**A framework of approaches to research supervision (Lee, 2008)**

Lee’s work is based on interviews with a sample of supervisors from the UK and USA who are recognised as ‘excellent’ by their peers and students.

A framework that identified five main approaches to supervision emerged from the data. Although separated out for clarity in the table below, the approaches intertwine and are not considered independent of one another.

|  |
| --- |
| **Professional**---------------------------------------------------------------------**Personal** |
|  | **Functional** | **Enculturation** | **Critical thinking** | **Emancipation** | **Relationship development**  |
| **Supervisor’s activity** | Rational progression through tasks | Gatekeeping | Evaluation, challenge | Mentoring, supporting constructivism | Supervising by experience, developing a relationship |
| **Supervisor’s knowledge and skills** | Directing, project management, negotiation | Diagnosis of deficiencies coaching | Argument, analysis | Facilitation, reflection | Integrity, managing conflict, emotional intelligence |
| **Possible student reaction** | Obedience, organised negotiation | Role modelling, apprenticeship | Constant inquiry, fight or flight | Personal growth, reframing | A good team member, emotional intelligence |

The five approaches are placed in the table moving from left (functional) to right (relationship development). Research by Lee (2009) shows that the supervisor who is outstanding will be able to work from any of the five approaches as it becomes appropriate. Lee (2010) argues that supervisors who are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of all of these approaches to supervision, and who are able to combine approaches appropriately will be better placed to develop their students.
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