Diverse views on supervision: Insights from interviews with EAL supervisors in Sweden and Indonesia

Musrifatun Nangimah and Robert Walldén

Abstract

Literature on thesis supervision emphasises collaborative approaches with strong and supportive relationships. Despite an increasing research interest in supervisory relationships, little cross-cultural research has been conducted on supervisory roles and relationships in expanding circle countries. This study explores how thesis supervisors negotiate different roles and relationships in supervision in English as an Additional Language (EAL) contexts. A multi-case study was employed in three contexts: a Swedish university, two Indonesian private universities, and an Indonesian public university. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with fourteen thesis supervisors. Thematic analysis and systemic-functional appraisal theory were used to analyse the discourse. Our findings revealed that supervisors expressed dealing with (a)symmetrical relationships with students and colleagues, dealing with different supervision roles, and managing priorities relating to intellectual development and instrumental goals. However, these dimensions of supervision were described differently in the three contexts. The Swedish supervisors expressed concerns about having weak authority; meanwhile, the Indonesian private supervisors described frustrated attempts to form a closer relationship with the students, whereas the Indonesian public supervisors reacted to students trying to become too familiar. Furthermore, supervisors in the three contexts had to take different unwanted roles in supervision. The article concludes with implications for understanding situated aspects of supervision.

Key words: cross-cultural perspectives; discourse models; supervisory relationships; supervisory roles

Introduction

The supervisory relationship plays a pivotal role in thesis supervision because it shapes students' affective reactions (i.e., mood, emotion, and feeling) and interest toward their projects. Furthermore, it has been shown to have a more direct effect on students' performance than self-regulation (Wagener, 2018). Research on the supervisory relationship has stressed the necessity for collaborative supervision styles that entail both collaboration between the supervisor and the student and the student's knowledge-based research improvement. A strong and supportive collaborative supervisory relationship facilitates students achieving their goals, creates trust in feedback, stimulates students' creativity and innovation, empowers students, and boosts their self-esteem, all of which improves student performance (Mahmood et al., 2019; Ugrin et al., 2008; Vähämäki et al., 2021).

However, attaining the ideal collaborative supervisory relationship involves considerable challenges because it is inherently asymmetrical, such as the relationship between elder modellers versus proteges (Covan, 2000) or supervisors/experts versus students/novices (Bazrafkan et al., 2019), which can be further exacerbated in certain cultural contexts. Although supervisors are expected to strive for collaborative learning (Hanson & Deluliis, 2015), the hierarchical element of supervision cannot be entirely removed. Manathunga (2007) emphasised that thesis supervision deals with conflicting impulses between the desire to support students' self-direction and the paternalism (i.e., supervisors in control) embedded in the institutional practises and responsibilities of supervision.

Although research into supervisory roles and relationships is relatively scarce, previous studies have highlighted obstacles to productive relationships between supervisors and students. Some factors may cause supervisory relationships to become dysfunctional, such as conflicting supervisory purposes (encouraging students to find their own way and giving corrective feedback as experts), institutional shortcomings, interpersonal challenges, and cultural distance between supervisors and students (Colnerud, 2015; Krase, 2007; Norberg et al., 2016). These factors frequently lead to supervisors assuming problematic roles and experiencing moral stress, a lack of supervisory resonance (supervisors and students feel that their relationship does not work well), and supervisees' distressing reactions (feeling angry and hurt)—particularly when supervisees and supervisors have different sociolinguistic competences and levels of academic literacy (Colnerud, 2015; Krase, 2007; Norberg et al., 2016). Another dilemma occurs when supervisors try to balance providing scaffolding to promote students' ownership of their texts, fulfilling institutional demands, modelling professional relationships, and evaluating the need to encourage students' intellectual development (Frith, 2020).

Previous research has highlighted complications occurring within cross-cultural settings. Son and Ellis (2013) claimed that Western individualistic cultures (e.g., the USA) tend to be less hierarchical and induce few role conflicts than Asian collectivist cultures (e.g., South Korea). Other research focused more on language-related issues in interracial supervision; for instance, Chang and Strauss (2010) found that the agency of Chinese students in New Zealand depended on supervisors' linguistic support, Wang and Li (2011) reported how non-English-speaking students in Australia experienced negative emotional responses in understanding feedback, and Doyle et al. (2018) noted that African students in New Zealand had difficulties related to language and writing. Moreover, Alabdulaziz and Faisal (2020) described how Saudi Arabian students at a UK university experienced language-related challenges in writing. However, this research is mostly limited to the inner-circle countries (Kachru, 1985)[1] and often concerns linguistic issues. It follows that research on supervisory relationships in the expanding circle countries (Kachru, 1985) is still lacking. Situating supervision practices also in the expanding circle may contribute *inter alia* to the development of World Englishes (Kirkpatrick, 2012) and intercultural negotiation (Mendes de Oliveira, 2018).

Therefore, the present study aims to illuminate the supervisory relationships in non-Anglophone contexts. Both Sweden and Indonesia can be regarded as expanding circle countries since they use English as an additional language (EAL) without necessarily having historical colonisation reasons. Another reason for choosing both contexts is to illuminate the supervisory practices that are seen through the integration of the Northern (Sweden) and Southern (Indonesia) educational practitioners. Thus, the study contributes by exploring beliefs about supervision not only from the privileged Northern perspective but also in the relatively marginalised Global South as mentioned by Pennycook and Makoni (2020). Geographically and culturally, Sweden can be associated with what Son and Ellis (2013) called a Western sphere assumed to have more horizontal supervisory practices than countries in the Eastern sphere, including Indonesia. Nevertheless, similar to Manathunga (2007), our point of departure is that supervisory relationships are inevitably imbalanced. Thus, it is insufficient to understand supervision based on stereotypical notions of individualistic versus

---

[1] Kachru (1985) creates three concentric circles to describe the spread of English use:
- The *inner circle*: the region where English is used as the first and standard language, i.e., the UK, the USA, Australia, and New Zealand.
- The *outer circle*: the region where English is used as a second language due to colonisation by the users in the inner circle, i.e., Nigeria, Zambia, Singapore, etc. The inner circle's linguistic and cultural effects become a historical part.
- The *expanding circle*: the region where English is used as an international language without necessarily being colonised by the inner circle, i.e., Japan, Russia, Greece, China, Indonesia, Sweden, etc. It creates English varieties or EFL.

collectivist cultures (cf. Son & Ellis, 2013). In this article, we explore how the supervisory relationship is negotiated by Indonesian and Swedish supervisors.

The present study responds to the need for qualitative insight that can promote a more multifaceted understanding of supervision in different contexts. To shed light on the diverse nature of supervision as a practice and, in particular, on the way supervisors negotiate their roles in different contexts, the study draws inspiration from Gee's (2014) discourse model (see the theoretical underpinning section). The research questions are as follows: *In what ways do Swedish and Indonesian supervisors describe experiencing thesis supervision? In what ways do Swedish and Indonesian supervisors describe their relationships with students and colleagues?*

Theoretical underpinnings

In the present study, we use interview data and employ a discourse analysis inspired by Gee (2014) and systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday & Maythiessen, 2014; Martin & Rose, 2007). Our interest in the participants' beliefs, attitudes, and views about supervision aligns with Gee's (2014) concept of figured worlds, or *discourse models* (p. 95). The term refers to taken-for-granted assumptions about how the world works. Gee (2002, pp. 167–168) points out how discrepancies in discourse models can lead to problems, for example, when supervisors and students have conflicting assumptions about their respective roles. The interview data provides insights into how supervisors in different social and cultural contexts view themselves in relation to both the students and different contextual and institutional factors.

In our application of systemic-functional linguistics (SFL), we focus on the concept of *tenor*—one of the three variables that constitute the situational context (Halliday & Mathiessen, 2014, pp. 32–33).[2] *Tenor* refers to the participants in a situation, such as the practice of supervision. With inspiration from Halliday and Mathiessen (2014, p. 33) and Martin (1992, p. 526), we find the following aspects of tenor relevant to the study at hand:

- •the institutional roles taken by the participants
- •the status relations between the participants
- •the degree of contact between the participants

---

[2] The other two variables are *field*, describing what is going on in a situation, and *mode*, referring to how the communication is channelled into a coherent flow (Halliday & Mathiesen, 2014, pp. 32–33). While these variables are not foregrounded and linguistically probed in the analysis, we will discuss activities associated with supervision (field) and the use of different modes in instruction, such as languages or communications channels, in relation to tenor.

•the values and beliefs held by the participants

Our focus is on how the supervisors express their roles in relation to students and colleagues, and on the values they express related to supervision. This enabled us to provide insights into how the supervisors take part in construing or resisting discourse models of supervision. In accordance with Martin's (1992) assumption that tenor constitutes part of the linguistic register of discourse, we employed SFL constructs from appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005) to analyse the interview data. In the data analysis section, we describe how these constructs were employed in conjunction with thematic content analysis.

Method

This study follows a multi-case study design (Yin, 2018) to explore how supervisors experience their roles and relationships with students and colleagues. The study is situated in three different thesis supervision contexts that are treated as separate cases: Swedish university (first case), Indonesian private university (second case), and Indonesian public university (third case). We adopted a qualitative method (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) by interviewing thesis supervisors to yield the participants' detailed descriptions of their supervisory experiences. This research method allowed us to reveal the participants' reflections and beliefs about their past supervisory roles and relationship with students and colleagues. Convenience sampling technique (Robinson, 2014) was used to acquire specific and matched cases where the participants had intimate knowledge of thesis supervision in their respective contexts. This technique allowed us to obtain exemplified knowledge of situated supervision rather than potential generalisations about the supervision practice.

Contexts

The final-year students in both Swedish and Indonesian higher education are required to write an empirical-research-based thesis (also called an independent project) and defend their project *viva voce* (also called a thesis defense) to get their degree. For the Indonesian students and the Swedish students within English Studies (see below), this entailed writing a bachelor thesis. For the Swedish students involved in Teacher Education, the thesis was written at an advanced level. Regardless of the level, this was the first time the students wrote a thesis based on individual, empirical research.

Thesis supervision is offered to develop students' research skills and to help them complete their thesis. In this context, both Swedish and Indonesian universities are granted autonomy to run their organisation, curriculum, course content, grades, and

other related issues, including thesis supervision (Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, 2014; OECD, 2017; Undang Undang no 12 tahun 2012, ch 35, §2).

In the Swedish context, which constitutes the first case in this study, thesis supervision is offered only during the one term in which students are scheduled to complete their thesis, either individually or with a peer. Moreover, supervision is conducted on a fixed schedule, with no additional supervision time allocated should the students need an extension or re-examination. In addition, supervisors are often assigned several thesis projects, but they never examine their own students. Students' work is made available through the university's archives upon completion of examination requirements. Although students are not required to publish their work in academic peer-reviewed journals or elsewhere, they are not precluded from doing so (The Swedish Higher Education Act, 1992:1434, section 6).

In accordance with the Indonesian Ministry of Education, Indonesian supervisors are trained to follow Dewantara's tripartite notion of supervision as the *among*-system ('guiding system' in Javanese). Based on this *among*-system, every teacher in all educational levels (or in this study, the supervisor) should fulfil three roles. Firstly, supervisors are expected to be role models for students by setting a good example (*Ing Ngarsa Sung Tuladha*). This includes how they speak, dress, behave, and treat their surroundings. Secondly, supervisors should be facilitators by initiating cooperative learning (*Ing Madya Mangun Karsa*). This involves creating learning opportunities to encourage students to develop their competence and inspire students to achieve their learning goals. Finally, supervisors should be motivators by encouraging students to learn independently (*Tut Wuri Handayani*). This embodies the ability of supervisors to trust their students in carrying out assignments properly (Wiryopranoto et al., 2017). Along with academic peer-reviewed journal publication policy (Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal pendidikan Tinggi, 2012), the Dewantara's tripartite notion and accreditation demands[3] are construed differently in private and public universities.

In Indonesian private universities, which constitute the second case in this study, the thesis is an individual project that receives supervision for two to four terms. Although deadlines are set individually by supervisors, flexible supervision schedules are mandatory. Hence, supervision is scheduled in agreement with the students. Supervisors also examine their own students together with two independent examiners. Supervisors manifest the *among*-system as a form of

---

[3] Although the Indonesian Ministry of Education allowed undergraduate students to have a study period of 14 semesters (Permendikbud no 3 tahun 2020, ch 17, §1d), many universities regulate the 8–to–10 semesters policy since students' outcomes and study period are considered as the accreditation assessment criteria (Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi, 2020). In this study, the Indonesian private universities have greater accreditation ranks and regulate shorter study periods than the public university, which means a shorter length of thesis supervision.

guiding students, thus focusing on encouragement. Moreover, a single supervisor supervises several thesis projects, similar to the Swedish context.

At the Indonesian public university, which constitutes the third case in this study, theses are also written individually, with supervision spanning from two to seven terms. Students receive neither specific deadlines nor fixed supervisory schedules. Instead, they need to initiate the supervision by scheduling appointments. Supervisors also manifest the *among*-system through 'guiding as role models' within a co-supervisory system. The main supervisor focuses on content development, while the co-supervisor pays attention to language and mechanics. Both main and co-supervisors examine their students together with one independent examiner. However, co-supervisors mainly assume a moderator role during students' thesis defense and can only examine language use.

Participants

The participants were recruited via email and interviewed thereafter on a first-come-first-served basis. The recruitment email invited six universities with a similar number of participants: eight supervisors for each case (see the method section). However, three universities did not answer the research invitation, and some participants in both Indonesian and Swedish contexts withdrew their participation. Thus, fourteen thesis supervisors (four females and ten males) participated in the study: five from a Swedish university, five from two Indonesian private universities, and four from an Indonesian public university. We treated the two Indonesian private universities as one case due to the unequal number of participants, four versus one. Exploring possible differences between the private universities, as two separate cases, would have required more participants. We involved four instead of five participants from the Indonesian public university since they apply a co-supervisory system, so having an odd number of participants would have left one participant out.

The selected participants do not represent all forms of university organisations, for example, university colleges in Sweden or vocationally oriented universities both in Sweden and Indonesia (UKÄ, 2019; Undang Undang no 12 tahun 2012, ch. 15–17). The university type, number of participants, and gender distribution among the supervisors is the result of convenience sampling and may not be representative of supervisor populations in all contexts. Nonetheless, the study design still enables interesting qualitative insight into the included contexts, especially considering the lack of previous cross-cultural research on supervision in expanding circle countries. The selected participants allowed us to explore their supervisory experience in depth and gain distinctive perspectives without the need to generalise their experience based on gender or institution, which is consistent with the nature of case studies as explained by Yin (2018).

The recruited participants had supervisory experience ranging from 2 to 22 years at different educational levels. Eight supervisors reported having no formal supervisory training (all Indonesian), five supervisors have completed formal training (four Swedish and one Indonesian), and one Swedish supervisor reported limited training experience. The difference between the contexts may reflect the fact that the Swedish university teachers are generally obliged to study particular academic courses for teaching and supervising in higher education. However, as part of their completed postgraduate education, all the Indonesian supervisors had practical experiences of supervision, backgrounds as English teachers, and formal training to teach in higher education.

The participants supervised students majoring in two study programmes: English Studies and English for Teacher Education. Further details about the participants from the online questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1 where pseudonyms were used to ensure participants' anonymity and credibility. We used SU to address Swedish supervisors, IPTU to refer to Indonesian private university supervisors, and IPCU to specify Indonesian public university supervisors. The number after those letters denotes the interview's order in each context, which was determined using the first-agreed-first-interviewed system. For instance, Swedish university supervisors were addressed by SU1 up to SU5, Indonesian private university supervisors were specified as IPTU1 up to IPTU5, whereas Indonesian public university supervisors were credited as IPCU1 up to IPCU4.

Data collection and procedure
The first author (Nangimah) collected the data from April 7 to June 19, 2021, after obtaining the participants' informed consent. The data included an online questionnaire about the participants' backgrounds and supervision experience followed by one-hour-long semi-structured individual interviews conducted through a video-conferencing tool (as a result of COVID-19 pandemic restrictions). In the interviews, the first author endeavoured to create an atmosphere of trust and discretion to obtain the participants' detailed descriptions of supervisory experiences, particularly those related to their relationship with students and colleagues (Brinkmann, 2013; Galletta, 2013). The interviews were conducted following Galletta's (2013) interview protocol (see Appendix 2). It allowed the researcher to ground the interview purposes and to move from open-ended questions (to ease the participants' way into the interview situation and gain their concrete experience) to more specific theory-laden questions with a focus on the participants' supervisory practice, experiences, and feelings. This interview technique enabled the researcher to gain the participants' supervisory trajectories that helped the thematising process. The interviews were mainly in English; however, seven participants chose to respond in Indonesian. A verbatim-recorded interview transcription with appropriate editing (i.e., omitting repetition and

nonverbal sounds) was created to preserve all information and obtain clarity (Powers, 2005). Selected excerpts from the interviews were translated from Indonesian to English by the first author with the second author's (Walldén) help to ensure that the translations conveyed the original meaning and accurately reflected the use of the linguistic resources (e.g., conjunctions, evaluative language, and expressions of modality). Furthermore, the translations were discussed to ensure that they were ethically and culturally appropriate (Skaff et al., 2002). The process was facilitated by the first author being a native Indonesian speaker and the second author having grammatical knowledge of the language and rudimentary proficiency in using it.

Data analysis
We carried out an abductive analysis that entailed movements between the data and the theory (Timmermans & Tavory, 2012). The process of using theoretical concepts—discourse model and tenor—to discern themes in the collected data aligns with the principles of thematic content analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thus, the themes were actively developed rather than passively obtained from the existing data (Varpio et al., 2017). We paid particular attention to what the supervisors expressed about institutional roles, status relation, the degree of contact with students and colleagues, and values and beliefs related to supervision.

We used the appraisal constructs in Table 1 to analyse what the supervisors expressed in the interviews regarding the tenor and discourse models of supervision. The constructs have been used for similar purposes in previous educational studies (e.g., Walldén, 2019, 2020, pp. 55–61).

Table 1

Appraisal-theoretical constructs used in the analysis

Construct	Function	Example
Modality (deontic)	expressing varying degrees of obligation or allowance	you *have to* write long justifications
Subjective modality	sourcing expressions of modality or concessions to oneself, thus appearing open to other's alternative viewpoints	students who *I would say* sometimes don't recognize
Concession	construing something as counter to expectations	*actually* making them work
Negation	denying something while also presenting the opposite alternative	I'm *not* an editor
Affect	conveying feelings	*sad* about it
Judgement	evaluating persons and actions that can be more or less direct	students who are *dependent or clingy* become *honest, open-minded*
Appreciation	evaluating things or phenomena that can be more or less direct	*actually shameful*, *impeccable work*, being *inspired*
Graduation	intensification or quantification carrying attitudinal meaning	*long* justifications; *lots of* measuring mechanisms

In the present study, the selection and application of these constructs occurred as part of the abductive movements between data and theory. The construct *modality* (deontic)[4] proved useful for probing perceived obligations related to the role of supervisor and, indirectly, students (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 110–111). *Low* modality use, indicated by auxiliary verbs such as *can* and *may*, possibly mirrors views that are not widely accepted by the discourse community. The use of *high* modality is more authoritative but still construes a dialogic space for the alternatives (Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 111). Alternatively, high modality could be used by the participants to describe their own obligations, for example, in relation to others' expectations. In different ways, *subjective* modality (use of first-person pronoun in expressing modality; see Martin & White, 2005, p. 107), *concession* (Martin & Rose, 2007, pp. 56–58), and *negation* (Martin & White, 2005, p. 118) were useful to highlight how the supervisors positioned themselves in relation to alternative perspectives or viewpoints. The categories of *affect*, *judgement*, and *appreciation* are different aspects of what Martin and White (2005, pp. 42–43) term *attitude*. Attitude can be either positive or negative and be expressed in a direct or more indirect way (e.g., 'This is not McDonald's'). Some expressions of attitude (e.g., 'a wonderful supervision experience') related to questions in a very direct way, such as questions about 'pleasant' and 'unpleasant' supervision experiences. Such expressions were not highlighted in the linguistic analysis. A final resource for conveying attitudinal meaning is *graduation*. It

---

[4] The *deontic* modality of willingness and obligation can be contrasted with *epistemic* modality, which describes frequency and likelihood (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 104–105). The latter category is less relevant to the discourse analysis conducted in this study.

involves using, for example, quantification to scale meanings and express commitment to utterances (Martin & White, 2005, pp. 135–137).

Ethical considerations
The study was conducted in compliance with the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity[5] and GDPR[6] requirements. Faculty approval was required and granted from the Indonesian universities, which was not necessary from the Swedish university. Signed informed consent was acquired prior to the data collection. No sensitive personal data were collected. Both written and oral explanations about the study purpose, data use, freedom of research contribution, and assurance of the participants' confidentiality and anonymity were provided before the data collection. Data anonymisation and careful deletion of any reference to the participants' identity were used to ensure privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality (Davies, 2014). The participants' responses were free from influence since their participation in this study was voluntary and provided without any incentive (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). To ensure the validity and reliability of the analysis, we discussed the interview findings, thematic coding development, codes cross-checking, case analysis, and data interpretation and achieved intercoder agreement while avoiding data misinterpretation. We used personal reflexivity to mediate subjectivity and the elements of data gathering, analysis, and interpretation (Carl & Ravitch, 2018).

The findings

This study aims to explore the supervisors' reflections and beliefs about their roles across the three contexts: a Swedish university, two Indonesian private universities, and an Indonesian public university. Two broad themes emerged from the analysis of the interview data: negotiating relationships and managing priorities in supervision. Similarities and differences between the contexts with respect to these themes are presented and discussed below.

Negotiating relationships
A common view among the participants was that they negotiate relationships for their supervisory practice. During the supervision process, they experience challenges related to asymmetrical relationships and different roles.

---

[5] https://www.vr.se/download/18.ad27632166e0b1efab37a3/1547123720849/h2020-ethics_code-of-conduct_en.pdf

[6] https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32016R0679

Dealing with (a)symmetrical relationships with students: in the interviews, there were multiple references to supervisor/student tensions. In both Sweden and Indonesia, supervisors experienced different challenges related to the inherently (a)symmetrical relationship between supervisor and students. In other words, the supervisors expressed concerns related to the tenor aspect of status.

In the Swedish context, some supervisors revealed experiencing low authority related to students' rights. An issue alluded to by several supervisors was the students having the right to move on to the thesis defense without the supervisor's approval. However, underprepared students frequently experienced an unsuccessful thesis defense. Supervisors SU1 and SU3 said that they prefer having the authority to approve students for opposition and be involved during the opposition. SU1 expressed missing the situation they had when they worked in another country 'where I'm actually with them to the very end and seeing an external supervisor saying that it is impeccable work. It feels great and wonderful'. The supervisor used a concessive conjunction 'actually (…) to the very end' (see Table 1), positive wordings of appreciation 'impeccable work' and affect 'feels great and wonderful' to positively contrast the supervision model at a former university with that at the current university. From SU3's answer below, it is evident that the Swedish system also provides difficulty for the role of examiner:

> Generally, the supervisors can give the recommendations like 'You're not ready. Please don't go'. But then the students also have the right to go to the opposition, which means even if they don't follow the recommendations, they can still do that. Even though we know that if they do that, they will fail anyway. And that is actually the most difficult one because dealing with the failed students actually takes more time. You have to write long justifications as to why they fail, and you also have to write long feedback. (SU3)

SU3's example of supervisors' wording of appeal 'please don't go' further underscores the relative authority of the students in the matter of advancing to the thesis defense. From the perspective of being an examiner, the high modality evident in the wording 'have to write long justifications on why they fail' shows a perceived lack of authority since there is an obligation to justify assessments of failing theses. The use of graduation in 'long justifications' underscores the extra workload involved.

Apart from dealing with students participating in their thesis defense without their approval, the Swedish supervisors conveyed being challenged by students. SU4 cited students 'getting angry', 'complaining about their grades', and 'not recognizing they haven't done enough work'. The supervisors felt accused of doing insufficient work regardless of the amount of supervision time. Meanwhile,

SU1 and SU2 experienced feeling accused of not doing a proper job. SU2 recounted that, at an early point in their supervision experience at the university, students questioned their authority and 'inflexibility in actually making them work'. The negative wording conveys both feelings of being judged by students and students not expecting to be challenged and put to work by their supervisor, indicated by 'actually making them work'. The word choice 'inflexibility' shows negative evaluation (judgement) of the supervisor, namely being accused of being unwilling to change to facilitate students' movement through the writing process. SU1 and SU4 expressed similar experiences of feeling 'accused' and having to justify their work:

> Student sent an email with 'Well, we didn't get the supervision we were supposed to'. When I was saying 'Well, that's not true. They got the supervision they were supposed to. Here is the documentation to prove it', and that's unpleasant. I have to admit, as a supervisor, I didn't like having to do that because I felt accused of not doing my job, and that's not a nice experience for anybody. (SU1)

In phrasing the accounts of such unpleasant parts of supervision practices, the supervisors used wordings employing concessions and subjective modality: 'I have to admit' (SU1) and 'students who I would say sometimes don't recognize' (SU4). The use of subjective modality leaves openings for alternative perspectives, thus signalling these statements as something problematic or not commonly agreed upon in the discourse community (see Martin & Rose, 2007, p. 111). These careful wordings imply the supervisors were hesitant to directly criticise the students, which further indicates a discourse model in which the unequal status relationship between supervisors and students is less pronounced.

In contrast to the Swedish supervisors, the Indonesian counterparts pointed to more pronounced differences in status relations between the students and the supervisors. The Indonesian participants explained that students require documented official approval from their supervisors to have their thesis opposition (see IPTU1 quote below). None of the Indonesian supervisors reported getting official complaints from their students as their Swedish counterparts did. This may be a result of students' concerns about failing their thesis defense since their supervisors are also their examiners. Therefore, the tenor of the supervision practice involves supervisors having a comparably high status in relation to their students. Thus, the issues regarding roles and relationships perceived by the Indonesian supervisors were different from their Swedish equivalents.

Further indicating the more pronounced differences in status relations, Indonesian students typically require their supervisors' documented approval to move on to the defense. However, IPTU1 and IPCU3 explained that students could

sometimes insist on moving forward to the defense despite this lack of approval. In such cases, the supervisors used both negative judgement 'unreadiness', and appreciation 'having awful thesis defense' and 'getting major revision' to describe this possible but undesired practice. As IPTU1 explained:

> Students need to present the signed approval sheet as a thesis defense requirement. It's designed that way. Yet, passive approval is given if students insist. Sometimes, students are persistent. They keep asking for approval. The supervisors get annoyed by that and let them go unwillingly. (IPTU1)

The approval is construed as conditional 'if the students insist' and is connected to the supervisors' negative affect 'annoyed' and 'unwillingly'. This indicates that such actions from students were seen as unwelcome challenges to a discourse model of relatively pronounced differences in status relations. This contrasts with the more pleading stance described by the Swedish supervisor (SU3) above.

Between the two Indonesian contexts of private and public universities, the supervisors described different kinds of tensions in relation to their students. In the private Indonesian university context, supervisor/student relationships exhibit particular complexity with respect to the desired equal relationships with the students. These supervisors emphasised their supervisory practice as a form of service provision for students, as in the quotes by IPTU2 and IPTU4 below. Therefore, their high status is at tension with their intention to provide help and befriend the students:

> I am positioning myself not as a supervisor who knows the best, but as a friend. Although it's still impossible to imagine me as their friend. I did that so they will not be afraid of me. If they speak Javanese, I use Javanese, so we can have a closer relationship. (…) I even allow them to write their ideas in Indonesian. They can change it into English later on. (…) Some students still feel uneasy. (IPTU2)

> I try to be more proactive. Keep monitoring students' progress. At least every two weeks, I check and talk to them or email them. Increasing the contact will be good. Although some students kind of simply disappear. (…) more helpful and more friendly to the students. (IPTU4)

The Indonesian supervisors from the private university indicated that they aim for an equal status with the students, as indicated by the following quote: 'but as a friend (…) more friendly to the students (…) have a closer relationship'. In addition, IPTU4 expressed striving for 'increasing the contact'. The considerations of both status and degree of involvement point to the supervisors seeking a close tenor with the students. As evident from the quote above, IPTU2 adjusted the mode of instruction to enable the students to speak Javanese (the first language for most of the students) and write their drafts in Indonesian (their second language) in early parts of the writing process. This flexibility aligns with the supportive tenor generally favoured by the private university supervisors.

Despite the good intention of inviting students to speak in their first language, Javanese, this strategy might be ineffective in achieving closer relationships with them due to the Javanese hierarchical politeness system.[7] Moreover, the supervisors' frequent use of concessive conjunctions shows a perceived difficulty with reaching the students in the desired way: '*although* it's still impossible to imagine me as their friend (…) still feel unease' (IPTU2), '*although* some students (…) disappear' (IPTU4), '*even* [if] it does not always work' (IPTU5), and '*though* it's hard to really know them' (IPTU1). Thus, the supervisors expressed facing difficulties and tensions in making less hierarchical relationships fit the discourse model of supervision.

In contrast, the supervisors in the Indonesian public university did not express a desire for friendly relationships with the students. Instead, they conveyed

---

[7] Javanese has three hierarchical politeness systems (*ngoko*, *krama madya*, and *krama inggil*), where *ngoko* is used with individuals of a similar age and position, individuals who are younger or lower in position, or close friends. In the student/supervisor relation context, students likely use *krama madya* or *krama inggil* to speak with supervisors due to the age and position gap. Thus, inviting students to speak in Javanese will create a more distanced tenor between students and supervisors. For further information about the Javanese hierarchical linguistic system, see Subroto et al. (2008).

supervisor/student tensions arising from the students approaching them in ways which challenged the tenor of unequal status. While IPCU3 reported 'creating a more friendly atmosphere', the other supervisors explicitly revealed their concerns over re-establishing their higher status in the relationship. IPCU1 indicated concern over 'disrespectful and irresponsible students' who neglect the supervisors' feedback. IPCU4 expressed concerns over personal boundaries with the following:

> I want to get closer to students. But they sometimes cross the line where they don't know the boundary. They address their lecturers the way they speak to the friends they hang out with in the coffee shop. That makes me energy drained. They also send private chats outside working hours. (IPCU4)

The negative judgement 'disrespectful', 'irresponsible', and 'cross the line', and the negative affect 'energy drained' indicate the ambivalent disposition; the supervisors desire close relationships, yet they still maintain the asymmetry by seeing the students' responses as a personal affront. In contrast to IPTU2, who strives for informal conversation, IPCU4 frets over the students' way of speaking, which is negatively judged as 'speaking to their friends they hang out with'. In other words, the public university supervisors expressed negative reactions to students deviating from discourse model expectations of a distant and respectful tenor. Perhaps this relates mainly to the students' way of speaking rather than to how students address their supervisors. The students are unlikely to address their supervisors by directly using their names—as close friends would—since that would be highly impolite in the Indonesian context.

Dealing with (a)symmetrical relationships with colleagues: in addition to supervisor/student tensions, the supervisors reported collegial tensions, which differed across the three contexts. The Swedish supervisors explained that they could freely discuss supervisory problems (i.e., related to topic expertise) with colleagues when they need support. Some of them described having limited authority compared to the examiners during the opposition. SU1 defined the examiner as the 'ultimate decider' of the grade. No tension or conflict was mentioned with respect to this asymmetry.

Exclusive for this particular context, the Indonesian supervisors from the public university expressed dealing with the asymmetrical status relations between main supervisors and co-supervisors. Interestingly, only the co-supervisors drew attention to this imbalance:

> I think the second supervisor has weaker authority than the first supervisor. (…) I only give feedback on things that I can. But, if there are rejections

from students for various reasons, what can I do? I actually avoid conflict both with the first supervisor and students. (…) So, I follow the main supervisor to avoid conflict. (IPCU4)

The asymmetrical relationship is made clear by expressions such as 'weaker authority', as is the co-supervisor's comparative lack of agency 'what can I do?' and 'I follow the main supervisor'. As none of the main supervisors alluded to this asymmetrical relationship, we understand it as a taken-for-granted part of the discourse model from the perspectives of the main supervisors. However, IPCU2 cited the complexity of reminding colleagues to do their supervisory work due to 'overlapping structural position in study programme'. Even though the co-supervisory system is a complex activity, 'supervision has been conducted separately between the main and co-supervisors. Students and two supervisors will conduct supervision together if only conflict occurs' (IPCU3). Overall, this indicates a distanced tenor.

While both the Swedish and Indonesian public universities mentioned asymmetrical relationships—supervisor/examiner and co-supervisor/supervisor relationships, respectively—none of the supervisors from the Indonesian private university voiced any imbalances in relation to their colleagues. Apart from the lack of a co-supervisory system entailing unequal responsibilities, this may be due to them having a supportive collegial system. IPTU1 disclosed that supervisors 'frequently discuss students' problems, learn from each other, and have temporary supervisory exchanges where students can join supervision from different supervisors with relevant expertise as the additional supervisory session'. IPTU3 described the existing community in their study programme as 'helpful collegial supervisory support'. Since such testimonies signal both a high degree of involvement and horizontal – rather than hierarchical – power relations, the collegial tenor appears very different to that described by the public university supervisors.

Dealing with different supervisory roles: although most participants in all the three contexts strived for the desired supervisory roles of learning facilitators and research fellows, they also expressed finding themselves dealing with multiple roles, including ones they would rather have avoided. The present section highlights tensions between the shared discourse model of engaging in dialogue and sharing a mutual learning experience and the necessity to take on contrasting roles.
In the Swedish context, the supervisors expressed resisting being editors of students' texts. Instead, they wished to adhere to the role of learning facilitators, providing intellectual rather than language-oriented support:

If their writing isn't up to what I consider to be good quality writing, I emphasised that they must get a third party to help them in their text because

> it's not my job to be an editor. I'm not an editor, and that's made very clear to us as well. In our instructions with regard to these jobs at the university, we're not their editors. There's a writing clinic as well that is available at the university's library. They should use that. (SU1)

SU1 clearly state they are not an editor. The shift between singular and plural use of first-person pronouns '*I'm* not (…) *We're* not their editors' and the reference to job 'instructions' underlines a shared discourse model for supervision between the supervisors. However, the use of negation '*not* an editor' also presents itself in opposition to students' beliefs that supervisors should in fact be editors (see Martin & White, 2005, p. 118). In addition, SU1's use of modality '*should* use that [writing clinic]' indicates a belief that the students do not turn to the writing clinic as much as they should. A possible explanation is a mismatch between (a) the supervisors' discourse model of supervision and (b) their understanding of the students' discourse model of supervision—that is, between institutional expectations and actual practice.

SU2's response calls attention to the tendency of supervisors to take an editorial role: 'end up correcting immediately'. While Swedish supervisors emphasised not being the students' editors, none of the Indonesian supervisors distanced themselves from this role. Although Indonesian supervisors revealed asking students to use Grammarly and to find other language help, they barely voiced their objections to being editors. Moreover, the Swedish supervisors' references to desired practices—such as 'developing argument' (SU2), 'formulating comments as a question' (SU3), and 'want to hear their response (…) do you agree with me?' (SU5)—indicate the dialogic and facilitating supervisor role the Swedish supervisors strive for. However, SU4 admitted that time constraints work against developing substantial dialogue according to the students' need: 'So actually, I don't really start knowing them and have those discussions'.

In the Indonesian context, the supervisors conveyed having to act as pseudo-debt collectors. The issue pertained to 'disappearing students', that is, students who had been temporarily absent from supervision due to the lack of research progress or other reasons:[8]

> I usually hound slow-progress students or idle students by sending many 'hi' chats. They know what it means. They are usually frightened and say that they had a nightmare about it. Let it be (…) I terrorize them [laugh]. (IPTU5)

---

[8] In contrast, Swedish supervisors remarked that students will simply drop out themselves if they do not have time to do research or keep up with the tight schedule. Therefore, the supervisors focus on helping students to develop their research and thesis writing as long as they participate in the programme.

Above, strong affect-laden language 'hound', 'frightened', and 'I terrorize them' is used to describe the supervisor's efforts as a debt collector of sorts. Furthermore, some supervisors disclosed their efforts to trap the students, for example, by going to their boarding house so the students 'couldn't escape' (IPCU3). IPCU2 depicted making 'threats', being 'passionately angry', and considering the students 'as [their] own children', looking for a 'rule (…) to bind them' to their obligation of finishing the thesis. As evident from the quote above, the oppressive and trespassing behaviour described by the supervisors reflects a confrontational, but highly involved, tenor—one necessitated by taking the role of debt collector or authoritative parent.

In addition, the Indonesian supervisors communicated that they provided greater support for students they perceived to be in need of more assistance. Apart from keeping a fierce watch on the students' progress, some Indonesian supervisors expressed having to spoon-feed such non-idealised students, whom they perceived as dependent, less motivated, or low performing. The spoon-feeding activity is particularly relevant for supervisors in private universities, who saw it as their mission to provide such support as a form of service. IPTU2 phrased it as having a 'commitment to help them and give them the best time during their last educational stage'. The practice of spoon-feeding is exemplified in the following excerpt:

> Students frequently said that they can't find the references. So, I demonstrate how to use keywords in the class and show them. (…) Sometimes, weak students cannot understand what the research gap is. So, I write it down for them. (…) Some students only need examples; they can do it by themselves. Others need more help. (IPTU1)

Here, the supervisor expressed providing support in finding references and research gaps to students described as unable, ones that 'can't find' or are perceived 'weak'. IPTU5 cited the students' tendency to focus 'mostly on the topic that has been discussed in class', thus needing support to find both relevant research topics and references. Although a Swedish supervisor mentioned 'recommend[ing] possible references' (SU4), the use of low modality 'sometimes', and the choice of verb 'recommend' rather than 'demonstrate', this did not indicate spoon-feeding of the same kind.

In contrast to the Indonesian private universities' mission to provide service, the supervisors from the public university depicted spoon-feeding of a different kind: one necessitated by the new and under-financed study programme. IPCU1 underlined the lack of 'grammar and research services and high-quality reference sources' while stressing the need for 'financial adjustment'. In addition, IPCU4 voiced considerable frustration:

It's different from a private university that can hire well-qualified lecturers who specifically teach research methodology, for example. We cannot do that. So, it is common that I find students who are dependent and clingy. I need to push them to read and send them the references. It is actually shameful, but our academic atmosphere is not well-established yet. (…) So, we adapt to a new study programme and to dependent and clingy students. (IPCU4)

IPCU4's use of high modality 'need to push them', negative judgement of the students 'dependent and clingy', and negative appreciation of the academic environment 'actually shameful' shows a disposition different from that of supervisors from the private universities, thereby indicating that the discourse model of providing necessary support is not shared between the two different contexts in the country.

Managing priorities in supervision
The participants discussed managing priorities in supervision. More specifically, the supervisors expressed divergent views on supervision as the students' intellectual development or as instrumental practice.

Striving for students' intellectual development: the three contexts differ in the degree to which they emphasised supervision as a process of intellectual development or as the instrumental reaching of a goal: the thesis. In their responses, the Swedish supervisors placed most emphasis on the intellectual journey, for example, by stressing the students' independence in 'lead[ing] the conversation' (SU2) and praising the students' ability to bring up 'new topics, new discussions, new perspectives' (SU3). SU4 reflected on exploring the students' interest and understanding of the research topic through dialogue to 'figure out what kind of questions they would be able to answer' in their project. Similarly, some Indonesian lecturers from the private universities expressed striving to support 'students to develop their critical thinking through commenting on each other's work' (IPTU3) and allowing them to 'express their ideas in Indonesian in early parts of the writing process to develop their thinking process and remove the linguistics hindrance' (IPTU2). They also referred to expecting the students to show independence:

I do expect students to be very proactive. They should teach themselves actually. They have a thesis guideline (…) I tell them to be more independent, autonomous. Usually, I provide an example of a good research question. If I see research questions as yes–no questions, I usually strongly suggest or even require them to revise, rewrite it. (IPTU4)

IPTU4 echoed the Swedish supervisors' sentiments about the value of dialogue and intellectual development, thereby indicating a shared discourse model. However, the partly contradicting wording suggests that the supervisors must take steps or use their authoritative roles to ensure independent behaviours: 'tell them to be more independent'. Similarly, the high modality in 'they *should* teach themselves' signals the perception that students tend to rely on their supervisors. In addition, providing examples and making strong suggestions in cases of unsuitable research questions reflect the Indonesian private supervisors' mission to provide support as well as the spoon-feeding practices discussed previously. Thus, the desired independence of the students seems at tension with a discourse model of the supervisors doing what is necessary to enable the students to succeed.

Except for one supervisor, who saw 'research understanding' (IPCU1) as important, the public university supervisors did not foreground students' academic intellectual development. However, IPCU4 referred to research activities to support more general skills relating to reading and intellectual growth:

> At least they will increase their reading by doing research. I read an OECD report about PISA where students' willingness to read is low. (…) I want my students to graduate on time, become honest, open-minded, and read well. (…) All I need is to prepare my students to be open-minded and honest. (…) They do not cheat or plagiarise others so they can graduate on time. (IPCU4)

While the same supervisor also referred to the students' conduct 'not cheat or plagiarise', the phrasing of positive judgement 'open-minded' and 'honest' pointed to generic skills rather than, for example, to more specific critical skills of observation of research ethics.

Dealing with instrumental goals: while echoing the other supervisors' appreciation of intellectual conversations, SU5 described facing students with instrumental goals:

> But if the students are saying up front that 'I'm not really interested in learning anything. I just want the grade', that kind of makes the supervision more difficult and less enjoyable. (…) I don't understand that attitude at all. You know this is not McDonald's. You can't just order a BA. You have to work for it. (...) As a supervisor, I cannot do much about it. I mean, in a sense, I can only be sad about it. I think that the programme has failed them. (…) Lots of measuring mechanisms on courses and everywhere else.

> Producing a sense of what are the minimum requirements for passing this course (…) it's eroding, taking away the intellectual adventure. (SU5)

The supervisor used wording that carries indirect negative judgement of students with instrumental goals: 'don't understand that attitude' and 'this is not McDonald's'. However, the blame is shifted to the study programme, which the supervisor criticised for having 'lots of measuring mechanisms (…) taking away the intellectual adventure'. Through negations and wordings of affect, these failings are marked to be situated outside the supervisors' and students' control and responsibilities: 'cannot do much about it' and 'only be sad about it'. Thus, the ideal discourse model of supervision clashes with the constraints of the educational programme.

The Indonesian supervisors from the private universities communicated that they faced instrumental goals of a different kind: these goals related to the Ministry of Education's demands to increase the national publication levels by compelling students to publish their theses.[9] IPTU1 expressed choosing not to 'push students to publish their thesis and join a lot of conferences' and added 'I'm not that kind of supervisor (…) It's too much for me'. IPTU1's use of negation and negative evaluative language expresses a tension between the institutional goals and the desired role of a supportive supervisor. Further, the use of first-person pronouns 'I'm not' and 'too much for me' indicates that this perspective deviates from that held by the discourse community. Indeed, the other supervisors seemed to align themselves with the policy:

> The new policy comes with possible changes. One of them is the end-product of the research itself. So, instead of just producing thick unread thesis which ends up in the library repository, we are now trying to embrace and to encourage students to publish. And that's a huge transformation. (…) Students need to learn how to pick the research topic and develop their research skills. Be critical. It is very important to focus on something other than memorising all the research methodologies. (IPTU3)

IPTU3 describes the policy's effects on 'the end product of research'. The past practice is implicitly negatively appreciated 'producing thick unread thesis', 'memorising all the research methodologies', whereas the changed practice is connected to the increased expectations of research skills: 'pick the research topic',

---

[9] Indonesian students are required to publish their theses in the form of articles in a peer-reviewed journal. Indonesian BA students are encouraged, whereas MA and PhD students are obliged to publish their work in a national journal (MA) and an international journal (PhD), which constitutes part of each university's accreditation assessment (Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi, 2020; Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, 2012).

'be critical', and 'focus'. Thus, the intellectual development of the students is seen as a prerequisite to achieving increased publication. Aligning with this stance, IPTU5 used positive appreciation to express the merits of the students' co-publishing with supervisors 'so people can read, be inspired and citate it'. Similarly, IPTU4 considered it as a 'wonderful supervisory experience' when students published in peer-reviewed journals, even before attending the thesis defense. Thus, they construe the students' public participation in research practices as a desired part of the supervision discourse model.

As previously mentioned, the Indonesian public university supervisors' responses showed a stronger orientation to instrumental goals. Except for one supervisor, who saw 'research understanding' (IPCU1) as important, the public university supervisors mostly referred to the instrumental goals of finishing the research projects and 'graduating on time' (IPCU4). IPCU2 foregrounded the product-oriented goals of having 'understandable writing; and following conventions of thesis writing.

Furthermore, some of the public university supervisors expressed concerns about how the students' performance—namely graduation rate (IPCU4), publishing theses in university journals (IPCU3), and presenting at conferences (IPCU1)—reflected the accreditation of the educational programme. On the one hand, while these accreditation-related concerns foregrounded the instrumental goals of the finished product rather than the intellectual goal of the research process, Indonesian students—albeit more so in public than in private universities—are expected to engage in research practises. Swedish students, on the other hand, do not face such expectations. Since instrumental goals beyond the completion of the thesis were not addressed by any of the Swedish supervisors, such goals seemed to fall outside of the Swedish discourse model of supervision.

Summary and conclusions

This study has explored supervisors' experiences across three contexts: a Swedish university, two Indonesian private universities, and an Indonesian public university. Using Gee's (2002, 2014) concept of discourse model, we have highlighted supervision as a situated practice: the supervisors in the three contexts were shown to share perceptions of challenges in managing relationships and priorities in supervision, but in three distinct ways. The two main themes that evolved through the data analysis were negotiating relationships and managing priorities. Negotiating relationships involved four dimensions: dealing with (a)symmetrical relationships with students, dealing with (a)symmetrical relationships with colleagues (co-supervisors and thesis examiners), dealing with different roles as supervisors, and spoon-feeding students. Managing priorities embodied two

dimensions: striving for intellectual development and dealing with instrumental goals.

In the study, the systemic-functional concept of *tenor* (Halliday & Mathiessen, 2014; Martin, 1992) was used to explore the ways in which the supervisors described occupying their institutional roles and negotiating status relations with colleagues and supervisees due to the inherently imbalanced relationship within supervision as stated by Manathunga (2007). In addition, in the Indonesian public universities, the perceived tensions did not solely pertain to supervisor/student relationships but also to collegial relationships. While responses from the Swedish supervisors suggest the less hierarchical supervisor/student relationships according to the Western tradition outlined in earlier cross-cultural research (Son & Ellis, 2013), we discovered that, arguably, this lack of hierarchy also entails a perceived lack of supervisory authority. Thus, the Swedish supervisors experienced the feeling that they had failed the students, being accused by the students of not doing their work, or trying to compensate by taking on extra work.

Although none of the Indonesian supervisors expressed frustration at being accused of not doing their work, they mentioned meeting challenges in the supervisory relationship with their students. Despite being driven by the notion of offering a service, the private university supervisors described difficulties in attaining equality in their relationship with the students. The desire for a close tenor with the students was evident in these supervisors' testimonies regarding trying to befriend the students, increase contact, and accommodate the students through a selection of the mode of communication. However, the supervisors communicated failed attempts at mitigating relational asymmetries due to students expecting a more distanced tenor. Furthermore, the use of the students' mother tongue, Javanese, actualized the status relations embedded in the linguistic system of the language. It seems that building a strong relationship with more trust, as suggested by Ugrin et al. (2008), can be problematic because of both interpersonal matters and linguistic factors. This finding highlights the need of using applicable strategies to mitigate the complex supervisory relationship. In contrast, the Indonesian public university supervisors were concerned about students' disrespect and lack of work ethics, and they expressed the need to maintain a distanced tenor with the students.[10] They also reported lack of agency and collegial asymmetries in co-supervision—something that does not seem to occur at the Swedish university and at the Indonesian private universities. Thus, the supervisors reported negotiating their

---

[10] In contrast to the private university supervisors in this study, the public university supervisors report preferring to have distance tenor. Thus, while this university is relatively low-ranked, the supervisors may choose to adopt distance tenor due to the usually competitive admission to public universities. However, this cannot be ascertained from the data sample collected.

relationships with students and colleagues in different ways depending on the context.

Apart from negotiating relationships, the supervisors also juggled different roles. The Swedish supervisors strived for the role of facilitators, in which they provide intellectual rather than language-oriented support and resist student expectations of being editors. Furthermore, they lamented that time constraints restricted dialogue and student intellectual development. Though more accepting of the editor role, the Indonesian supervisors in public and private universities complained about playing a pseudo-debt-collector role when dealing with disappearing students. It seems that a more flexible period of writing a thesis contributes to the students' disappearance since the public university supervisors expressed more resentment than private university supervisors. Some Indonesian supervisors reported being obligated to hound and seek out their students. With reference to the SFL concept of tenor, these Indonesian supervisors had to negotiate challenges inherent to having a low degree of contact with the students in an extended timeframe. In contrast, the Swedish supervisors could be presumed to have an increased degree of contact within a more limited timeframe, making it less challenging to uphold the communication.

Another commonly resented role was that of a spoon-feeder, as it clearly conflicts with the development of intellectual independence in students. For the Indonesian private university supervisors, spoon-feeding aligned with their discourse model of supervision as a service. In contrast, for the Indonesian public university supervisors, spoon-feeding was expressed as adversarial to their discourse model of supervision, necessitated by the new and underdeveloped study programme. Such pestering and mothering by Indonesian supervisors might relate to their attempt to apply concepts from Dewantara's tripartite (Wiryopranoto, et al. 2017), such as *ing madya mangun karsa* (facilitating students to work extra hard to achieve their learning goals) and *tut wuri handayani* (motivating students to learn independently), and to achieve or maintain the good student outcomes that constitute great accreditation results. It can also be an expression of care—of wanting to avoid students paying more tuition fees due to study prolongation.[11] Indonesian supervisors view their role as a relationship between elder modellers and proteges (Covan, 2000). In contrast, Swedish supervisors reported receiving formal training, which (in our experience) tends to foreground collaborative learning and dialogue (see Hanson & Deluliis, 2015). This may reflect their increased emphasis on the students' intellectual development through striving for dialogic supervision. However, the Swedish supervisors voiced difficulties in enacting these supervision ideals, reflecting on the challenge of supporting the

---

[11] Indonesian students at both private and public universities are required to pay tuition fees.

students in completing the thesis and developing a relationship based on intellectual dialogue (see below) in a condensed timeframe.

Furthermore, we demonstrated that the supervisors in the three contexts have different supervision priorities. While underscoring the desire to promote the students' intellectual development in alignment with collaborative supervision ideals described in previous research (Hanson & Deluliis, 2015), supervisors expressed having to deal with instrumental goals. As with the negotiation of roles and relationships, the specific challenges varied between the three contexts. The Swedish supervisors clearly appreciated their students' intellectual journeys, but they also had to deal with some students' instrumental goals. Similarly, the Indonesian private university supervisors both expected and supported the students' intellectual development, but they also described the need for directing the students. In both contexts, the linguistic analyses showed discrepancies between the discourse models of promoting intellectual development and dealing with the instrumental aspects of supervising thesis writing. In contrast, the Indonesian public university supervisors appreciated instrumental goals and depreciated intellectual development to a degree.[12] This indicates the difference in the discourse models of supervision between the two Indonesian contexts. Overall, we have demonstrated that although the supervisors' discourse models of supervision emanate from shared ideals about promoting dialogue and students' intellectual development (Mahmood et al., 2019; Ugrin et al., 2008; Vähämäki et al., 2021), these supervisors face different tensions and dilemmas in enacting these models, depending on their context. Arguably, the supervision practice must be situated in its context to be explicated.

As problematic supervisory roles occur in Krase's (2007) research due to the institutional shortcoming and interpersonal challenges, most Indonesian supervisors also described how institutional concerns of accreditation affected the practice of supervision. They mentioned challenges in striving for students to publish articles in academic peer-reviewed journals and participate in conferences to boost the academic rating of the universities. While this clashed with one of the private supervisor's beliefs about supervision, it seemed to be held as a positive, or at least unproblematic, part of the discourse model of supervision for the other Indonesian supervisors. These instrumental and accreditation-related concerns seemed to fall outside the discourse model of Swedish supervisors since none of them expressed goals beyond thesis completion. It follows that, for the Swedish supervisors, students' participation in the wider research community was not conveyed as a desired outcome, from neither an instrumental nor an intellectual perspective.

---

[12] The focus on product-oriented outcome might occur because a new study programme must strive for excellent accreditation results, where students' graduation rate is one of the assessment criteria.

While previous research has applied quantitative measurement (Son & Ellis, 2013), teaching dilemma as a theoretical lens (Frith, 2020), and meaning-making in social interaction (Norberg et al., 2016) to highlight supervisors' dilemmas in dealing with their goals, the present study has employed systemic-functional appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005) to explore the situatedness of supervision from a linguistic perspective. This has brought attention to the supervisors' linguistic resources for expressing their beliefs, describing their roles, and positioning themselves in relation to others' expectations and to students, colleagues, and institutional contexts. This has allowed us to elaborate on Gee's (2014) concept of discourse model to provide insight into the different roles, relationships, and priorities foregrounded by the supervisors in the three contexts. The findings also show the need to move beyond the East-West dichotomy (cf. Son & Ellis, 2013) in understanding supervision as a situated practice. While it is impossible to draw conclusions about the typicality of the supervisors and universities participating in the study in relation to their respective contexts, the appraisal analysis has highlighted striking differences (a) between the two Indonesian contexts regarding how the supervisors viewed their roles and responsibilities to the students and (b) between certain aspects of the two Indonesian contexts and the Swedish context. Therefore, we suggest that the analytical lens applied in the present study is a fruitful point of departure for further research into the situated nature of supervision. Such research might explore discourse models as expressed by the students and use ethnographic methods to document on-going supervision.

Author biographies

Musrifatun Nangimah is a PhD student in Language Arts Education at the Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University. Her research interests range from English as a Foreign Language speaking anxiety, critical thinking, and thesis supervision. She is currently working on a doctoral project focused on undergraduate thesis supervision.

Robert Walldén is Associate Professor in Language Arts Education at the Faculty of Education and Society, Malmö University. His research interests include disciplinary literacies and text practices in second-language education. His research often builds on systemic-functional linguistics, Bernstein's sociology of education and critical discourse analysis. He has published his research in several international journals, including Linguistics and Education, Journal of Language, Identity and Education, and Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research.

References

Alabdulaziz, M. S. & Faisal, I. A. B. (2020). Saudi mathematics students' experiences and challenges with their doctoral supervisors in UK Universities. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *15*, 237–263. https://doi.org/10.28945/4538

Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. (2020). Akreditasi perguruan tinggi: *Instrumen suplemen konversi peringkat akreditasi*. Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi. https://www.banpt.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Lampiran-A-PerBAN-PT-2-2020-ISK-ISK-APT.pdf.pdf

Bazrafkan, L., Yousefy, A., Amini, M., & Yamani, N. (2019). The journey of thesis supervisors from novice to expert: A grounded theory study. *BMC Medical Education*, *19*(320), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1739-z

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford University Press.

Carl, N. M., & Ravitch, S. M. (2018). Interviews. In B. B. Frey (Ed.) *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation*, 872–877. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Chang, C. E., & Strauss, P. (2010). 'Active agents of change?' Mandarin-speaking students in New Zealand and the thesis writing process. *Language and Education*, *24*(5), 415–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500781003789873

Colnerud, G. (2015). Moral stress in teaching practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *21*(3), 346–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.953820

Covan, E. K. (2000). Revisiting the relationship between elder modelers and their protégés. *Sociological Perspectives*, *43*(4), S7–S20. https://doi.org/10.2307/41888814

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, D. J. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Davies, A. (2014). Does anonymising steal the voices of researchers and research subjects?. In W. Midgley, A. Davies, M. E. Oliver, & P. A. Danaher (Eds.) *Echoes: Ethics and issues of voice in education research,* 25–34. Sense Publishers.

Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan. (2014). *Buku kurikulum pendidikan tinggi*. Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Doyle, S., Manathunga, C., Prinsen, G., Tallon, R., & Cornforth, S. (2018). African international doctoral students in New Zealand: Englishes, doctoral writing and intercultural supervision. *Higher Education Research and*

Development, *37*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1339182

Frith, H. (2020). Undergraduate supervision, teaching dilemmas and dilemmatic spaces. *Psychology Teaching Review*, *26*(1), 6–17.

Galletta, A. (2013). *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: from research design to analysis and publication*. New York University Press.

Gee, J. P. (2002). Literacies, identities, and discourses. In M. J. Schleppegrell & M. C. Colombi (Eds.) *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages: Meaning with power*, 159-176. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Hanson, D. J., & Deluliis, E. D. (2015). The collaborative model of fieldwork education: A blueprint for group supervision of students. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, *29*(2), 223–239. https://doi.org/10.3109/07380577.2015.1011297

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.) *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*, 11–30. Cambridge University Press.

Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi (2012). *Surat edaran publikasi ilmiah No.152/E/T/2012*. Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education. In A. Kirkpatrick & R. Sussex (Eds.) *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education*, 29–44. Springer.

Krase, E. (2007). "Maybe the communication between us was not enough": Inside a dysfunctional advisor/L2 advisee relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *6*(1), 55–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2006.12.001

Mahmood, M., Uddin, M. A., & Fan, L. (2019). The influence of transformational leadership on employees' creative process engagement: A multi-level analysis. *Management Decision*, *57*(3), 741–764. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2017-0707

Manathunga, C. (2007). Supervision as mentoring: The role of power and boundary crossing. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *29*(2), 207–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370701424650

Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: system and structure*. John Benjamins Publishing.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause (2nd ed)*. Continuum.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mendes de Oliveira, M. (2018). Cultural conceptualizations of business negotiations in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, *37*(4), 684–696. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12346

Norberg, J., Axelsson, H., Barkman, N., Hamrin, M., & Carlsson, J. (2016). What psychodynamic supervisors say about supervision: Freedom within limits. *Clinical Supervisor*, *35*(2), 268–286. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2016.1219896

OECD. (2017). *Education policy outlook: Sweden*. www.oecd.org/edu/policyoutlook.htm

Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2020). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge.

Permendikbud no 3 (2020). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan tentang standar nasional pendidikan tinggi*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/163703/permendikbud-no-3-tahun-2020

Powers, W. R. (2005). *Transcription techniques for the spoken word*. AltaMira Press.

Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in interview-based qualitative research: A theoretical and practical guide. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *11*(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2013.801543

Skaff, M., Chesla, C., Mycue, V., & Fisher, L. (2002). 'Lessons in cultural competence: Adapting research methodology for Latino participants', *Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(3), 305–323. doi: 10.1002/jcop.10007

Son, E., & Ellis, M. (2013). A cross-cultural comparison of clinical supervision in South Korea and the United States. *Psychotherapy*, *50*(2), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033115

Subroto, D. E., Dwirahardjo, M. & Setiawan, B. (2008). Endangered krama and krama inggil varieties of the Javanese language, *Linguistik Indonesia*, *26(1),* 89–96.

The Swedish Higher Education Act (1992:1434). Retrieved March 9, 2022, from https://www.uhr.se/en/start/laws-and-regulations/Laws-and-regulations/The-Swedish-Higher-Education-Act/

Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory, 30(3),* 167–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112457914

Ugrin, J. C., Odom, M. D., & Pearson, J. M. (2008). Exploring the importance of mentoring for new scholars: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, *19*(3), 343–350.

UKÄ Swedish Higher Education Authority. (2019). *Higher education institutions in Sweden: 2019 status report*.

Undang-Undang no 12 (2012). *Undang-undang tentang pendidikan tinggi.* https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/39063/uu-no-12-tahun-2012

Vähämäki, M., Saru, E., & Palmunen, L. M. (2021). Doctoral supervision as an academic practice and leader–member relationship: A critical approach to relationship dynamics. *International Journal of Management Education*, *19*(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100510

Varpio, L., Ajjawi, R., Monrouxe, L. v., O'Brien, B. C., & Rees, C. E. (2017). Shedding the cobra effect: Problematising thematic emergence, triangulation, saturation and member checking. *Medical Education*, *51*(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13124

Wagener, B. (2018). The importance of affects, self-regulation and relationships in the writing of a master's thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *23*(2), 227–242. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1379480

Walldén, R. (2019). *Genom genrens lins: pedagogisk kommunikation i tidigare skolår [Through the lens of genre: Pedagogic communication in primary school]*. (Diss.) Malmö universitet. https://doi.org/10.24834/2043/26799

Walldén, R. (2020). Communicating metaknowledge to L2 learners: A fragile scaffold for participation in subject-related discourse?. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, *20(1)*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2020.20.01.16

Wang, T., & Li, L. Y. (2011). "Tell me what to do" vs. "guide me through it": Feedback experiences of international doctoral students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *12*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787411402438

Wiryopranoto, S., Herlina, N., Marihandono, D., & Tangkilisan, Y. B. (2017). *Ki Hajar Dewantara: Pemikiran dan perjuangannya* (D. Marihandono, Ed.). Museum Kebangkitan Nasional.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Appendix 1
Participants

Table 2
Outlining the participants in this study

Supervisor name	Sex	Supervisor experience (yrs)	Degree of supervised students	Formal training experience	Discipline	Topic supervised
SU1	M	10	BA, MA	Very limited	French and English studies	Topics related to language policy, interculturality and language attitudes
SU2	F	15	BA, MA, PhD	Yes	Linguistic, English studies, English studies and Education	Teaching and learning academic writing, teaching grammar, reading strategies
SU3	M	3	BA, MA, PhD	Yes	English Education	Literature in Classroom, Creative Writing, Critical Pedagogy
SU4	M	20	BA, MA	Yes	English Literature, Media and Communication, Cultural Studies	Theoretically informed thematic analysis of a novel Genre analysis of a number of texts Conceptual (say, narrative) analysis of a computer game
SU5	M	22	BA, MA	Yes	English, Media and Communication, IMER (International migration and ethnic relations)	Projects about novels, poetry, & some form of cultural practice
IPTU1	F	10	BA	No	English Language Teaching	Reading, teaching practice, reflective practice
IPTU2	M	15	BA, MA	No	English Education	Teacher Professional Development (pre-service and in-service), Teacher

						Identity Construction, and EFL challenges and strategies
IPTU3	M	14	BA, MA	No	English Education and management	English learning Educational Management English literature
IPTU4	M	20	BA, MA	Yes	Linguistics, English education and sometimes literature	morphology (word-formation), syntactic analysis, and writing skills
IPTU5	M	10	BA	No	English language education and applied linguistics	Technology in language learning, student engagement, rhetorical moves
IPCU1	M	5	BA	No	English literature, English education	classroom action research, descriptive study on method implementation, textbook analysis
IPCU2	F	18	BA	No	Linguistics and Education	Speech Act, Error Analysis, Discourse Analysis
IPCU3	F	10	BA	No	Applied linguistics and Language Education	Error Analysis, Students' Perception, Language Learning
IPCU4	M	2	BA	No	English Education	Teaching Media, Learning Materials

Appendix 2
Interview protocol

1. **Introductory questions**
   - How are you doing?
   - What is your main activity this week?
2. **Content questions**

Supervisor practice:
- Could you please describe your supervision in general?
- What do you do?
- What do you comment on?
- How do you comment?
- Why do you choose to do it this way?
- How do you prepare it?

Supervisor experience:
- Could you share your previous pleasant experience in supervising?
- What was good? Why? How did you feel?
- Could you share your previous unpleasant experience in supervising?
- What was not good? Why? How did you feel?

Supervisor feeling:
- How does it feel to be a supervisor?
- Are you confident/interested/motivated/knowledgeable/prepared?
- Do you like supervising?
- What do you like about it/don't like about it?

3. **Probing questions for clarification**
- Tell me more…
- What do you mean…
- Could you please explain more on …