ABSTRACT

Interactions between supervisor and supervisee during consultation particularly in the postgraduate level are essential in the completion of a thesis or dissertation. In most interactions, both speakers; the supervisor and the supervisee assert their identities who they are. Such scenario has been an important phenomenon to examine how stance-taking and identity construction are portrayed. This research specifically examined 10 conversations between supervisors and supervisees during research consultations at the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The study combined the Stance Triangle and Model of Stance Marker as theoretical framework in analyzing the construction of identity between supervisors and supervisees. In addition, conversation analysis was used as an approach in analyzing the data. The findings of the study show that in supervisor-supervisee interaction certain stages are followed in the conversational structure. This study reveals that there are 6 stages in supervisor-supervisee interaction, such as, making follow-up, testing the knowledge of the supervisee, giving suggestion, seeking for clarification, giving recommendation and making conclusion. In every stage, it shows that different stance takings are used by both supervisors and supervisees. Furthermore, the study reveals that epistemic stance markers, textual stance markers, attitudinal stance markers and deontic stance markers are commonly used. In every stance that supervisors and supervisees take, they tend to position their identities. Such identities shift from one stage to another. Generally, the supervisors position themselves as mentor, expert, counselor, knowledgeable, controlling and responsible. On the other hand, supervisees position themselves as mentee, neophyte, counselee, learner, follower and grateful.

ABSTRAK

Interaksi antara penyelia dan supervisee semasa rundingan terutamanya dalam peringkat pengajian lepasan ijazah adalah penting dalam menyiapkan tesis atau disertasi . Dalam kebanyakan interaksi, kedua-dua penceramah; penyelia dan supervisee yang menegaskan identiti mereka siapa mereka. Senario seperti itu telah menjadi fenomena penting untuk mengkaji bagaimana pendirian pengambilan dan pembinaan identiti digambarkan . Kajian ini secara khusus examined10 perbualan antara penyelia dan pelajar pasca siswazah semasa perundingan di Universiti Malaya , Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Kajian ini digabungkan Segitiga Pendirian dan Model Stance Marker sebagai kerangka teori dalam menganalisis pembinaan identiti di antara penyelia dan supervisees . Di samping itu, analisis perbualan telah digunakan sebagai pendekatan dalam menganalisis data. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa interaksi penyelia supervisee berikut peringkat tertentu di dalam struktur perbualan. Kajian ini mendedahkan 6 peringkat dalam interaksi penyelia supervisee seperti membuat susulan, menguji pengetahuan supervisee , memberikan cadangan, mencari penjelasan, memberi cadangan dan membuat kesimpulan. Dalam setiap peringkat ia menunjukkan bahawa perolehan pendirian yang berbeza berlaku ini digambarkan oleh penanda pendirian yang digunakan oleh kedua-dua penyelia dan supervisees . Tambahan pula , kajian itu mendedahkan bahawa penanda epistemic pendirian , penanda pendirian teks , penanda pendirian sikap dan pendirian penanda deontic adalah penanda pendirian biasa digunakan. Dalam setiap pendirian penyelia dan supervisees mengambil mereka cenderung untuk meletakkan identiti mereka. Identiti itu beralih dari satu peringkat ke peringkat yang lain. Secara amnya, penyelia meletakkan diri mereka sebagai mentor, pakar,

kaunselor , berilmu , mengawal dan bertanggungjawab. Sebaliknya , supervisees diri mereka sendiri sebagai mentee, pemula , counselee , pelajar , pengikut dan bersyukur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest and warmest gratitude to Allah who gives me the patience and strength to finish this work, then to my dear supervisor Dr. Francisco Perlas Dumanig for his assistance, patience and continuous support throughout the writing of the thesis. I am so thankful for his guidance, insights, and friendliness which helped a lot in the completion of this thesis.

I would like to express my deep thanks to the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics and to all my lecturers who taught me various courses before venturing this research. I also thank all my friends and classmates in the English Department at the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, who provided me with insights, advice and support throughout my work. A special word of gratitude is also due to Dr. Kais Amir Kadhim, Rajaa Emad and Amal Mechraoui who motivated me to finish this research.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and indebtedness to all my family members especially to my parents who give me support and encouragement throughout my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	6
1.3 Research objectives	7
1.4 Research questions	7
1.5 Significance of the study	8
1.6 Scope and limitation of the study	9
1.7 Definition of terms	9
1.8 Conclusion	10
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Supervisors-supervisees relationship	11
2.2.1 Power and control in supervision	13

2.2.2 Working alliance 14

2.2.3 Supervisory experience 16

2.2.4 Conflict in supervision 18

2.3 Stance-taking 20

2.4 Modality 26

2.4.1 Epistemic modality as markers 27

2.4.2 Deontic modality as markers 30

2.5 Identity 31

2.6 Conclusion 35

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY 36

3.1 Introduction 36

3.2 Theoretical framework 36

3.2.1 Stance triangle 37

3.2.2 Stance markers 40

3.3 Conversation Analysis 42

3.3.1 Turn-taking 43

3.3.2 Adjacency pairs 46

3.4 Research design 46

3.4.1 Participants 47

3.4.2 Data 48

3.4.3 Data collection 49

3.4.4 Plan for analysis 52

3.5 Conclusion 55

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS 56

4.1 Introduction 56

4.2 Stages ofconversational structure in supervisor-supervisee Interaction 57

4.2.1 Making follow-up 57

4.2.2 Testing the knowledge of the supervisee 61

4.2.3 Giving suggestions 65

4.2.4 Seeking for clarification 69

4.2.5 Giving recommendations 72

4.2.6 Making conclusion 76

4.3 Stance-taking in supervisor-supervisee interaction 79

4.3.1 Stance markers in making follow-up 80

4.3.2 Stance Markers in testing the knowledge of the supervisee 81

4.3.3 Stance markers in giving suggestion 82

4.3.4 Stance markers in seeking for clarification 83

4.3.5 Stance markers in giving recommendation 84

4.3.6 Stance markers in making conclusion 85

4.3.7 Summary of occurrences of stance markers in supervisor-supervisee interaction 86

4.4 Stance-taking and identity construction in supervisor-supervisee Interaction 88

4.4.1 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in making follow-up 89

4.4.1.1 Supervisor as mentor and supervisee as mentee 89

4.4.2 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in testing the 93

konowledge of the supervisee

4.4.2.1 Supervisor as expert and supervisee as neophyte 93

4.4.3 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in giving suggestion 97

4.4.3.1 Supervisors asknowledgeable and supervisees as learners 98

4.4.4 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in seeking for clarification 101

4.4.4.1 Supervisor as counselor and supervisee as counselee 101

4.4.5 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in giving recommendation 105

4.4.5.1 Supervisor as controller and supervisee as follower 106

4.4.6 Identity of supervisor and supervisee in making conclusion 109

4.4.6.1 Supervisor as responsible and supervisee as grateful 109

4.5 Conclusion 112

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 114

5.1 Introduction 114

5.2 Summary of findings 114

5.2.1 What are the stages in conversation or conversational structure used in supervisor-supervisee interaction? 115

5.2.2 What are the types of stance taking used in every stage or conversational structure in supervisor-supervisee interaction? 116

5.2.3 What identity/identities do the supervisors and supervisees construct when they take a stance in conversation? 117

5.3 Conclusions 118

5.4 Recommendations 121

References 122

APPENDIX 1 132

APPENDIX 2 134

APPENDIX 3 337

APPENDIX 4 339

LIST OF TABLES

1. Table 4.1. Number of occurrences of stance markers in making follow-up 80
2. Table 4.2. Number of occurrences of stance markers in testing the knowledge of the supervisee 81
3. Table 4.3. Number of occurrences of stance markers in giving suggestion 83
4. Table 4.4. Number of occurrences of stance markers in seeking clarification 84
5. Table 4.5. Number of occurrences of stance markers in giving suggestion 85
6. Table 4.6. Number of occurrences of stance markers in making conclusion 86
7. Table 4.7. Summary of occurrences of stance markers in supervisor-supervisee interaction 87

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Figure 3.1: Stance Triangle 39
2. Figure 3.2: Data collection procedure 51
3. Figure 3.3: Procedure of analysis 54
4. Figure 4.1 Stance Triangle in making follow-up 92
5. Figure 4.2 Stance Triangle in testing the knowledge of the supervisee 97
6. Figure 4.3 Stance Triangle in giving suggestion 101
7. Figure 4.4 Stance Triangle in seeking for clarification 105
8. Figure 4.5 Stance Triangle in giving recommandetion 108
9. Figure 4.6 Stance Triangle in making conclusion 112