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Abstract

Gender as a concept encompasses “culturally-determined cognitions, attitudes, and belief systems about females and males; [it] varies across cultures, changes through historical time, and differs in terms of who makes the observations and judgments. The purpose of the present study is to examine postgraduate supervision in higher education in relation to gender discrimination. The applied methodology is a critical discussion via reflection upon personal experience and literature review. The supervisory relationship is an incredibly important one in the personal and professional development of supervisees. In relation to gender, it is crucial that supervisors use the relationship as an opportunity to educate, confront, and model. This requires a special level of awareness of self and society. Challenging our own biases, prejudices, and issues is one of the most critical parts of the process.
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Introduction

Research has shown that failure or success of a PhD project is largely determined by supervision (Berger & de Jonge, 2005). Woolston (2019) presents a Nature’s survey which illustrated widespread cases of hurtful behaviours by supervisors that can demoralize postgraduate students and derail career paths. Findings show that 21% of the PG participants in the survey claimed that they experienced harassment or discrimination during their supervision and about a similar proportion claimed experiencing bullying. One-quarter of participants in this survey who were females stated that experienced harassment or discrimination and only 16% of men experienced the same behavior. North America seemed to have the highest rates of harassment or discrimination (24%), and Australasia to have the lowest (18%). Figure 1 shows that gender discrimination received the highest rate resulting in women to feel isolated and less support (Berg and Ferber, 1983).

In this research, 57% of students who reported bullying said they were feeling unable to discuss their situation with their academic /supervisor without fear of personal repercussions. Such stressful situation often makes students to be in dilemma to give up or not their studies (Golde, 2000).
In this research, 57% of students who reported bullying said they were feeling unable to discuss their situation with their academic/supervisor without fear of personal repercussions. Such stressful situation often makes students to be in dilemma to give up or not their studies (Golde, 2000).

Discussing my own experience as PG supervisor regarding the issue of gender discrimination, personally, I do not discriminate among my students or other colleagues. The University code of academic & personal values for equal opportunities, equal support & healthy collaboration with students & co-supervisors dominate in my practice. Nor gender matters when supervisory relationships are established against research findings from a survey among Norwegian universities which support the existence of a significant same-gender tendency in graduate supervisory relationships which seem stronger among women than among men (Smeby, 2000). Addressing the underrepresentation of women in science seems nowadays a priority for many institutions, however, the majority of efforts to increase representation of women are neither evidence-based nor rigorously evaluated. The key evidence is an increase in gender bias awareness and self-efficacy to promote gender equity in academic science departments and perceptions of a more positive departmental climate (Devine et.al.,2017). Borrowing from my experience, there is still under-representation or/and underestimation (less opportunities for promotion) of female academic faculty members, less opportunities for PhD supervision or to get good PhDs (e.g. I was not allowed to supervise PhDs during my probation when male colleagues had no problem; Right after, I was assigned a PhD student with good background and after 2 months a male colleague via connection with another male in charge of my discipline, took this PhD from himself). Also, more work with no credit is requested when getting
a PhD (e.g. I supervise now 6 PhDs where I am assigned formally as B supervisor but has agreed to be Acting A supervisor due to my expertise; the A supervisor is a male colleague in an irrelevant field, he does not even meet students (he also travelled a lot), so I do the whole work for both of us meeting students every 2 weeks for providing continuous feedback, and in the meantime, I have to inform him for the students’ progress in order himself to complete only the forms for TMCs. So, there is not really supervising team which should be according to the rules. So the credit of A supervision is not given to the staff that works as a supervisor, but also does double work. This is caused, because according to the UK PhD regulations, one supervisee has to complete so formally to be stated as A supervisor. This causes a stressing research environment for the supervisor. Universities which wish to increase their rates of PhD completion and PhD candidates’ satisfaction should pay attention to the high workload of PhD candidates (Van Rooij, 2019). However, I keep always balances avoiding conflicts and try to share the information of my workload to colleagues who are involved so the situation in the near future to be improved. The University Code, my interest in research, professionalism and academic culture dominate in my practice; this overload restricts my time for attending more supervisory training programs. So, I agree with Conrad (1994) article that there is still gender discrimination in a faculty level and not only the number of female faculty members should increase (role modelling might be important as Conrad, 1994 claims) but also to be improved the hierarchical academic level (female staff to be promoted equally as males) and to be acknowledged academically their status when serve as A supervisors. However, there is no discrimination for PhDs in terms of recruitment; there is awareness that female students face problems (economic, social etc) and some adjustments take place whenever are needed (extended time for presentations etc), but these might be on an administrative level; From my own experience having a pregnant PhD student or an MSc student with 4 kids, I was supportive in practice consulting the students providing alternative solutions for their problems, supporting them emotionally, being more academically supportive for their research so to close gaps and delays, speaking to other staff member for additional support, being flexible with timetabling and other. Definitely, there might be cases of problems with female PhD students & supervisors due to poor advising, toxic climate, or because often they want to pursue other options (Langin, 2018). Although I have not experienced cases of discrimination with students, I do believe that females are isolated, that there are different communication styles between men and women and often are not taken seriously because of a power conflict between males & females, that it is important to keep women in contact with other communities and faculty members; from my practice I support the above by raising students’ matters in discipline meetings, I consult and facilitate my students to develop contacts with other staff members, I consult them about the process of complaints and enquiries, I support them to the extent that I am allowed under my role and the space the dominant culture of my workplace provides to me. The quality of the supervisor-PhD candidate relationship, the ‘match’ between PhD candidate and supervisor is critical, both personally – a good relationship – and academically, i.e. that the PhD candidate works on a topic closely related to the supervisor’s research (Van Rooij, 2019). For me this is important, and develop this ‘match’ bridging differences (cultural, personal, etc) acting as a role model for my students to do the same in practice. I am aware of communication characteristics with my female students I always keep balances and harmony in relationships couching disagreements in a way that reveals respect for the student and establish a climate where disagreement is welcomed and aggressiveness or/and defensiveness is avoided. I try to challenge thinking by raising questions and using examples than to direct thinking. My approach is to leave space.
students (and especially female students) to create and innovate consulting them than to have a direct style ‘what to do’. Of course, in many necessary cases with regards to standards for research quality, I mix my style following together a directive and counselling approach explaining though in details ‘why’ (providing reasoning) things have to be done in a specific way in order these to be understood. I develop a friendly, comfortable academic based climate in my contacts with all my students. Also, by arranging group learning activities where male and female students interact, power is based on the power of mind and not on gender characteristics, the same intellectual opportunities and acknowledgment is provided for everyone in the group in front of other group members.

My practice supervising students is successful as I can see this from my students’ success in TCMs and Upgrade panels, the understanding, the mindset and way of research thinking, their progress, as well as from their satisfaction as it is claimed to me and my colleagues. I believe this relates to my practice which incorporates informally three roles: (i) mentor or advisor, (ii) educator, and (iii) supervisor (Clement et.al., 2020). My role as mentor or advisor includes: i) providing psychological and emotional support to the student, (ii) supporting the student in setting goals and career path, and (iii) acting as a role model. Studies have shown that mentors are overall beneficial for psychosocial and career support, as well as role modeling, are integral to mentee success across gender and cultures, with the strongest effects coming from role modelling (Hernandez et.al., 2018). My role as educator: to teach specific key research elements & help develop skills that are needed. Research faculty who take on a new supervisee might be expected by students to teach them /develop research skills so they can become a productive member of the research team. Therefore, emphasizing this pedagogical role of research mentors is an important step to improving the training experience of future scientists (Balster, 2010). My role as supervisor: planning, organizing, leading, consulting, directing, controlling, supporting the human, in an effective and efficient manner, evaluating in accordance with university guidelines (Bovee, 1993).

The goal is to increase the retention rates for women postgraduates and provide a supportive research environment (encourage their completion in good time, and bring about greater satisfaction and success for both women postgraduates and their supervisors). Women as PG students face inequalities and barriers (they are older at age, are less likely to get scholarship, have financial and family issues and this make them work ending up in having less supervisory time than men)

Less women in senior positions in academia so less likely female PhD students to be supervised by women. This means lack of role modelling. Women could be role models for women; they experience more often suspension (fell to part time) and these interruptions cause delays and finally withdrawal; female students are more successful in completing postgraduate degrees when there are of female academics is relatively higher; Women often feel alienated when males use intimidation and shaming, or 'leave advisees feeling objectified' or depersonalized or who use 'overly intellectualized approaches' (Heinrich, 1990: 4);Issues of power and sexuality often permeate women's descriptions of their relationships; women feel distance when are treated as sex objects resulting in lack of seriousness etc.; the relationship of supervisor and student, because of the power differential, is highly probable to be sexualized ;women feel isolates as men interact less with women (Berg and Ferber, 1983: 631) and this leads to less informal peer supervision ;less access to faculty social life and research culture (Bulbeck, 1994: 2); communication differ between men and women (Deakins, 1992;
Graddol and Swann, 1989; Kramarae and Treichler, 1990; Smythe and Huddleston, 1992); misunderstanding and conflict when the two sexes interact and must struggle to communicate using systems which operate largely unconsciously; Supervisors can actively intervene to change the context in which supervision takes place; is to improve the university climate for women by working to eliminate their isolation;

Supervision helps to enhance opportunities for female postgraduate students to meet women from other institutions; Supervisors can encourage the development of small, informal groups of students to provide one another with peer support; arrange meetings, increase interaction with students so not isolate; encourage departments or faculties to provide support to part-time students (who are more often women than men), providing them work space on campus and/or common rooms, for example, and arranging for peer support through opportunities for social and intellectual interaction, preferably in a non-competitive, non-hierarchical setting; supervisors should call attention to the importance of ensuring that increasing numbers of women join the academic staff and become available as role models and potential supervisors for women; enhance status of academic staff; to spend significant time with PG female students; Supervisors need to ensure that they take women seriously. They need to respect women’s work, showing trust, appreciation and flexibility to increase women’s confidence to do their best; increase self confidence and avoid bad behaviors; to demystify the process of postgraduate research, that is, to present it as a do-able piece of work; Confiding one’s own initial disappointments, followed by eventual success, may be one way to achieve this and to create a sense of shared experience; should try to achieve a balance of professional and personal concern for the student; best to keep always in mind respect for the student and a concern for helping that student do her best; Possible differences between women and men in communication styles need to be kept in mind as well; supervisor's increasing sensitivity to student interaction characteristics (as well as the supervisor's own interaction features) in order to maximise the chances of clear communication; to think through what she wants to do rather than to 'tell' the student what to do; in order to elicit emotional support to help them come to their own solutions rather than to seek detailed advice on what to do. Direct advice can be given, of course, but enabling the student to work out the best strategy may be more effective.

Women tend to wait for a space to be given to them before they speak rather than interrupting to discuss their own concerns. This suggests that supervisors need to avoid long perorations and allow for pauses in which women can feel comfortable to speak without competing for time; Generally speaking, women tend to pay more attention than do men to the non-verbal or paraverbal language of the person with whom they are speaking; Women’s language tends to imply doubt, uncertainty, or tentativeness. There is some evidence that this is because women lack confidence of the women were concerned about the possible harm that disagreement might lead to, and half felt that there had to be some mutual agreement on values if an argument was to be 'safe'. Except in situations where they had equal status with colleagues or were with close friends, women expected that their disagreement would be interpreted as criticism. Women express more dissatisfaction with their supervision by men, and have less confidence.
Discussion & Evaluation of My Own Practice

My experience is supervising MSc & PhD students in the School of Business. I supervise about 15-25 MSc students annually. My PhD supervision is 4 years where formally I am stated as B supervisor but has been agreed to be Acting A supervisor due to my expertise. The A supervisor is a colleague whose expertise is in an irrelevant field, he travels a lot so can not meet our supervisees nor can provide feedback on the subject of students’ research, ending up to have all the responsibility & load of research work. I also have to inform him about the students’ progress so him to complete the forms for the TMCs. Since I am the main supervisor contact, I meet students almost every 20 days so to get continuous feedback.

I focus on issues of complexity, abstraction, depth, research considering issues of autonomy, professionalism, unpredictable situations.

PG supervision regards academic & emotional support

PG supervision & international students: At the beginning, I try to help students’ transition to the research environment exploring via brief individual meetings about their educational background, research experience & interest, concerns sharing with them in an interactive way information about the research environment (nature of the task & standards, processes, UoD facilities, sources, people involved, challenges, concerns, strategies to be resolved, experience of other students. Considering that students who have to write graduate theses or PhD dissertation in a language other than their first, encounter serious difficulties and writing programs designed to help such students present dissertations written to an acceptable standard (Allison et. al., 1998) or advising students for other ways (e.g a native speaker to review their work etc) is of critical importance. I try to provide advice and directions for improvement of language writing and correct mistakes during my review of work, however, due to time constraints and partial submission of the draft work to be commented, I feel that I do not provide all the necessary feedback (commenting all language mistakes). However, for the development of academic writing skills, I train them through comments, directions, examples of good writing, and other pedagogical approaches for good writing such as meta-commentary template exercises (Kamler & Thompson, 2014) and direct them for attending ODP training programs.

PG supervision requires in depth knowledge in the specific research subject/area (Bowen and Rudenstine,1992): I try to be sufficiently proficient and familiar with the students’ area of research. Towards this direction, I continuously try to improve my self through reading seminal papers of the research area, attending conferences and research symposia, exchanging knowledge with my colleagues, trying to be updated with new trends and research findings in the specific research areas so to be always informed and provide constructive feedback in my written comments, individual meetings and tutorials with my students. However, often I feel that supervising many MSc students (24 this year) and being assigned as Acting A supervisor for many PhDs (6) due to my expertise there is not enough time to be equipped with all the knowledge I would wish. This causes stress to me. Although formally I am stated as B supervisor for all the above PhD students whereas the formal A supervisor is a colleague, however, he is not present really because he is of totally irrelevant field so I have to do the whole supervision and I acknowledge that finally this is not a good practice to serve the quality I wish.

Quality standards for all: Having carefully read, and being always updated for any changes, I follow the Research Degree Quality Code which defines the University of
Dundee’s standards (e.g. academic standards, support standards) and requirements (mandatory procedures on monitoring, training, supervision, assessment and examination) for the quality of research degree provision; this code, which also takes into account the Quality Code of Higher Education (2013-2018) helps me to clarify correct procedures, to assure quality and enhance & improve activities. This has added value to the development of the right research environment & climate between myself (as supervisor) and the student because it helps a ‘partnership’ to be developed based on secure academic standards for doing research and requirements for learning about research approaches, methods, procedures and protocols. This builds a commonly accepted framework of work which helps communication, collaboration, and trust between the student and myself but also with the other supervisor/s being involved.

The code plays important role designing & developing activities which serve students’ learning & support in order standards to be met. This learning & support applies equally for all my students (with no absolute discrimination) and my passion to support, inspire, teach and guide is the same for all.

Being in line with the code, PG supervision is a supportive learning process and includes teaching for learning & guidance; For example, for my MSc project supervisees and new entrant PhD students, for every semester (and summer period), I design specific workshops (for students getting immediate experience (Nicol, 2012; Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick 2006), tutorials (group based), group & individual meetings (monthly based) for all students consulting & sharing information with my colleagues in my discipline about the context of them with regard to management research (K1), the duration and the mode of delivery of these activities (face to face or/and online due to COVID-19), teaching & learning practices for PG in workshops and tutorials; participating in panel discussions about what is needed to be included and how the quality of the context is assured; borrowing from my experience in developing tutorials & workshops and considering past students feedback; informing the context of these activities developing materials and selecting resources via online research considering what other disciplines in the SoB do, what the UoD standards and requirements are, what other Universities do and what the context of similar research workshops/tutorials include (K1), as well as, using my own academic research & publication of articles in the field of business management education, and materials I find relevant from training programs (OPD), research papers from conferences and professional research workshops I attend in management research (V3) (such as the British Academy of Management workshops) in which conferences and workshops I participate annually among many other conferences and symposia as part of my professional & academic development to inform my teaching & research.

More specifically, I design & deliver a brief induction 2 hrs workshop (preparing slides, developing resources & sharing handouts, inviting guest speakers) explaining the nature, context and objectives of their research task, making them familiar with the research environment of the School of Business, explaining about the responsibilities of supervisors (main & second supervisor), the responsibilities of research students and expectations to be met, standards to be satisfied according to the UoD Research Quality Code, the research and generic skills training available, research integrity/ethics, library, IT and student support resources ( and for the PhD students I also include information about learning & teaching approach, upgrade and thesis monitoring arrangements, how they can raise any issue concerning effective operation of the PhD Programme etc). After the induction workshop, throughout my supervisory period I arrange different brief tutorials, and individual meetings to create
a continuous supportive learning environment providing detailed instructions & feedback for every piece of work (sharing notes & guidelines in advance via email or/and using MS Teams, uploading in Turnitin research materials, handouts, and my detailed comments/written feedback to individual research work which has been delivered to me in advance as requirement for this tutorial, discussing with them issues of progress & review, informing them about research events such as seminars and training activities, answering their queries and providing solutions to their problems as part of face to face feedback, consulting and guiding them about submitted reviewed work but also about the development of their research work as a whole setting agreed timetables to be helped organizing their work, appropriate selection and application of research methodology etc. trying to teach/explain with clarity and through selective examples specific research areas (e.g. developing successful & critical literature review, selection of methodological approach and research design etc) and inviting guest speakers from business I teach/I explain about the skills we aim to develop through their thesis (e.g. critical thinking, research skills, transferable skills etc) and their importance for them when entering the labour market (Enders and de Weert 2004).

For developing an interesting argument, I also encourage them to watch videos for various companies via Youtube, to visit companies and learn informally about current management problems business address. During these activities, I also encourage them to do empirical studies selecting data from business & organizations they can either freely find, or, can choose from those I recommend to them facilitating their access on the basis of my contacts & network as academic member of the CIPD (Chartered Institute of Personnel Development, UK) and fellow of the CMI (Chartered Management Institute, UK) so that to develop communication channels and network for future job opportunities but also to learn about the real world and these companies through their visits, discussions and interaction. In this way students learn formally & informally. I am happy, after the completion of their studies, to be informed that many of my students achieve to become members to the above professional associations or/and find work in some of the listed organizations/companies.

For PhD students I have additional tutorials supporting & preparing them (for the thesis monitoring committees & upgrade review, informing them about research & generic skills training, research methods training etc.) but also providing them employability & career guidelines connecting their work & skills with future employment opportunities. My teaching for these activities is research based, student-centred, interactive, reflective & inclusive and students with language difficulties and disabilities are assisted either emailing them a review summary of its context or/and arranging additional personal meetings so that all to have the same access to learning opportunities. The above workshops, tutorials and meetings help students to become familiar with the research environment, to learn about the task and their supervisor/s, to learn what they need about the stages of development of their work, to get continuous oral/facial feedback from me and peers in the class for their work and the queries they raise during the tutorials; these become supportive for the completion of their work because they feel that they work with other students and they learn and are supported and guided by their supervisor to progress & develop skills and complete their work on time (borrowing from my experience, none ever failed nor delayed unless there were personal reasons) to enjoy the research journey. All these are evident in the feedback I get from the students via emails, face to face in class, their progress, their skills development and above all their success as many of them not only complete successfully but are awarded for their distinguished research or best thesis in the SoB.
or/and with my continuous support their work is presented in conferences or/and published in journals which I personally encourage & work with them this to be achieved. My Teaching award was a confirmation of my success of my teaching for PG students since my academic work regards PG level only, and especially most of my MSc supervisees are students from my classes.

Also, for the MSc & PhD students, I arrange separately for each level of study individual meetings (once per month) as well as group meetings (once per 2 months) preparing notes for the issues to be raised, handouts with important materials and guidelines to be shared; the group meetings (where are open to all MScs or PhDs accordingly) are student-led meetings where students present part of their work and get feedback by the participants, facilitate sharing of knowledge & experience among them, help to learn from others and not only from the supervisor, interact and collaborate (e.g. the strategies they apply to address research issues), minimize the feeling of isolation and help students to move on as often some students become role models of progress for others. The individual meetings are tailor made to the needs of each supervisee, provide equal opportunities for all to participate & learn as time is equally allocated for each student separately, and the feedback I provide is equally detailed for everyone and if someone due to health problems or disabilities cannot participate I either provide instructions & feedback via email or via skype contact facilitate a personal learning environment to be built (answering specific queries, providing specific guidelines, sources & materials which relate to the specific individual research topic, and commenting on the progress and context of the provided every time piece of work and planning for the next steps. The group & individual meetings assist students’ learning on the examined subject but also developing skills such as team work and socialization. The success of these learning opportunities is evidenced by the students’ satisfaction as expressed to my colleagues, to emails being received etc.

The formal final assessment of the research work takes place by both supervisors and is based on specific standards that have been set by the SoB (for MSc students) and standards of the Thesis Monitoring Committee, Upgrade Review Panels and Examination Committee (for the PhD students) upon the delivery of their work (e.g. critical literature review, in depth analysis in the discussion, rationality of the research design etc); informal assessment takes place via my comments and during meetings. Before I finalize my assessment, I always review briefly the work, evaluating the objectivity of my comments and personal notes comparing and contrasting with other cases.

In the tutorials & meetings, preparing a brief handout/guide and slides, using examples of published research work from conferences I attend and top in the field journal articles I select or/and pieces of their own research, doing exercises and encouraging discussion, interaction & reflection, I focus on six elements which via my readings I found that are called ‘facets’: teaching students how to extract knowledge or ideas from sources using them afterwards to construct new knowledge (abstraction), ways to acquire more knowledge and use them differently (depth) (e.g engaging in a narrow topic of their research in depth or engaging in an up-to-date research), developing critical research and enquiry skills (research and enquiry), recognizing and dealing with complexity of knowledge, complexity of learning, knowledge application in practice & integration of skills (complexity), be responsible for own learning, acquisition of knowledge & motivation (autonomy), understanding that problems are complex and using experience & knowledge to be creative solving these
problems (unpredictability), showing professional attitudes and values (professionalism). The starting point, while explaining each of the above is to build an exemplary model that is to ‘build’ an example on the blackboard or/and give adequate time space to them to read the relevant page for each step in my handouts, and then to challenge them to think, reflect upon their own experience & research, & produce a similar example and share it in the class or meeting or/and send it to me via email. It would be though also helpful to encourage students to think about what facets are developed in their PG work and which facets are most or less important and myself to design activities for developing better each facet (Warring, 2011) but unfortunately I do it. Interaction with students and the supervisor are encouraged during these activities and via email so that all possible questions per student to be answered on time; no question is left unanswered. All students have the same learning opportunities and get equal feedback. Special arrangements are made for students with problems and disabilities (e.g additional personal meetings, preparation of review points being discussed etc via emails or Turnitin [when the research outline is upload for MScs] and during meetings/and tutorials I provide detailed written and face to face comments for each student separately explaining via a rational approach every detail of the answer. Following the approach that ‘repetition is the mother of learning’, & active learning through repetitive similar exercises, quiz questions , examples etc I challenge them to connect theory with practice, I encourage peer learning & self-learning approach reading and searching themselves what they need, learning from and sharing with others, challenge them to reflect on their thoughts, apply, learn from my feedback, be active learners engaging in all our activities using IT facilities and UoD training opportunities. I try to inspire them the passion (cultivating enthusiasm, sharing my own enthusiasm, having passion of doing what they do, for loving research and being part of their everyday life supporting them emotionally, etc), to help them to internalize these facets and become part of their practice. I inform my approach improving concepts and structures for providing interdisciplinary exposure to research being engaged with the University professional development and research program (Centre for the Enhancement of Academic Skills, Teaching Learning & Employability CASLITE). I am engaged to help students take control of their work and be able to self – assess. I am sending reminders and keep notes of students’ attendance of meetings and tutorials/workshop so that to follow up with those who might miss sth rescheduling meetings so to ensure that all equally get what they need (V1). Being in line with the UoD Code standards, requirements, roles ( supporting learning via workshops, tutorials, group, individual meetings, keeping track with attendance and follow ups) contribute to development of a transparent & stable research environment, develop their own academic practice & work. The research mindset students develop, the progress of their work, the expressed satisfaction by students for the support & on time constructive feedback they get, sharing this with others, are ways of assessing the success of my supervision. However, focusing mainly on the context of research quality and on time completion of it to minimize anxiety , I do not really support students via design variety of activities & stimuli as supervisor professionalism so that the student to be connected much more with a discipline/occupational community; I engage them with many organizations and train them about ways of getting funds to facilitate and enhance generic skills, but I do not engage them with professional programs, I do not contribute to their commercial awareness of their area or encourage development of entrepreneurship skills but it might be to a basic and not advanced level as might be needed nowadays. Also, I feel that I have not supported to the extent that might be needed students with interdisciplinary approach in their research.
I try to direct & guide my students, trying to keep a balance between directive/consulting support and their autonomy (to help them having access to resources & activities but also to build on them the responsibility of their work reminding that it is their own work not mine); I provide general information for UoD and IT facilities but I give them space to search and found as well what else is needed. I encourage formal & informal communication to help them feel comfortable and have trust, but keeping balance values to be respected.

Conclusion

I agree with Conrad (2014) that there are issues with female academic staff and occasionally with female PG students. In my own practice, I am against discrimination applying the same standards for all students following the University Code for Research. A supervisor can make some difference in a female’s experience of postgraduate study-and in her success or/and can try to influence the institution to improve the climate for women students however all depend on the culture of the University, the dynamics of politics and power which stem from the hierarchy. I provide some opportunities of contact for all my students. I do not have personal experience of a case of a female student who had problems with her, if it happens, I will support the most I can providing emotional support (mentoring), and consulting her towards the right direction and support of her rights as a student. My practice is focused mentoring, educating and supervising my supervisees, keeping a good relationship (match), creating a comfortable but stimulating environment as well and being in line with the UoD Code for Research.
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