, if you like, the creative process that goes on. And, of course, the same can also apply to methodology, that you can invent a methodology, or if not a methodology, you can invent an instrumentation or an approach to doing it, which is also creative and, um, original, that no-one has ever done before, at least in this context. I mean, Maggie's really interesting, because Maggie is looking at how people choose hotels and she plans to use a laptop and a real website in order to investigate, literally, how people book hotels, by asking them to go to this website, give them a scenario and go through the process of selecting a hotel that they would stay at in a particular location. Whilst they're going through that process, she's going to film them, plus she's going to freeze the screen … or print the screen … at various stages to see what's on the screen. She's then going to do content analysis of all of that but, at the end of all that process, she's then going to interview them. Now, I don't know anyone who's done that. You know … I know people who have done bits of this, but I don't know anyone who's done this in that way. Quite how we're going to do it and how we'll find the respondents is another issue but that's what we're grappling with at the moment. But, that's original, that's creative. Um, at the recent tourism conference we had 2 or 3 weeks ago, there was a guy … I can't remember the phrase he used … but basically, he handed out disposable cameras to visitors and residents in, I think it was Aberystwyth and said, 'Go and take photos of the things you think represent Aberystwyth' and then he did content analysis of the photos people had taken and compared the images that had been photographed by the residents with the visitors in order to try to understand how residents … now, that's original, that's great stuff. Is there scope for originality? Sure, there is. And creativity? Yes, there is. Um … I'm sure, you know … well, I'm not sure … in doing action research, there'll be some stuff there that could be creative and so forth. So, yeah, I don't think the PhD process is entirely mechanistic, prescriptive, I think the notion that you can be creative is quite important, um, but you shouldn't be creative just for the sake of being creative. You shouldn't use some sort of off-the-wall, innovative way of doing your research or thinking about it, just for the sake of doing that, it has to contribute to what we're trying to understand in an effective way, I think.

Great, thank you. I'm nearly finished, I promise.

That's fine.

Do you encourage … I'm sure I already know the answer to this … encourage your students to go to conferences and publish and that kind of thing?

Er, yes we do. Um … as I said, we have a regular series of research seminars within the School which, if you like is rehearsal time and practice. Um … there was a Hospitality conference in Paris and we actually hired a minibus and 10 of us went, of which … 4 of us were staff and 6 were PhD students. Um … there's going to be … that same conference was in Thesolonniki, which was a bit too far away, but in 2006, it's going to be in Leeds and we're already talking about a minibus of even more students going to that. Um … and there is a UK based conference called CHIME which is going to be in Oxford next year and, again, we're talking about taking minibus there. So … we certainly encourage students to make conference presentations, um … journal publications, um … we certainly encourage our students to do those … we are tending, though, to focus more on quality that quantity, so better to have one really good paper in a fairly high-powered journal that 2 or 3 in less high-powered journals. So, it's not about slicing the PhD or the data as thin as you can to get as many as you can, it's more about quality. Um … but I mean that's always a fine judgement. I mean, I think, I've got a couple of students whose pilot work is so good, I'm hoping we'll publish articles on the basis of that. But … would we publish a literature review? No. Would we publish pilot data? Probably not, in most cases. We might get 2 or 3 papers out of the total PhD study, but only if they're there to be written. Um … so … and again that's partly influenced by the RAE … I mean, it's also partly influenced by my own background where, um … as I said, I published a fair amount and got plenty of journal articles and all the rest of it but, when I look back and think whatmy sample size was and so forth, I think, goodness me … And one of the reasons … I was Head of School at Brighton when I moved here in 1997 … I gave up being Head of School to come here just,

basically, to do research and, in the first year or two, I actually got my PhD by publication. And I kind of made a decision at that time … it was, you know, a real career break, change .. and so my whole view of what I was going to write and publish changed as well. I sort of said … don't quote me on this … I said, 'I'm not going to publish any more Mickey Mouse articles' and the 2001 RAE process simply reinforced that view as well. So, my output has fallen considerably since I moved here, ironically, but I'm not too fussed about that … I not fussed about quality … I'm not fussed about the quantity any more, I'm only fussed about whether or not what we've written is really … um, hitting home. So, yeah, lots of conference papers but, you know, that's about networking and spreading Surrey's name, attracting more people to study at Surrey. But, articles, I think we're very much more focussed now with our publishing. And, one of the things that happens is that we publish, routinely, in non-Hospitality journals. And I have to say the Hospitality community is hopeless at actually finding out stuff. I mean I've written what I regard as a seminal article on revenue management in hotels, I happened to publish it in the Journal of Operations Research. I don't think I've ever seen it cited.

Right.

So, there is an issue about the Hospitality literature and journals and what they do and don't tell people and the extent to which people in our community actually look outside that field. I mean, here's an example of something that Andrew's done, it's in the Benchmarking Journal, and I bet you anything you like no-one ever cites that either, even though it probably is quite a significant contribution to that field of study.

I'll probably be coming back to you on that one when I get on to my next part about dissemination and that sort of thing …

(laughs)

That's the kind of things I want to look at there.

Well, one of the interesting things we do, as a group, um, we have agreed that … I don't know if you've ever come across the magazine Hospitality Review … and this is aimed more at practitioners that it is at academics. It's really very much for practitioners, but one of the aims of the magazine is to share with practitioners the research that academics do. So, we actually agreed 2 years ago … actually we started doing this more than 2 years ago … but we actually kind of formally agreed that we would write one article every magazine, so we actually have a rota of who writes something and the whole purpose is to disseminate our research in a user-friendly way. We also, of course, publish our own journal, which is the Surrey Quarterly Review in Tourism and Hospitality Research and I am actually the Practice Section Editor of that. Again, part of the journal is devoted to dissemination, really, or non-academic dissemination of stuff. We are quite active in that field of disseminating our stuff to industry. Our agenda isn't set by industry, we set our agenda, but we do feel the research we are doing is of value to industry, if they could find out more about it. Far more value than some research that's done in Hospitality, I have to say … to industry.

Great, that's lovely, thank you very much.