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WELCOME TO THE SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS – PROFESSOR RICHARD SAKWA, HEAD OF SCHOOL

The School of Politics and International Relations at Kent (SPIR) was one of the founding departments of the University when it was established in 1965. On the Canterbury campus it now has some 570 undergraduate and about 100 postgraduate students, 30 members of staff, a dozen graduate teaching assistants and at times visiting fellows from around the world. The School offers a very wide range of programmes and modules, all of which are research-led and taught by active researchers presenting the cutting edge of work in their fields. Our focus is on Politics, Political Thought and International Relations, but much of what we do is inter-disciplinary in character. This is reflected in the close links that we enjoy with other Schools in the University, including the provision of joint Masters programmes.

The University of Kent proudly claims to be Britain’s European university, and the school makes a full contribution to this role. On campus, and especially in the school, you will find a large number of students drawn from the continent. They are joined by students from all parts of the world who work and relax together in a variety of campus clubs and associations. The teaching staff, too, is very cosmopolitan, with academics from Belarus, Britain, Canada, China, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Nigeria, Norway, Turkey and the USA, joined periodically by Visiting Fellows from around the world. We aim to deliver the best of British academic life in a European and international context.

The School has five members of staff at the Brussels School for International Studies, part of the University of Kent campus in Brussels (UKB) where over 100 postgraduate students take MA and PhD degrees. In addition, we enjoy links and exchange programmes with universities across Europe and in the USA and Russia. We have recently introduced double award two-year MA programmes, which give students the opportunity to study a year in Canterbury and a year in a partner institution abroad. There is a vibrant postgraduate Research School in Politics and International Relations, which offers excellent opportunities for PhD research for those who wish to continue after completing their MA.

The School has a strong tradition in teaching and research in Politics, Political Thought, International Relations and International Conflict Analysis. The main research and teaching interests of staff lie in the fields of political philosophy; politics, democracy and governance; area studies; international relations and international organisations; international conflict analysis; European integration and enlargement; and international political economy and the politics of the environment. We can offer a very wide range of expertise on different areas of the world, with specialists in European governance and in the politics of a number of European countries (France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Eastern Europe in general, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom), the domestic and international politics of the United States, Latin America and Africa, and in East Asian politics, including China and Japan.

Our work at all levels is now organised around three research and teaching groups: Conflict, Security and Human Rights; Comparative Politics; and Political and Social Thought. We encourage our research students from the very beginning to affiliate themselves with the work of one or more of these groups. The best way to do this is to attend our School of Politics and International Relations Research Seminar (SPIRRS), which invites leading experts from outside to present their work in an interactive format. Our research takes place within the framework of the three research and teaching groups, but we also have four research centres: the Conflict Analysis Research Centre, a world-leading centre for conflict studies; a unique Centre for Federal Studies, the only one of its kind in the UK; the recently-established Global Europe Centre, whose focus is on the interaction between domestic EU normative and political development and international politics; and the Centre for Critical Thought, a transdisciplinary platform for contemporary theoretical research. These centres and groups are responsible for inviting guests to our Public Speaker Programme (PSP), which you are warmly invited to attend.

We seek to provide a stimulating environment for students to develop their intellectual talents and academic skills. We offer a wide range of programmes and modules, a varied visiting speaker and research seminar programme and a supportive learning environment. We enjoy it and we hope that you will too. Welcome!
WELCOME FROM THE DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE STUDIES (RESEARCH)

Dr Iain Mackenzie, Director of Graduate Studies, Post-Graduate Research (PGR)

It is a pleasure to welcome you to the Research School within the School of Politics and International Relations at the University of Kent. We are a vibrant community of researchers, a community of which we are very proud. We are all engaged in, and committed to, our individual research, but we also understand the importance of supporting each other in our research endeavours. The right support at the right time can make a crucial difference to our work. To that end, at the core of our research community are the Graduate Research and Training Seminars (GRTS) and the School Research Seminar Series. At GRTS, we read and comment on each other’s work in a spirit that is both supportive and challenging. Staff and students attend, and the discussions of student papers prove to be an excellent way for all of us to sharpen our own research skills and thinking. The fortnightly School Research Seminar Series allows established academics in the field to come and present their work at Kent, and for academic staff members to also present research that is near to completion to colleagues. All research students and staff attend the Seminar Series which is a further forum for all of us to engage with each other’s work.

This handbook is intended to explain in some detail how our postgraduate research programmes run. It explains the different research degrees that we offer and then outlines the various steps research students take from submitting an application to submitting their dissertation for examination. Research students are required to present their work periodically at the Graduate Research and Training Seminars; this handbook explains how frequently, and what format the presentation of work should take. The handbook also provides information about the other research activities going on in the School, including through the School Research Seminar Series and the School’s research groups. It is our intention for all research students to be affiliated with at least one of the research groups and get involved in its research activities. Other sections of the handbook provide details on a range of other training opportunities available to you through the School, the Faculty of Social Sciences, the Graduate School, the University, and the ESRC’s Southeast Doctoral Training Centre. You will find various references to web links and telephone numbers for important services that will help you navigate your early days in the School.

We aim to provide a research environment that encourages and helps students to achieve their potential. Your feedback is essential for helping us maintain and improve this environment. Once every year you will be asked to take part in the University’s postgraduate research student survey, which will ask you questions about the quality of supervision you have received, the quality and availability of learning resources on campus, and other aspects of your student experience at Kent. In addition to these questionnaires, there are numerous informal opportunities for you to tell us about your experience by talking to your supervisors, to your student representatives, or to me.

For every query you have or problem you may face, there will always be someone in the School or University to help. Many of the answers to your questions can be found in this handbook. Your supervisors should be your first port of call for any concerns you have, and if any concern cannot be addressed or resolved by them, please do not hesitate to contact me.

We very much look forward to working with you.
RESEARCH PROGRAMMES

Research programmes are offered in different shapes and sizes. The underlying principle is always the same: research students work on a topic of their choice with the help of a supervisor or supervisory panel and produce a written document – the thesis or dissertation – which they submit at the end of their work. The thesis is then examined, which for PhD students involves an oral examination known as the ‘viva’ (viva voce examination – *viva voce* is Latin for ‘by live voice’). All research programmes require students to work independently and to demonstrate self-direction in tackling and solving problems; they are also expected to attend the relevant research seminars (see below). But the amount of time that it takes students to write their dissertations, the length of the dissertation, and the requirements and expectations that students have to meet differ for the various degrees on offer.

Master of Arts (MA) by Research and Thesis

The shortest research degree available is the MA by Research and Thesis, which is a one-year programme if taken on a full-time basis (see below for an explanation of the difference between full-time and part-time studies). MA by Research and Thesis students have to write a dissertation of up to 40,000 words. A successful MA dissertation will normally provide an ordered and critical exposition of existing knowledge at the forefront of the relevant research area; it will demonstrate that its author has a systematic understanding of the relevant subject and that she or he is able to situate the research within a wider field of knowledge. The dissertation should also provide evidence that its author is able to deal with complex issues, to present arguments that are supported by reasoning and evidence, and to communicate conclusions clearly and effectively. Although relatively short, the MA dissertation should form an integrated whole, with an introduction and a conclusion, i.e. with a beginning and an end. It should clearly articulate its purpose and research question(s), and it should explain how it will go about answering its questions.

Master of Philosophy (MPhil)

The MPhil is a two-year programme (if taken on a full-time basis), and the MPhil dissertation is normally longer than the MA dissertation but should not have more than 56,000 words. A successful MPhil dissertation has to meet the same criteria as a dissertation written for the MA by Research and Thesis. In addition, it will normally provide a more comprehensive and thorough overview of the relevant area of research. Given that the MPhil dissertation gives students almost 50% more space and time to develop their ideas compared to an MA dissertation, MPhil students are also expected to reach higher degrees of specialisation in their research. The research questions posed by MPhil students will thus bring them even closer to the forefront of their chosen research area. The longer dissertation will allow them to incorporate more material – which therefore has to be more carefully structured – and to offer a more substantial analysis. They will be able to devote more space to questions of method and research design.

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

The PhD remains the ‘flagship programme’ among the research degrees. If taken on a full-time basis (see below for an explanation of this term), the PhD registration is for four years. It is the University’s expectation that students will aim to submit their thesis at the end of the first three years. They may be permitted to enter the fourth year if further time is needed for writing up. A successful PhD
candidate will normally have to fulfil all the requirements that MPhil candidates have to fulfil; in addition, they have to provide evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline and merit publication (possibly in a revised form). There is thus a considerable difference between the MPhil and the PhD. A PhD dissertation will normally make an original contribution to the relevant academic discipline and will therefore be publishable. In order to achieve this goal, PhD candidates are given more time (three years as full-time students) and more space – a PhD dissertation should be between 80,000 and 100,000 words. It must not be longer than 100,000 words. Writing a PhD dissertation over a period of three years is a considerable challenge as it requires independence and self-direction, research skills, creativity and the ability to listen to advisors, a considerable degree of discipline, careful time management, and the flexibility and adaptability necessary to deal with unforeseen problems.

As part of the examination process, PhD students have to attend an oral exam, in which they have to ‘defend’ their dissertation. This exam is known as the ‘viva’ – the *viva voce* (‘by live voice’) examination. After a careful reading of the thesis, the examiners will explore and discuss the various aspects of the thesis with the candidate; they will normally focus on areas they have identified as weaknesses, e.g. unsound reasoning, methodological flaws, omissions and gaps in empirical research etc. It is not uncommon that the viva is a decisive element in the examination process. Many examiners make the final outcome of the examination process dependent on the candidate’s performance during the viva. Further details of the examination process are discussed below in the section ‘How does a research programme work?’

**Compulsory Research Training**

All new research students starting their programmes in September 2013 or later are expected to attend and pass the following modules:

- **PO825 Philosophy and Methodology of Politics and International Relations**  
  Convenor: Dr Seán Molloy  
  Autumn term: Lecture - Mondays, 15.00-16.00, MarLT1  
  Seminars – Mondays 16.00-17.00, 17.00-18.00; Tuesdays 11.00-12.00, 13.00-14.00.  
  (sign up to attend one seminar group).

- **PO8100 Quantitative Methodology for Political Science**  
  Convenor: Dr Matt Loveless  
  Spring term: Lecture - Thursdays, 09:00-10:00, room TBC  
  Terminal: Thursdays, 10:00-11:00, room TBC

Passing these modules is normally a pre-condition for progression into the second year of registration for full-time students, and the third year of registration for part-time students.

If students have already completed equivalent research training as part of a previous degree programme, they may be exempt from this requirement. If you think this is the case, please discuss this with the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR).

Further details about the modules – module contents, assignments – can be found in the module outline, which will be available at the beginning of term in which the modules are taught.
Word counts

The word limits given above may be taken as excluding bibliographies, appendices, tables and footnotes/endnotes. However, candidates are strongly discouraged from using long, discursive footnotes/endnotes in order to incorporate material that they were unable to include without exceeding the relevant word limit. As explained above, the ability to communicate findings and to appropriately organise and present research is an essential criterion for the award of the degree. Conciseness of presentation is an integral part of this ability.

Subjects

The MA by Research and Thesis, the MPhil and the PhD can all be taken in the following subject areas: Comparative Politics, Political and Social Thought, International Relations, and International Conflict Analysis.

Part-time and Full-time studies

Students can choose between two different ‘modes’ of study: full-time and part-time. The ‘full-time’ mode assumes you can devote most of your time, i.e. a full working week, to your programme of study. If you study on a part-time basis, you will be given more time to complete your programme, allowing you to study at your own pace.

Registration times for each degree programme type on a full-time and part-time basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme type</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA by Research and Thesis</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>3 years (maximum 4)</td>
<td>5 years (maximum 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a candidate has many non-academic commitments, the part-time mode of study may be more suitable. Moreover, part-time students normally pay half of the full-time tuition fees. Given that the part-time degrees take longer, the overall costs are still similar to a full-time programme, but studying part-time helps to spread these costs over a longer period. Part-time students are required to attend the course on a pro rata basis. For example, where full-time students are required to attend the Graduate Research and Training Seminar (GRTS, see below) every week, part-time students have to attend half as many seminars. Similarly, part-time students would normally be entitled to half as many supervision sessions per term as full-time students (more on supervision below).

External Candidature

In very (!) exceptional circumstances we may consider offering a place on the MA, MPhil or PhD on the basis of external candidature, which means that the candidate does not have to meet the standard residence requirements (see below). We normally consider applications for external candidature only in cases where the need to study away from Canterbury is closely related to the research project, e.g. when someone working for UNHCR in Geneva wants to do research on the UNHCR. Moreover, the candidates will have to demonstrate that they have adequate access to the relevant learning resources (libraries) and to email in order to stay in contact with the members of the supervisory panel; they must also show that their training needs can be met
without being able to attend classes on the Canterbury campus. External candidates are expected to attend supervision sessions in Canterbury with some regularity, at least twice a year. External students who wish to upgrade would also have to attend their upgrade sessions in Canterbury. External candidature is a complex arrangement that should only be considered in very exceptional cases as it is difficult for both candidate and supervisor to sustain an appropriate level supervision over long distances.

**Changing your registration during your studies**

Research students can apply for a change from part-time to full-time mode of study at any point during their programme. The Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) may allow students to transfer from full-time to part-time and vice versa, provided he/she is satisfied that the candidate will be able to complete the degree satisfactorily in the new format. Students can also switch to external candidature during their studies provided that the conditions mentioned above are met. Depending on the concrete circumstances and how long a student has been registered for a particular type of programme, it may be possible to switch to a shorter type of programme, e.g. from the PhD to the MPhil, or from the MPhil to the MA, or to a more advanced programme, e.g. from MA by Research to PhD. If you wish to be considered for a more advanced programme, your case will be evaluated as part of your End of Year Review by your supervisors and the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). If you are the recipient of a scholarship or stipend, you must first check with your sponsor that they approve the proposed change in your registration before proceeding with your application.

**What programme is the right one for me?**

The variety of available programmes and options can be confusing at first. If in doubt, please feel free to discuss your situation with your supervisors or, if you are thinking about applying, with the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). When you decide what programme you wish to apply for, you should consider the following questions: What subject area does my research belong to (Comparative Politics, Political and Social Thought, International Relations or International Conflict Analysis)? For how long do I want to/can I afford to study and what degree do I wish to obtain at the end of my studies? (MA, MPhil, PhD)? Do my other commitments allow me to study full-time?
HOW DOES A ‘RESEARCH PROGRAMME’ WORK?

Admissions

Applying for a place on one of our research programmes could not be easier. You can apply online at
http://www.kent.ac.uk/studying/postgrad/apply/index.html
You should mention in your email that you are interested in applying for a postgraduate research programme. During the application process you will be asked to give your personal details (name, address, date of birth, academic background, English language qualifications etc) as well as the names of two academic referees. We would normally expect your letters of reference to come from the last academic institution you attended but depending on the circumstances we may also consider professional references. All applications are assessed on an individual basis, and we will always try to take your personal circumstances into account. In addition to the application form, you will also need to submit supporting documents such as transcripts, which provide evidence of your academic qualifications and your English language qualifications. Please note that it is your responsibility to ensure that your referees send their references to us. We receive in excess of 100 applications each year and we simply do not have the staff to chase your referees. If your file is still incomplete two months after submitting the initial application form – e.g. because your referees failed to send in their references – we have no choice but to reject your application.

Minimum entry requirements

Students who want to do a research degree must normally have a first or upper second class honours BA degree in a relevant or appropriate subject, or the equivalent. It is important to stress, however, that this is a minimum entry requirement. When considering applications for the MA by Research and Thesis, we would normally look not only for good grades but also for evidence of the independent learning skills that are essential for research programmes. For example, good results in an undergraduate dissertation course will be an advantage. We would normally expect applicants for the MPhil/PhD to have some postgraduate experience from e.g. taught MA, MSc or LLM courses unless there is strong evidence of independent research skills in their undergraduate transcripts. If in doubt, you may wish to discuss your qualifications with the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) prior to submitting an application. In exceptional cases, relevant professional experience may compensate for missing academic qualifications.

The University requires all non-native speakers of English to reach a minimum standard of proficiency in written and spoken English before beginning a postgraduate degree. We accept the following qualifications as evidence of proficiency in written and spoken English:

- International English Language Test (IELTS) 6.5 with a minimum of 6.0 in reading and writing
- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) paper-based 600 including 4.0 in writing/Test of Written English
- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) computer-based 250 including 4.0 in writing/Test of Written English
- Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) internet-based 90 including 20 in writing/Test of Written English and 20 in reading
- ‘C’ in the Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency in English
- ‘B’ in the Cambridge Advanced Certificate in English
The research proposal

Your research proposal is perhaps the most important part of your application. In your proposal you need to explain the research that you wish to do if admitted to the programme. The proposal should outline your key research question(s); it should indicate what methods you intend to use in order to answer those questions. Particularly for PhD applications, the proposal should also explain in what ways your work, when completed, would make an original contribution to the research field in question. It should clearly explain what the puzzle is at the heart of the proposed research. It should explain what is interesting about this puzzle, and should identify the ways in which existing academic literature has not adequately solved the puzzle. In other words, your research question and proposed project need to be situated within existing academic debate and relevant literature. Your proposal should also include a preliminary bibliography of works you intend to consult in your research. Please note that we cannot assist you in writing this proposal because (a) we do not have the staff to supervise hundreds of ‘potential’ students in addition to our current research students and, more importantly, because (b) the ability to write a persuasive, solid proposal is a crucial admissions criterion. You should spend some time and thought on your proposal as we will read it as a true reflection of your research skills. We understand, of course, that when writing the proposal you are still at the beginning of the project, and there will be much in your proposal that is vague, conjectural and provisional. We also understand that your research skills will develop as you work on your project. However, it is still very important for us to know how prepared you are to conduct the proposed research, and your proposal will help us assess the degree of your preparation. Your research questions should be clear and specific; you should have some understanding of research methods in political science or cognate subjects and you should have some idea of how these methods may help you answer your research questions. Your proposal should be approximately 1,000 to 1,500 words in length.

Admissions criteria

For the assessment of applications we normally use three main criteria: 1) the academic and/or professional background of the applicant as evidenced in transcripts, references and/or employment history; 2) the quality and originality of the research proposal; 3) our ability to provide expert supervision in the relevant research area. We must stress again that we look at each individual application on a case-by-case basis and assess in each case whether we can help the applicant to obtain the degree s/he is applying for. It is not uncommon that we reject high quality applications because our staffing situation at the time of receiving the application does not allow us to offer expert supervision in the applicant’s chosen area of research. We also have a policy that academic staff should normally not supervise more than SIX research students at a time. This policy was introduced in order to protect both staff and students. After all, research supervision is only one aspect of academic work. If academics are too busy supervising large numbers of research students, they will struggle to sustain their own research. In turn, if your supervisor supervises too many students, chances are that she or he will have very little time for you because you have to share the limited time that your supervisor has for supervision with your peers. As a result of this policy, we sometimes have to reject high quality applications because the colleagues who could supervise the relevant projects already supervise the maximum number (6) of students. Sometimes, if an application does not answer all our questions, we may ask applicants to attend an interview or to submit writing samples.

What will happen after I send off my application?

The admissions office will collect all your material in a file, which will be sent to the School’s Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) who is responsible for processing the applications.
After an initial assessment, if the applicant meets our entry criteria, the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) will send the research proposals to colleagues who work in the relevant research area. These colleagues will then review the proposal and report back, indicating whether or not they would be willing to supervise the proposed project. If all the entry conditions are met and if a supervisor can be found, the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) will complete the paperwork and recommend that an offer be made to the applicant. The application file will then be returned to our colleagues in the Admissions Office, who will send out the official offer letter. Please note that, technically, the final decision is with the Admissions Office, not with the School, but in practice the Admissions staff will normally simply follow our recommendation. If the application fails at the initial stage of assessment or if no supervisor can be found, the application will be rejected. We normally do not give feedback on rejected applications. Please note that submitting an application does not entail any obligations on your part; if we offer you a place, you are still free to decline it. However, submitting an application is the most efficient way of initiating the process whereby we evaluate your project and look for potential supervisors. If in doubt, apply!

Supervision

Each research student in the School has a supervisory panel with three members: the main supervisor, the second supervisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR), who is ex officio a member of all supervision panels in the School. NB The role of the Director of Graduate Studies on the panel is NOT to provide supervision on your on-going work (unless you are one of her/his own research students). Rather, her/his role is to ensure that appropriate supervision arrangements are in place, and that those arrangements are working properly. (S)he also oversees the monitoring of your progress at various stages during your registration. (S)he can advise you on the technical aspects of the programme you are on, e.g. monitoring, progression, submission. Finally, (s)he is there to arbitrate if problems arise between you and your supervisors. Please note that changes of the supervision arrangements have to be approved by the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR).

The main supervisor

Throughout your time at Kent, your main supervisor is your most important contact. You should meet with your main supervisor as early as possible after your arrival on campus. You should discuss your project with her/him and agree on a work plan at least for the first year of your programme. For almost everything you wish to do as part of your degree, you will need your supervisor’s support. It is crucial for the success of your studies that you have a good working relationship with your supervisor. Your supervisor should read your work and give feedback, discuss any training needs, advise you on training opportunities, attend your GRTS presentations, help prepare you for the end of first year review, discuss with you any feedback you receive in your GRTS sessions, advise you on the steps you need to take in order to get your thesis ready for submission, decide with you on the proper timing of submission, and prepare you for the viva.

University regulations require first supervisors to meet with research students for substantive supervision at least once per month and that these meetings are logged on the Student Data System (SDS). Substantive supervision may be concentrated into term time, and where necessary, may occur by telephone/skype.

Regarding the reading of work, first supervisors should regularly read and provide substantive feedback on the student's work. The School's commitment is that such substantive feedback will be given within two weeks of receiving the work. In exceptional circumstances, such as when a colleague is on annual leave or on a field work visit, then the delay should be explained to the student, and feedback should still be given within a reasonable time frame. If the student is nearing the end of their
registration and supervisors are reading the whole thesis, then there are grounds here for taking longer than the normal two week period. At other stages though, such as reading the upgrade materials or end of year review materials, colleagues should be endeavouring to read and provide feedback on work within two weeks, unless there are very good grounds for a delay.

The second supervisor

The second member of your supervisory panel is available for consultation but compared to the role of the main supervisor, (s)he is normally much less involved in your project. Especially for projects that touch on more than one research area, it can be important that students have more than one academic involved in their work. But the main work has to be done between you and your main supervisor; you and your main supervisor have to take the key decisions about the overall direction of your research.

The School’s expectation is that second supervisors will meet with their supervisees minimally once per term. Once per term, first and second supervisors should see their student together. At a minimum, therefore, second supervisors should attend one meeting per term with both the first supervisor and student. This is to ensure that supervisors and student have a shared understanding of the direction the student’s project is taking. Second supervisors can also meet supervisees separately, in addition to this joint termly meeting.

Second supervisors are expected to read work periodically, although not as frequently as first supervisors. Certainly they should be reading work at key moments in the process (upgrade - for students on the old system, end of year review - for students on the new system, submission review), and occasionally, polished drafts of chapters, especially when these fall within the second supervisor’s area of expertise.

The second supervisor will normally also be available as a ‘back up’ supervisor in case your main supervisor is unable to look after your research for longer periods of time, e.g. during study leave periods or illness.

Where colleagues are co-supervising, they share the workload equally, both in terms of meeting with students and reading and commenting on the work. They should also see the student together at least once per term.

The work that academics are doing as supervisors is fully recognised in the School’s ‘Work Allocation Model’ (WAM). The WAM is a points system that awards points for every job that is being done in the School. In order to be able to compare the amount of work the main supervisor and the second supervisor are investing in the supervision, it may be helpful to note that main supervisors receive 2.5 times as many points as second supervisors.

In some cases, there may be good reason for both your supervisors to ‘co-supervise’ you, particularly if both of them work on research that is highly relevant to your project. The Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) will be able to help you determine whether you should have a first and second supervisor, or whether your two supervisors should share the workload equally.

The Director of Graduate Studies (PGR)

The School of Politics and International Relations has two Directors of Graduate Studies – one dealing with postgraduate taught programmes (PGT), and one dealing with postgraduate research programmes (PGR). The Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) is the Director of the Research School.
The University’s Code of Practice for Research Programmes can be found at:
http://www.kent.ac.uk/uelt/quality/rescode2005/index.html
Sections 4 and 5 refer to the responsibilities of supervisors and the frequency of supervision meetings.

**Supervisory meetings**

At Kent, you are required to make a record of your supervisory discussions at least every four weeks during the year. This may be a record of a meeting, a telephone conversion or emails you have exchanged with your supervisor. It will be your responsibility to complete the record and the responsibility of your main supervisor to provide any clarification and to sign it off. The record will cover the following areas:

- Progress since the last meeting
- Points discussed at the meeting
- Work agreed

Records of supervisory meetings are important as they provide a useful aide memoire for you and your supervisory team. These records also provide an evidence trail of your supervision to date which can be used at progression reviews. From the 2012-13 academic year supervisory meetings will be recorded on the student data system and postgraduate researchers will be sent reminders to complete this record on a monthly basis. These monthly records are a way of ensuring that you and your supervisor are clear about your progress and the steps that should be taken to progress your research. They do not need to be in perfect prose, nor should they take very long to complete. You are simply asked to keep a record of what has been discussed and what needs to be done next. These brief records provide an opportunity for clarification that might not arise during conversation and help to demonstrate the progress you are making.

**What can I reasonably expect my supervisors to do for me?**

There is a growing literature for research students on how to ‘survive your dissertation’. Most of these well-meaning books (see below for references) devote a few pages to the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. The following guidelines are largely based on Gina Wisker’s *The Postgraduate Research Handbook*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp.36-38, but they have been adjusted to reflect the specific situation of Politics and International Relations students and staff at Kent.

You can expect your supervisor:

- To supervise. Your supervisor should provide guidance on how to structure your work, and on the scope of your work; he or she should be able to advise you on questions of methodology. Your supervisor should also warn you if your work goes off course, seems misguided, becomes too adventurous, too esoteric, too enormous in scope, and generally when things seem to go wrong. Clearly, supervisors cannot give this kind of guidance without seeing and discussing the work in progress. In other words, there must be written material – chapter breakdowns, chapter drafts, outlines etc. – on which such guidance must be based. If you do not produce this material, your supervisor will not be able to help you. At some point, therefore, the talking needs to stop and the writing needs to be done, and the writing has to be done by you. Supervision tends to be re-active rather than pro-active, which means that supervisors respond, when asked, to the work that you have done or to questions that you have asked. Don’t wait for your supervisors to take the initiative. It is your project, not theirs.
To read your work carefully. Supervisors will need time to read your work carefully, but they should still acknowledge receipt of the work and they should set a date and time for a meeting to discuss the work soon after receiving it. When submitting work to your supervisors (papers and draft chapters are usually sent as email attachments) you should make it very clear in what areas you would like advice and comment. Please note that supervisors need to fit both the careful reading of your work and the meeting into their busy schedules. Try to work around this fact by working on other aspects of your project while you are waiting for feedback on the submitted work. It is not uncommon that supervisors need two weeks to carefully read a chapter; in difficult but rare circumstances, it may take even longer. When you submit longer pieces of work, e.g. the first complete draft of your thesis, it is crucial that your supervisor knows about this in advance so that she or he can plan ahead and allocate some time to reading your work. This is important especially for the late stages of your work as you are preparing the thesis for submission and as strict deadlines are looming.

To be available when needed. You and your supervisor need to mutually plan regular supervision sessions. In between those sessions, students should be able to consult their supervisors through office hours and by email or phone. Some supervisors in the School have special office hours for research students. In order to be able to plan meetings and supervision, you and your supervisor need to know when and how you will be available. If your supervisor plans to be away from campus for a longer period of time, perhaps in order to do fieldwork or attend conferences, he or she should let you know in advance; but the same applies to you: if you plan to be away for longer periods, you should let your supervisor know.

To be friendly, open and supportive. A good supervisor will not only give good academic advice, but he or she will also be able to establish and sustain a consultative, supportive relationship with his or her research students.

To be constructively critical. Students can expect praise and encouragement where appropriate and relevant; but they should also expect their supervisors to be critical of their work where necessary. Criticism should be toned to the constructive rather than the harsh, because the aim of all criticism is to enable change. Generally, whether critical or positive, feedback should always be helpful. As your work progresses, you should endeavour to become more autonomous and independent as your own judgement becomes more and more based on knowledge and understanding.

To have a good understanding of your research area. Your supervisor may not always be a specialist on your exact topic but if his or her specialism is related, he or she should still be able to provide effective supervision.

To structure the supervision. The supervisor should be able to create a structure for supervision that makes it easy to exchange ideas. In order to encourage students to talk openly about their research, supervisors should not always be in ‘judgment’ mode; there should be space to explore and ‘play’ with ideas.

To have sufficient interest in your research. Supervisors should be genuinely interested in your research in order to be able to refer you to relevant readings, resources and contacts.

To encourage you to attend appropriate conferences, to introduce you to others working in his or her field, and to discuss opportunities for publishing parts of your work (see also below). However, the desire to publish your work should not distract you from the work itself.

To advise you as you try to publish your thesis after a successful submission, to write references for job applications and to give advice on jobs sought.

Supervision styles should also change as your project develops. You will need more help at the beginning, in order to get your project started, and then again at the end, as you get ready for submission. Thus, depending on the stage of your work, you will need different kinds of support. The following guidelines are again adapted from Gina Wisker’s book (pp.38-40):
• At the beginning of your programme, your supervisor should help you define and clarify a working title for your work; he or she should suggest and evaluate proposed methods. He or she should also establish whether you have the necessary skills and knowledge to carry out the proposed research or whether additional training is necessary (see Training Needs Analysis below). The supervision should help you shape initial ideas, refine and define the field, method, scope and nature of the research. Your supervisor should help you set realistic goals and hopes, refer you to reading and interesting contacts, encourage you to start writing early, to make plans and outlines, and to review and refine such outlines. You and your supervisor may also agree on a set of ‘ground rules’ for the supervision in order to set up a pattern which helps coordinate the expectations that you have of each other. Your supervisor may also put you in touch with other research students he or she is supervising and generally help create useful learning situations for you.

• During the ‘middle stages of your project, your supervisor should certainly stay in touch but should not over-intrude unless necessary. She or he should encourage discussions that help you to think through the implications of your ideas, to conceptualise your ideas, and to bring out and articulate the assumptions underlying your ideas. Your supervisor should teach you the ‘craft of research’, which includes ethical decision-making, conceptual clarity, rigour and precision, setting realistic goals and timeframes, producing a well-argued, well-supported thesis. You can also expect your supervisor to read your work thoroughly, to consider your questions as well as the questions that you should be asking, to help tease out difficult issues and problems, and to be constructive throughout. Your supervisor should help you gain independence and autonomy in your research because, in the end, you (and not your supervisor) will have to defend the work! Your supervisor should also try to help with any crisis situation that you may face during your project.

• As you are getting closer to submission, your supervisor should encourage you to keep writing, to edit and polish your writing. She or he should look at the ‘final’ version of the thesis and either give the green light for submission or suggest further changes. Your supervisor should help you prepare for the viva and help you think beyond the viva towards further research and/or professional development.

What should I NOT expect from my supervisors?

While we do our best to create an environment in which you and your research can develop, you remain responsible for the final product, for the dissertation. Please remember at all times that you are doing your work; you are not working for your supervisor. There is sometimes a danger that supervisors impose their own research interests on those who work with them, and you should be aware of this danger. While you should carefully consider the advice you are given, you should not allow others to take control of your project. Supervisors cannot be expected to do the work for you, to write chapters or even parts of chapters for you, to proofread your work and correct your spelling and grammar, to edit the final or any previous versions of your thesis. Supervisors are not copy-editors. The important point here is not, however, that supervisors are not allowed to do the work for you; rather, the important point to remember is that letting them do the work, even if they were allowed to, would not be in your interest.

Could one of my supervisors come from a different department/school/University?

Yes, in exceptional circumstances it may be helpful to invite academics from other schools/universities to join your supervisory panel. However, your main supervisor must be from the School of Politics and International Relations at Kent, because you are registered as one of our research students. The ‘external’ supervisor could be the ‘second supervisor’ on your panel or, if appropriate, could become a ‘co-supervisor’, which means that she or he equally shares the
supervision work with your main supervisor. If the ‘co-supervisor’ comes from another School at the University of Kent, joint supervision means that the fees you pay are split between the two schools involved. Such joint supervision arrangements work well for some students; but it can be confusing for others. If the second supervisor comes from a different university, he or she can normally not expect to be paid for the supervision. If there are good reasons for inviting an academic from outside our School onto your supervisory panel, you and/or your supervisor should contact the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). If the academic is not from the University of Kent, the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) will ask him or her to submit a CV as evidence that she/he has the required qualifications and seniority.

**Can the supervision arrangements be changed during my programme?**

Yes. Please note that frequent changes are not good for progress. Continuity of supervision – ‘stability’ – is important for research to progress effectively. There may be situations, however, when a change is advisable. Both students and supervisors may suggest such changes by contacting the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). Please note, our offer of a place was based on a particular research proposal, and depending on the research area in question and our current staffing situation, it may sometimes be difficult to find an alternative supervisor with relevant expertise.

**Jointly supervised projects**

In some cases it may be appropriate to depart from our normal division of labour between ‘main’ and ‘second’ supervisor and to consider both of them ‘co-supervisors’. When you first arrive, the arrangements tend to be somewhat flexible as you are finding your feet. After some time, however, a clear pattern of supervision should emerge. If at that point you feel that your ‘second’ supervisor continues to be just as important as your main supervisor, your panel should consider turning this into a ‘co-supervision’ arrangement, which would give both your supervisors equal recognition of their work within the School’s Work Allocation Model (WAM). Co-supervision arrangements can be very beneficial and creative for some students, but it can also be confusing if, for example, the two supervisors disagree on a particular aspect of your work. In fact, there are some supervisors in the School who will not agree to be part of co-supervision arrangements as lines of communication and degrees of responsibilities can become quite complex.

**Researcher Development Programme**

The Graduate School coordinates the Researcher Development Programme for Postgraduate Researchers. The Researcher Development Programme is designed to equip research students and postdoctoral researchers with a full range of skills which will improve their effectiveness as researchers, and ensure that they are not only highly qualified but employable in a variety of careers by the end of their research project. All training is mapped to the national Researcher Development Framework. Further information about the Researcher Development Programme is available on the Graduate School Website at: [www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/skills/programmes/tstindex.html](http://www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/skills/programmes/tstindex.html). Postgraduate researchers should ensure that they obtain a copy of the Researcher Development Programme Handbook and register with the online booking system at: bloom.kent.ac.uk. The handbook provides postgraduate researchers with detailed information about the programme including the trainers, workshops and links to useful resources.

All new PhD students should attend a Researcher Development Assessment Workshop which will introduce them to the Researcher Development Assessment.
Completion of a Researcher Development Assessment via the online booking system is a requirement for successful completion of the probation review for PhD students (which is undertaken at 10 months for FT PhD students and 12 months for PT PhD students) – further information is available in Annex K (Progression and Examination) and Annex P (Researcher Development Programme) of the Code of Practice for Quality Assurance for Research Programmes of Study at www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/?tab=researchprogrammes

Progress reviews

Students and supervisors are required to complete regular written reports on their progress. The progress review process at Kent distinguishes several key review stages, and there is a form that needs to be completed for each review stage. A few weeks before a report is due, both you and your supervisor(s) will be notified and sent the relevant form. You must then get in touch with your supervisor in order to have your progress reviewed as explained on the form. You can also download the relevant forms from the ‘Procedures for Research’ section on the University’s Code of Practice website:
http://www.kent.ac.uk/ult/quality/rescode2005/index.html

The various review stages of the PhD programme are defined as follows:

- **The Initial Meeting**
  Main supervisors should hold an initial meeting with their research students within the first two weeks of registration to set out what will be required to have been completed by the end of the induction period.

- **The Induction Review**
  For full-time students this should be completed within 6 weeks of registration, and for part-time students within 12 weeks of registration. The induction review should involve the student and main supervisor. The induction review should focus on the following:

  1. Consideration of the student’s research topic as set out in their initial application
  2. Drafting of a work plan and targets to meet ahead of the next review (probation)
  3. Identification of key publications and/or sources relevant to the research topic
  4. Identification of skills training opportunities (supervisors should ensure that their researchers are aware of: (i) any obligatory training which must be undertaken within the academic school and (ii) the Graduate School’s Researcher Development Programme and the requirement for all new PhD students to complete a Researcher Development Assessment which they are introduced to at a Researcher Development Assessment workshop (for further details please consult the Researcher Development Programme Handbook available from the Graduate School, in hard copy and on-line).
  5. Discussion of any initial concerns
  6. Discussion of any work the student is undertaking in addition to their research which may impact on progress.
  7. Identification and discussion of potential resources and facilities available to the student both internally (within the academic schools and through central services) and externally during their research
  8. Consideration of any additional support which the research student may require (e.g. English language support)

---

1 Please note that this is not a requirement for MA, MSc or MPhil students.
9. Discussion and identification of the ways in which the supervisor-student relationship will work (e.g. preferred means of contact (e.g. email, phone etc), feedback mechanisms and turnaround times)

10. The *induction review form* should be completed at the end of the review. The completed induction form should be made available to other members of the supervisory team.

11. The induction review forms, once completed and agreed by student/supervisor, should be reviewed and approved by the School Director of Graduate Studies.

- **Probation Review: School of Politics and IR requirements**

It is important to understand that the Probation Review is a very important stage in your PhD registration, akin to an examination. Following the Probation Review, the review panel will have to decide whether your work is likely to meet the requirements of the PhD programme.

You and your supervisor should coordinate your preparation for the Probation Review. The Probation Review must be scheduled to take place in the summer term (May or June) if you registered in September, or at the end of the Autumn term (Nov/Dec) if you registered in January.

You are required to submit the following for your Probation Review:

- a summary of work carried out to date;
- a planned schedule of future work;
- completed review forms;
- records of supervisory meetings;
- completed Researcher Development Assessment;
- a sample of written work

The sample of written work for your Probation Review will normally comprise the following:

- The ‘Project Overview Document’
- ONE draft chapter of at least 6,000 words

The chapter is a ‘draft’ chapter, but it should still be a fairly polished and self-contained piece of work. This will be reviewed as evidence of your research and writing skills; you want to make sure, therefore, that it reaches the GRTS audience in good order. You are strongly advised to have someone proofread the work that you submit for your Probation Review. The chapter may comprise one of the following, or some combination:

- an in-depth literature review of the various bodies of literature that your research speaks to;
- a theoretical framework;
- a piece of empirical research;
- some other aspect of the research agreed *in advance* with the review panel

The ‘Project Overview Document’ should provide an overview of the research project. The document should also support your case that your project does indeed have the potential to pass an examination at the higher level of registration. It should cover the following issues/questions in some depth:

1. Statement of the Research Question
2. Discussion of the ‘puzzle’ at the heart of your research project
3. Explanation of the originality of the project
4. Literature Survey/Review which clearly identifies gaps or problems in the existing literature that relates to your project
5. Discussion of the proposed Methodology and Research Design: How does your method help you answer your research question?
6. Sources: do you have access to adequate and relevant sources in order to complete this project?
7. Potential Difficulties
8. Preliminary/Selective Bibliography
9. An outline of your work plan for completion of the project, including a detailed work plan for the next 12 months

You are encouraged to use these headings/subtitles for your Project Overview Document as this may help you ensure that you do indeed touch upon all these issues. At the review session, which will take place during the Graduate Student Conference in the Summer term (usually the second or third week of May) you will have approx. 30 minutes to give an overview of your project. **You are encouraged to base this presentation on your Project Overview Document, particularly points 1-5.** It is crucial that you work with your supervisor as you prepare your Probation Review, since your supervisors will be called on to make a judgement about whether you are making adequate progress to continue on the PhD programme. You also want to make sure that your supervisor reads your Project Overview Document and sample chapter **BEFORE** you email it to the Chair of the GRTS.

All material that you wish to be considered for your Probation review should normally be submitted by email to the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) and your supervisors no later than **seven days** prior to Graduate Student Conference.

Following your Probation Review presentation at the Graduate Student Conference, the review panel will meet and discuss your progress. The final decision about your progression is not with the panel, however, but with the Faculty Director of Graduate Studies. Still, the panel’s recommendation is normally decisive. The various possible outcomes of the Probation Review are outlined in the Code of Practice.

- **The End of Year 2 Review**

  The end of year 2 review should involve the main supervisor and the School Director of Graduate Studies or his/her nominee (who will normally act as Chair). Where the School Director of Graduate Studies is a member of the researcher’s supervisory team, another member of the School Graduate Studies Committee should be co-opted to act on behalf of the committee. Academic schools or faculties may require any other additional members of the supervisory team (e.g. second supervisor) to be present at the end of year 2 review.

  The end of year 2 review will focus on the following:

  1. Consideration of a portfolio of work (prepared by the student) which includes:
     a. A summary of work carried out to date
     b. A planned schedule of future work
     c. A sample of written work: this should comprise a document which provides an overview of the project (details below), and one chapter’s worth of additional material (this might comprise a literature review, the theoretical framework, or some empirical analysis)
d. Completed review forms  

e. Record of supervisory meetings  

2. Completed ethics approval form where applicable  

3. Formal review of targets and work plan set at the previous review  

4. Set future work plan and targets  

5. Review of work being undertaken in addition to the research degree to ensure that this is not adversely affecting the progression of the research  

6. Review of publishing opportunities (if considered appropriate)  

7. Review and discussion of the efficacy of the current working relationship between supervisor and student (e.g. means of contact (e.g. email, phone etc), meeting format/frequency, feedback mechanisms and turnaround times)  

The end of year 2 review will end with the panel recommending one of the following:  

1. that the researcher is making exemplary progress for the award for which (s)he is registered and should proceed with his/her registration:  

2. that the researcher is making satisfactory progress for the award for which (s)he is registered and should proceed with his/her registration;  

3. that there are concerns about the researcher’s progress but (s)he may proceed with his/her registration subject to review during the next academic year (the panel should set a date for a mid-year review. The date of the mid-year review should be set at the panel’s discretion but this should normally take place within six months of the end of year review).  

If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable him/her to complete their current research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations:  

4. that the researcher transfer his/her registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil (this is applicable for PhD students);  

5. that the researcher transfer his/her registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM (this is applicable for PhD and MPhil students);  

6. the researcher should withdraw from the University.  

The completed end of year review form should be considered and the decision of the panel approved by the Faculty Director of Graduate Studies.  

The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions 4-6 under the Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals.  

- The **Mid-Year Review**  

The mid-year review will be conducted in cases where there were concerns about a research student’s progress at the end of year review and the panel selected recommendation 3. “that there are concerns about the researcher’s progress but (s)he may proceed with his/her registration subject to review” The mid-year review will be scheduled to take place on a date agreed by the panel at the previous end of year review.  

The mid-year review will involve the student, main supervisor, and Director of Graduate Studies. The panel will need to make one of recommendations 1, 2, 4, 5 or 6 above from the end of year review recommendation options.  

The mid-year review will focus on the following:  

1. Formal review of targets and work plan set at the end of year review.
2. Skills training undertaken since the end of year review
3. Identification of any further areas of concern
4. Identify targets and work plan for review at the end of the current year. Review and discussion of the efficacy of the current working relationship between supervisor and student (e.g. means of contact (e.g. email, phone etc), meeting format/frequency, feedback mechanisms and turnaround times)
5. The mid-year review form should be completed at the end of the review.

The Submission Review
This will normally take place three months prior to the end of the minimum period of registration, i.e. 3 years for full-time students and 6 years for part-time students.

It is the expectation of the University that the student will be undertaking a programme of supervised research and training during the minimum period of registration (e.g. first three years for full-time PhD students and for the first five years for part-time PhD students). The principal function of the Submission Review is to ensure that the student is in a position to complete and submit their research in the allotted time.

The review will be undertaken by the main supervisor, another member of the supervisory team and the School Director of Graduate Studies (Research Programmes) who will normally act as chair. The panel will make one of the following recommendations to the Faculty (for consideration and approval by the Faculty Director of Graduate Studies):

1. that the candidate has made good progress and will be in a position to submit at the end of the minimum period of registration (e.g. 3 years for full-time PhD students and 5 years for part-time PhD students);
2. that the researcher has made sufficient progress to proceed to a continuation category of registration. This recommendation should only be made when a researcher (i) is only making use of the University’s general facilities, (ii) will no longer be using laboratories or other specialist facilities and (iii) will only be receiving advice related to the finalisation of his/her research and thesis. The candidate will qualify for a lower rate of fee (25% of the part-time rate). Continuation year fees will be charged on a sliding scale.

If the panel determines that the student has not made adequate progress and/or has not produced work of a sufficient quality to enable him/her to complete his/her research degree, it may make one of the following recommendations:

3. that the candidate has made insufficient progress to proceed to the continuation year and should have his/her period of supervised research and training extended for a set period(during which time (s)he will be charged full fees);

**Note:** in the case of recommendation 3 being selected, the candidate will undergo a 2nd submission review after the end of the extended period of supervised research and training.

4. that the candidate transfer his/her registration to the award of MPhil and submit a thesis for the degree of MPhil (applicable for PhD students);

5. that the candidate transfer his/her registration to the award of MA/MSc/LLM and submit a thesis for the degree of MA/MSc/LLM (applicable for MPhil and PhD students);
6. the candidate should withdraw from the University.

The researcher will have the opportunity to appeal against decisions 4-6 above under the
Standing Orders Governing Research Appeals.

Once the recommendations have been approved by the Faculty Director of Graduate Studies,
the Faculty administration will be responsible for (i) checking that the status of full-time PhD
students (entering the 4th year) and part-time PhD students (entering their 6th year) are correct
and (ii) changing the status of the researchers on the student records system when they are
approved to transfer to the continuation year (recommendation 2).

- **Continuation Year Reviews**
  It is the expectation of the University that the supervisor should be in contact with their
researchers on a monthly basis during the continuation year, however, there will be two more
formal opportunities to review progress during the continuation year.

  If the researcher has not submitted his/her thesis by the 5th month of continuation there should
be a formal review with the supervisor and Director of Graduate Studies to consider the
researcher’s progress towards submission.

  Continuation Year Review 1:

  This will take place 5 months into the continuation year for both full-time and part-time
students.

  Continuation Year Review 2:

  If the researcher (whether full-time or part-time) has not submitted his/her thesis by the 10th
month of continuation there should be a formal review with the supervisor and Director of
Graduate Studies to consider the researcher’s progress towards submission. The review should
be used to determine if the researcher will be in a position to submit his/her thesis by the end of
the continuation year. In extraordinary circumstances the panel may recommend to the Faculty
and Graduate School that the researcher proceeds to a final writing-up period (status W) for a
set period. This period should not extend beyond 12 months. All cases in which candidates fail
to submit by the end of the continuation year will be referred to the Dean of the Graduate
School for consideration.

- **Upgrading Review**

  In cases where students originally registered for one type of research degree may be eligible for
upgrading to a higher level research degree (e.g. from Masters by Research to PhD), schools may
use an end of year or a specially convened review to determine this. The principal function of
this review is to make judgements on the capabilities of the student and the viability of the
project for an award at a higher level. The review should involve the student, main supervisor
(and where there is one supervisory chair) and the Director of Graduate Studies (who will
normally act as Chair).
Progression Criteria

Every PhD student and every research project is unique and accordingly we look at each student and each project individually. However, there are standards and criteria which apply in all cases.

Quantity

As already mentioned, the Probation Review takes place in the Summer term, if you registered in September, or if you registered in January, this will be in November or December. During this time, students are normally expected to produce the equivalent of one chapter with a total minimum word count of 6,000 words. The Project Overview Document is not to be included in this word count.

Quality

As pointed out above, the chapter and the Project Overview Document will be taken by the review panel as evidence of your research and writing skills. Accordingly the material should be well presented; the writing should be clear and reasonably polished. The panel understands, of course, that the ‘chapter’ presented at this point is a draft and that it will undergo a series of revisions before being included in the final thesis. For the purpose of the Probation Review, however, it is normally the only basis the panel has for evaluating the potential of the project.

Originality

In order to be able to argue that your contribution is original, you must know the literature in your research area. You must be able to show that your work will add to the existing literature, that it fills a gap, improves on what others have done. In other words, you must show that after your first 9 months into the project (for full-time students; 18 months for part-time students), you have an awareness of your field. At the Probation Review, it should be difficult, if not impossible, for members of the audience to refer you to literature that is relevant to your research without you having seen or knowing about this literature. You must know your research area in order to be able to situate your own contribution within a wider field of knowledge.

Clarity of research question and research design

At the Probation Review, your research question(s) must be clear and concise. If concepts and technical terms are used in your question(s), their meanings must be clear too. If there is more than one question at the centre of your work, the relationship between the different questions must be clear. Equally important is that you have a clear idea of what needs to be done in order to answer these questions. There must be a clear link, in other words, between your research question and your research method. You must be able to justify why you answer your particular question with your particular method. For example, if you are doing a case study, how does the case study answer your research question? If you are doing fieldwork, why and how does the fieldwork help you answer your question? Are you doing interviews as part of your research? With whom? How will these interviews help you answer your research questions? What will you ask? If your research concern deals with certain key concepts, you will need to be clear about how these concepts are to be operationalised in your research. For example, if you ask a question about state-building, peace-keeping, democratisation, conflict resolution, conflict settlement, you will need to explain who your study will operationalise these terms: how will you identify ‘state-building’ in empirical reality? How will you know that ‘peace-keeping’ is going on?
How will you know that ‘state-building’ or ‘peace-keeping’ are ‘successful’ – how is ‘success’ to be measured? What are your indicators of ‘success’? These examples illustrate that when you discuss questions of method in your end of first year review presentation and project overview document, it will not be enough simply to state that you use ‘qualitative methods’, or that you will use books, articles or the internet.

Research plans

With a good research design – i.e. with a good match between question and method – you should be able to tell us what you will do next, i.e. what your next steps are going to be (assuming that the Probation Review is a success). How will you translate your research design into concrete research? If you are planning to interview decision-makers, how will you select them? How will you contact them? What will you ask them? How many interviews do you need? How much time will they take? Do you have ethical approval for these interviews (see below)? Do you have experience in conducting interviews? In short, in addition to your research plans, your Probation Review presentation should also explain how you will implement these plans? What steps will you take in what order of sequence? And what is your timetable for work over the next 12 months? You will need to convince the panel that your project is clearly defined, ‘settled’, original, feasible, and that you have the skills and knowledge to complete the project within the allocated time.

We urge you to prepare the Probation Review with your supervisor(s). Start to plan as early as possible. 9 months is not a very long time for writing a chapter and the Project Overview Document.

Can I change my research topic during my degree programme?

We accept applications for places on our research programmes on the basis of the research proposals that applicants submit with their applications. As explained above, if the admissions criteria are met and if we are able to offer expert supervision in the proposed research area, we can offer a place on our programmes. However, if subsequently the project changes substantially we may no longer be able to offer supervision. There is a danger, therefore, that a change of topic may marginalise students within the Department. It is to be expected, of course, that your project will change somewhat as you begin to understand your research questions better but any such changes need to be discussed with your supervisor. If you want to move into directions that lead you outside your supervisor’s expertise, you and/or your supervisor should discuss the situation with the Director of Studies (PGR), who will be able to advise you on possible, alternative supervision arrangements. If, however, no supervisor can be found for your modified project, we may either ask you to re-define your project so that it falls again within our area of expertise or we may ask you to withdraw from the programme and conduct the research at a different school/ university where expert supervision can be offered.
The Continuation Year

You should be aware that the University attaches great importance to the completion of research and that unless a reasoned case for entering the continuation year has been approved by the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR), a late dissertation will NOT be admitted for examination. All deadlines are exact deadlines; if your thesis is submitted only one day late, it will not be admitted for examination. Please note, the researcher can only enter the continuation year when they (i) are only making use of the University’s general facilities, (ii) will only be receiving advice related to the finalisation of his/her research and thesis. The candidate will qualify for a lower rate of fee (25% of the part-time rate). Students in the Continuation Year will be subject to Continuation Reviews at 5 months into the year, and 10 months into the year. If the researcher has not submitted his/her thesis by the 5th month of continuation there should be a formal review with the supervisor and Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) to consider the researcher’s progress towards submission.

If the researcher has not submitted his/her thesis by the 10th month of continuation there should be a formal review with the supervisor and Director of Graduate Studies to consider the researcher’s progress towards submission. The review should be used to determine if the researcher will be in a position to submit his/her thesis by the end of the continuation year. In extraordinary circumstances the panel may recommend to the Faculty that the researcher proceed to a final writing-up period (status W) for a set period. This period should not extend beyond 12 months. All cases in which candidates fail to submit by the end of the continuation year will be referred to the Dean of the Graduate School for consideration.

Submission, examination and viva

You are required to notify the School Office two months before you submit your thesis of your intention to do so by completing a ‘Notice of Submission’ form so that arrangements can be made for the formal appointment of the examiners. If the Submission Review panel decides that you should be allowed to submit, this form will be sent to you by the School Office along with a letter informing you of the decision of the Panel. Your thesis must be submitted to the School Office either in person or through the post (registered or recorded delivery). You should make sure you are given an official receipt. Please note that a thesis given to a supervisor has not been submitted for examination. It is your responsibility to make sure your thesis is received by the School Office. In addition to the hardcopy you must also submit an electronic copy of the thesis via the University’s virtual learning environment, ‘Moodle’ (please contact the School Office for instructions) or by submitting a USB memory stick with the thesis file to the School Office. We will keep the electronic copy only for the duration of the examination process; it will be deleted afterwards. The electronic copy can be made available to examiners if e.g. they wish to check the word count of the thesis.

Your dissertation will be read and examined by two examiners – the ‘internal’ and the ‘external’ examiner. The ‘internal’ examiner will normally be a member of the School, who knows and understands your research area but has not been involved in the supervision of your work; the internal examiner should not be too close to you and your work. Occasionally we ask colleagues from other University schools (History, Sociology, Philosophy etc.) to act as internal examiners. The ‘external’ examiner comes from a different university and should be a senior scholar with a substantial publication record in your research area. Your supervisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) will discuss who should be appointed as examiners and
they will eventually recommend two names to the University. Their appointment as examiners has to be approved by the Head of School, the Social Science Faculty, and the University’s Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research. In the case of PhD students, an integral part of the examination is a viva voce examination (viva), to be held on a day convenient to the two examiners and the candidate. In the case of MA and MPhil students, a viva is held at the discretion of the examiners. Your supervisor may, at the discretion of the examiners, be invited to attend the viva voce examination as a silent observer.

The viva is an oral examination, which is generally conducted as a conversation and discussion between examiners and candidate. In some cases, the examiners will have made up their mind about the dissertation prior to the viva; in other cases, the viva may well be crucial for determining the outcome of the examination. While reading the thesis, the examiners may have spotted problems, gaps, and perhaps factual errors or errors of judgement, and they will bring these problems to the oral exam. The viva is sometimes called a ‘defence’ because the candidate will have to defend his or her research and findings. On average the viva will take approx. two hours although we have had some viva voce examinations in the past that were shorter and indeed some that went on for much longer than two hours. When the examiners are satisfied that they have asked all their questions and feel ready to take a decision on the outcome of the examination, they will ask the candidate to leave the room while they discuss their views on the candidate’s research and his or her viva performance. Once they have agreed on the final result, the candidate is called back into the room and informed of the result.

The final examination result for the PhD, based on the dissertation and the viva voce examination, will be one of the following:

1. That the degree/diploma for which the candidate is registered be awarded;
2. That the degree/diploma be awarded subject to certain minor corrections to the thesis being carried out to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months of the official notification to the candidate of the recommendation of the examiners [Note: In cases where the examiners make the above recommendation, minor corrections include the following: spelling/typing errors, textual errors; reordering of material; correction of literature citations (possibly inclusion of a few additional citations); correction of figures, tables and diagrams (possibly inclusion of one or two additional figures/ tables/diagrams); additional paragraphs for clarification or qualification. If a substantial amount of new material is needed, examiners should not use this recommendation];
3. That the degree/diploma be awarded subject to revisions to the thesis being carried out to the satisfaction of the internal and external examiner within six months of the official notification to the candidate of the recommendation of the examiners [Note: In cases where the examiners make the above recommendation, revisions will normally take the form of more extensive revisions than that implied by a decision of pass with minor corrections. This decision will not require any significant extension of the original research to be undertaken by the candidate, if this is deemed necessary, examiners should recommend a resubmission. The examiners must be agreed that the candidate will be able to achieve the amendments within no more than six months from notification];
4. That the degree/diploma be not awarded at present but that the candidate be permitted to resubmit the thesis in a revised form not later (except in cases of illness or other good cause) than twelve months after the decision to allow resubmission has been made by the Board of the Faculty. If at least one of the examiners so wishes, he/she may require the candidate to undergo an oral or written examination or both [Note: a candidate should only be permitted one opportunity to resubmit except in exceptional circumstances where mitigating circumstances may justify a second resubmission];
5. That the degree/diploma be not awarded at present but that the candidate be permitted to take a further oral or written examination or both, on one further occasion, normally not later than six months after the decision to allow this has been made by the Board of the Faculty. [Note: This recommendation may only be made in cases where the candidate submits a thesis judged satisfactory for the award by the examiners but fails to satisfy the examiners in the written or oral examination or both];

In the case of candidates for the degree of Master of Philosophy:

6. That the candidate be permitted to resubmit the thesis without alteration for the award of the degree of Master of Arts

In the case of candidates for the degree of Master by Research and Thesis:

7. That the degree not be awarded but that the candidate be awarded a postgraduate diploma;

In the case of candidates for the degree of PhD:

8. That the degree of PhD not be awarded but that the candidate be permitted formally to resubmit the thesis without alteration and without further scrutiny for the award of Master of Philosophy;

9. That the degree of PhD not be awarded but that the candidate be permitted to resubmit the thesis for the award of degree of Master of Philosophy subject to certain minor corrections being carried out to the satisfaction of the internal examiner within three months of the official notification to the candidate of the recommendation of the examiners;

10. That the degree not be awarded.

Statistically, the most frequent outcome is option 2, also known as ‘pass with minor corrections’. Option 1 is very rare; most examiners will have some minor editing quibbles even if they liked the thesis overall.

**Intermission**

If research students face serious medical, personal or financial problems, they can apply for a period of intermission, which is a break in the period of registration. The Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) may grant intermissions for up to six months. Any further periods of intermission will require Faculty approval. You may need to check with your sponsor how the intermission will affect your funding. Intermission may also affect your visa status. Therefore, international students who are considering intermission (or withdrawal, see below) should make contact with the Student Advice Centre (Kent Union) to discuss the implications this will have on their visa status.

**Withdrawal**

If you run into serious problems that make it impossible for you to continue your research, and if these are long-term problems so that even a break (intermission) will not help you find a solution, you may have to consider withdrawing from the programme. You can withdraw at any time by informing the School in writing of your decision. If you face problems that affect your work, you should discuss your situation with your supervisor and/or the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). If you do not wish to discuss your situation with someone in the
School, you may wish to contact the University’s Counselling Service or one of the other student welfare services provided by the University (see below). **International students who are considering withdrawal should make contact with the Student Advice Centre (Kent Union) to discuss the implications this will have on their visa status.**

**Can I submit my thesis early?**

You cannot submit your thesis earlier than three months before the end of your registration. For example, if your PhD registration ends on the 17th of September 2014, you cannot submit your thesis prior to the 17th of June 2014. If you and your supervisor are very confident that your thesis could be ready earlier than this, you should apply for a Submission Review. If the review panel finds that the thesis is indeed ready, the supervisor and the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) should comment on the outcome of the review and submit their comments, together with the Submission Review form, to the Social Science Faculty. Once various University committees have considered the case, a decision will be reached as to whether the candidate can submit early and the candidate and the School will be informed accordingly.

**Residence requirements**

Section 5 of the University’s Regulations for Research Programmes of Study (See: [http://www.kent.ac.uk/ult/quality/regulations/research/phdres.html#attendance](http://www.kent.ac.uk/ult/quality/regulations/research/phdres.html#attendance)) makes it clear that full-time candidates are normally expected to reside in or near Canterbury and to attend the University for the whole period of registration. Part-time candidates are normally expected to reside within 100 miles of the University, and their attendance requirements are normally half of the full-time attendance requirements.

**Research expenses**

Limited School funds are available to support students attending conferences and/or research training events and courses (e.g. summer schools). Every research student can apply for up to £500 during the course of his or her registration. You can either spend the amount on one conference/event or use parts of the amount for a number of conferences/events, but the total amount claimed during your entire programme should not exceed the limit of £500. Please contact the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR) if you wish to apply for financial support to cover such research expenses. In exceptional circumstances – e.g. if you present a paper at a panel at one of the major national or international political science conferences (PSA, APSA, BISA, ISA) – we may consider offering more support on a case-by-case basis.

**Fieldwork: Risk assessment and Insurance**

If you undertake overseas work experience, fieldwork, study, research, or any other course-related activity you **must** discuss the risks involved in these activities with your supervisors. This risk assessment must be completed PRIOR to your departure. All University of Kent students who undertake such work abroad are now eligible to take advantage of University travel and personal accident insurance. There is no cost to the student or the School, subject to the following conditions being met:
Travel period: Period of travel will not exceed 12 months.

Medical history: You are fit and well and will not travel against medical advice.

Destination: You will not travel to Afghanistan or Iraq. Travel to any other country is covered by University travel and personal accident insurance.

Risk assessment: The planned journey cycle is risk assessed by the student and agreed with their supervisor/tutor (see above) before they leave. A signed copy of the risk assessment must be retained by the School.

Authorisation: Prime reason for travel is course-related and the journey has been authorised by University of Kent staff.

Online Travel Notification Form: Notify the Insurance Office about each and every overseas course-related trip, which departs from and returns back to the UK and/or your normal country of residence. Complete the online travel notification form no later than 5 working days before departure.

For further information about these regulations and policies, see:
https://www.kent.ac.uk/finance-staff/services/insurance/studentfieldwork/index.html

Further advice specifically for postgraduate students can be found at:
https://www.kent.ac.uk/finance-staff/services/insurance/travelpostgraduate/areas.html

The Student Travel Notification Form is available online at:
https://www.kent.ac.uk/finance-staff/services/insurance/forms/student-travel.html

For the risk assessment you can use the risk assessment form provided at:
https://www.kent.ac.uk/finance-staff/services/insurance/studentfieldwork/risk.html

For the overseas travel health assessment, see:
http://www.kent.ac.uk/safety/oh/help/travelinfo/index.html
THE GRADUATE RESEARCH AND TRAINING SEMINAR (GRTS)

The Graduate Research and Training Seminar (GRTS) is at the centre of our research community. The seminar meets every week during term time on Wednesday mornings at 11:00 in the Stanley Rogers Room. **Attendance is compulsory for all MA by Research and Thesis students and all MPhil and PhD students.** Full-time students are normally expected to attend GRTS every week; part-time students are expected to attend half as many sessions as full-time students. Part-time students may wish to discuss with their supervisors which sessions would be the most useful for them to attend. During 2012/13 the GRTS seminar is chaired by Dr Edward Morgan-Jones. The GRTS programme will be published via the School’s intranet pages for postgraduate research students at [https://www.kent.ac.uk/politics-local/pgresearch/index.html](https://www.kent.ac.uk/politics-local/pgresearch/index.html)

The primary purpose of GRTS is to provide an open forum where students can present their work. At the beginning of the academic year, students can book dates for their presentations. GRTS is normally attended by more than 15 students and, on average, three or four staff members. We have had sessions with more than 30 researchers attending. We consider GRTS a ‘protected’ space where we can try out ideas and present unfinished work in progress. Whoever presents at GRTS can expect a sympathetic audience: even when we are critical in our comments, our aim must always be to support the researcher who is presenting his or her work and to help him or her to develop the project. We do not attend GRTS in order to prove to everyone how clever we are or how ‘superior’ our knowledge of certain research areas is. GRTS is about offering support through constructive criticism. There are very few such ‘protected’ spaces in academic life. You should not expect such protection when you attend an international conference with an unfinished paper; and you should certainly not expect such protection in your PhD viva voce examination. GRTS therefore has its own ethos, and it is crucial to our community that those who present work and those who attend the presentations subscribe to this ethos of openness and constructive, mutual support.

GRTS can be quite a challenge for everyone involved – the presenters, the audience, and the chair – because our students work on a wide range of topics, and sometimes you may find yourself in a situation where you are asked to comment on a paper written on a subject that seems outside your immediate research expertise and interest. Still there are often surprising degrees of overlap and similarity between seemingly separate topics. Moreover, the problems we face when we do research in political science – e.g. working out a meaningful chapter structure, articulating a good research question, planning fieldwork, writing literature surveys, incorporating and presenting quantitative work, acknowledging unusual sources etc. – are common across the discipline and there is something for everyone to be learned from listening to the challenges, struggles and problems that other researchers have to overcome.

Although GRTS is central to the research community in the School, it is important to realise that attending and presenting at GRTS cannot replace the supervision sessions with your supervisor. In fact, it would be wrong to burden GRTS with the expectation that ‘supervision’ should take place within the GRTS framework. When you present your work at GRTS, you will receive feedback that comes from a number of ‘directions’. Staff and students will comment; there will be some who may be very familiar with your research area, and they may give you very specific feedback with suggestions for further specialist readings. And there may be some who look at your work from a distance and who are unfamiliar with the relevant area; their advice will be more general but no less useful. It is not uncommon that the GRTS discussions will pull you into different directions and that different pieces of advice contradict each other. Therefore, it is crucial that after the presentation you and your supervisor sit together
for a ‘debriefing’ and discuss the feedback that you received. If as a result of these discussions, you and your supervisor decide that the GRTS feedback should be ignored, so be it. Normally, of course, this will not happen, but still if different research avenues were discussed at your GRTS session, you and your supervisor will have to decide which one of those is the most promising. But the GRTS discussions should not be constrained by those considerations. Every constructive comment is potentially important; those who wish to comment should be encouraged to do so, and they will find it easier to comment if they know that the final responsibility for taking the comments on board or for ignoring them remains with the presenter and his or her supervisor.

_The standard requirement for all students – part-time and full-time – is that they must present at least once at GRTS in each academic year._ All students should discuss the date of their GRTS presentation with their supervisors and then book their dates with the academic chairing GRTS. The slots fill up very quickly at the beginning of the academic year, so it is advisable to make plans for the new academic year during the summer. It is expected that the student’s supervisory panel is present during the GRTS presentation, and this is the reason why students should co-ordinate their presentations with their supervisor(s). All presentations must be based on a written piece of work, which has to be submitted to the Chair of GRTS prior to the presentation. The papers are then made available to all members of our research community via our Moodle page. In order to give everyone sufficient time to read and study the paper, presenters should submit their work by email to Dr Edward Morgan-Jones at E.Morgan-Jones@kent.ac.uk _at least seven days_ prior to the date of the presentation.

**Calling Card presentations (CCs)**

Students give different kinds of presentations at different stages in their research. When you first arrive in Canterbury and begin your research, you will be asked to present a ‘Calling Card’ (CC). A Calling Card is a brief introduction to your project, which at this point may still be based on the research proposal you submitted together with your application. CCs can be as short as three pages; but they can also be as long as a normal chapter presentation. Calling card presentations tend to be brainstorming sessions: new ideas, still in their infancy, are presented, and everyone tries to think through these ideas and suggest ways to develop them.

After your CC presentation, the written papers you submit for your presentations will normally be ‘draft chapters’ and they will normally have approx. 20 pages. You can also use your GRTS slot in order to present fieldwork reports or papers which you are about to present at conferences. Each presentation should make clear how the paper relates to the overall context of the thesis. For example, if you present a draft chapter, you should include a chapter breakdown for the thesis so your readers can situate the chapter and its significance within the wider concerns of your thesis. Powerpoint facilities are available during the sessions. Both chapter and CC presentations should last about 25 minutes.

**Professional Training sessions at GRTS**

In addition to student presentations, GRTS also features regular professional skills and academic research training sessions. Topics covered in these sessions will vary from year to year, but could include themes such as:

- Managing your supervisor – a session where we discuss the student/supervisor
relationship
- Research ethics
- Publishing academic papers
- Preparing for an academic career
- Mock PhD viva
- How to write a book proposal

At the start of every academic year there will be a library induction session for new students, which also acts as a refresher session for existing students. If you have suggestions for additional training sessions, please let Dr Morgan-Jones know. The programme is reviewed every year and there is some flexibility that allows us to respond to your specific needs. The up-to-date GRTS programme will be circulated among staff and students at the beginning of the academic year.

Student Conference

Every year the School organises a one-day RSPIR Student Conference, which normally takes place during the Summer Term. The RSPIR Conference gives students another opportunity to practice their presentation skills. In contrast to the weekly GRTS sessions, the Conference meets in a lecture theatre with full audio-visual facilities. The Conference is open to the public and is advertised through the School’s webpages. In previous years the Conference was attended by a sizeable group of research students from our Brussels School of International Studies. Research students from Brussels are also invited to give presentations at the Conference. MA by Research and Thesis students are normally required to present at least once at the RSPIR Conference; PhD students are also normally required to present at the Conference every year. First year students are required to present their Probation Review materials at the conference. In the last few years we have had plenary sessions at the conference from leading scholars in Politics and IR, including from Professor Stephen Chan, Professor David Phinnemore and Professor Richard Jackson.

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

In addition to the training provided through GRTS, research students in the School of Politics and International Relations have access to a wide range of further training opportunities. It is important that student and supervisor discuss any training needs early on in their collaboration. There may be cases where training needs are identified and where we make it a requirement e.g. for an upgrade that a student has attended and passed certain research training modules or programmes in order to meet those needs. In such cases, the supervisor should advise the student on where and how the relevant training can be obtained.

ESRC DTC

The School of Politics and IR at Kent is one of the partner institutions in the ESRC’s Southeast Doctoral Training Centre. Throughout the year, each of the partner institutions will be offering advanced training opportunities for research students from all four partner institutions (Kent, Royal Holloway, Reading and Surrey). Dates and details are to be confirmed, so look out for information by email.
Faculty Research Training Modules

As part of its MA in Methods of Social Research, the University’s School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research (SSPSSR) offers four research training modules which can be attended by our research students. These are creditable modules, which means that if you meet the relevant attendance and coursework requirements, you will be awarded 20 University of Kent credits (for each module), which correspond to 10 ECTS credits (at MA level). You should discuss with your supervisor whether attending any of these modules might help you conduct your research project. [NB The following times are correct at the time of writing. Please check the on-line module catalogue for the most up-to-date information].

**SO833** Design of Social Research
Convenor: Dr B Baumberg
Spring Term: Wednesdays 13.00-14.00 followed by workshops

This module introduces students to a range of issues relating to the practice of research. The course begins by introducing students to key issues in the philosophy of social sciences such as knowledge growth, rationality vs convention in research and realism vs. nominalism. The second part focuses on issues related to the design of research such as experimental vs non experimental research, sampling and measurement. After a look at survey methods the course concludes by looking at issues of ethics in the social sciences.

**SO817** Using Secondary and Qualitative Data
Convenor: Dr V.A. Miller
Autumn Term: Mondays 12.00-14.00

This module introduces students to secondary data analysis, particularly the analysis of qualitative data. Students will learn how to search for data and to evaluate of quality, e.g. by using the world wide web. Examples of different techniques of analysis are presented and discussed.

**SO832** Using research-Advanced critical skills
Convenor: Dr B Baumberg
Spring Term: Mondays 13.00-15.00

This module introduces students to a wide range of data analytic techniques. The first part will look at techniques for qualitative analysis, such as grounded theory, computer-assisted qualitative analysis, and the comparative method. The second part looks at techniques for analyzing official statistics and data reduction and evaluation strategies.

**SO819** Quantitative Data Analysis
Convenor: Ms T Sundberg
Spring Term: Wednesdays 13.00-14.00 followed by workshops in terminal rooms

This module introduces students with little or no prior training to the methods used in quantitative analysis. Classes will be supplemented by workshops in applying specific techniques using SPSS for Windows. Taught sessions are designed to provide participants with a knowledge of basic statistical techniques as required by the ESRC Guidelines.

*If you wish to audit/attend any of these modules, please go the first lectures/meetings during Week 1 and sign up for the module. If you have any further questions regarding these modules, please contact the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR), Dr Mackenzie.*
Researcher Development Programme

The Graduate School coordinates the Researcher Development Programme for Postgraduate Researchers. The Researcher Development Programme is designed to equip research students and postdoctoral researchers with a full range of skills which will improve their effectiveness as researchers, and ensure that they are not only highly qualified but employable in a variety of careers by the end of their research project. All training is mapped to the national Researcher Development Framework. Further information about the Researcher Development Programme is available on the Graduate School Website at: www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/skills/programmes/tstindex.html. Postgraduate researchers should ensure that they obtain a copy of the Researcher Development Programme Handbook and register with the online booking system at: bloom.kent.ac.uk. The handbook provides postgraduate researchers with detailed information about the programme including the trainers, workshops and links to useful resources.

Researcher Development Assessment

All new PhD students should attend a Researcher Development Assessment Workshop which will introduce them to the Researcher Development Assessment.

Completion of a Researcher Development Assessment via the online booking system is a requirement for successful completion of the probation review for PhD students (which is undertaken at 10 months for FT PhD students and 12 months for PT PhD students) – further information is available in Annex K (Progression and Examination) and Annex P (Researcher Development Programme) of the Code of Practice for Quality Assurance for Research Programmes of Study at www.kent.ac.uk/teaching/qa/codes/?tab=researchprogrammes

Epigeeum Online Training

The Graduate School is pleased to able to offer online training through Epigeeum (an award winning provider of on-line training). The suite of training workshops is being made available to postgraduate researchers in Brussels and Medway, part-time researchers and all first-year postgraduate researchers in the first instance. The workshops titles will be as follows:

- Ethics 1: Good Practice Research
- Ethics 2: Working with Human Subjects
- Research Methods: An Introduction to Research Skills
- Research Methods: Arts and Humanities
- Research Methods: Social Sciences
- Research Methods: Sciences
- Research Methods: Literature Review
- Intellectual Property in the Research Context
- Project Management in the Research Context
- Getting Published in the Arts
• Getting published in the Sciences
• Managing your Research Supervisor or Principal Investigator
• Selecting a Conference, Presenting and Networking
• Career Planning in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
• Career Planning in the Sciences
• Avoiding Plagiarism

Further information about the on-line workshops is available on our website at: 
www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/skills/onlinetrng/epigeum/epigeumindex.html
Please do not hesitate to contact skills@kent.ac.uk if you would like further information about 
the on-line training.

Student Learning Advisory Service

The University’s Unit for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (UELT) is in charge of 
Student Learning Advisory Service (SLAS), which is a free, friendly advice service providing 
guidance and information on all aspects of effective learning and study skills to all students.
SLAS offers a range of workshops and programmes on how to improve your study skills. In 
addition to attending these workshops and programmes, students can also make individual 
appointments with learning advisors in order to discuss their individual learning development.
SLAS offers a free, one to one and confidential academic advice service to all students. Further 
details are available online at: 
http://www.kent.ac.uk/ult/learning/index.html

The English Language Unit

The English Language Unit provides listening, speaking, reading and writing classes and 
writing clinics for non-native English speakers (native speakers with such problems should see 
their supervisor and/or go to the Student Learning Advisory Service, SLAS, see above). The 
Unit is located in Keynes College and can be contacted by telephone on extension 4401 or: 
http://www.kent.ac.uk/cewl/
Their English Language Development Programme for non-native speakers aims to help 
students improve their English language and gives them the chance to discuss their specific 
difficulties. They can attend a total of 2 hours weekly in the Autumn and Spring terms and 
will receive guidance on which of the components will be most useful to meet their particular 
need. Students with high attendance rates will be awarded a letter of attendance.

Useful Literature

There is a rapidly growing volume of literature on postgraduate study and research skills. A 
good primer is Gina Wisker’s The Postgraduate Research Handbook (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 
2001), which covers everything from choosing the right type of degree to ‘life after the 
research’. Kjell Eric Rudestam and Rae R. Newton’s Surviving your Dissertation: A Comprehensive 
Guide to Contents and Process (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2nd ed. 2001), as well as Wayne C.Booth, 
Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. William’s The Craft of Research (Chicago: University of 
Chicago Press, 2nd ed. 2003), are classics in this field. Publishers Palgrave and Sage are 
particularly strong in the study and research skills area. Patrick Dunleavy’s Authoring a 
PhD: How to Plan, Draft, Write and Finish a Doctoral Thesis or Dissertation was also
RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Research Centres

The School currently has four University-recognised research centres:

1. The Conflict Analysis Research Centre, based at both Canterbury and Brussels, is a centre of excellence in international conflict analysis, mediation, security and international politics. It represents a core of expertise within the Conflict, Security and Human Rights research group: http://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/carc/index.html

2. The Centre for Comparative Federalism (CFS) is a focus for international and cross-disciplinary research on multi-level governance, European politics, and comparative political systems. The CFS is the only one of its kind in the UK: www.kent.ac.uk/politics/cfs/

3. The Global Europe Centre (GEC) works in partnership with other institutions and some other departments on campus and BSIS. This is a new research centre that focuses on Europe, its member states, and its place in a changing world: http://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/geo/index.html

4. We are a founding partner in the development of an interdisciplinary research centre, the Centre for Critical Thought, focussing on advanced critical thought in the humanities and social sciences; a collaboration between colleagues in the faculties with shared interests in contemporary critical theory: http://www.kent.ac.uk/cct/
Research Groups

Conflict, Security and Human Rights Research Group

This research group is based on the long tradition of excellence in international relations and conflict analysis at Kent, reinforced more recently by the development of a strong focus on security studies more generally.

Comparative Politics Research Group

This research group combines theory development and empirical analysis, and addresses both positive (how can we describe and explain political phenomena) and normative (how should politics be organized) questions. Research falls into six broad areas: state formation and dissolution; constitutional design and change; political institutions; political behaviour, attitudes, and identities; democracy and democratisation; policy implementation and analysis.

Political and Social Thought Research Group

Political and social theory has always been a significant area of study at Kent. Work in this group remains strongly collaborative with colleagues in other Schools in the University, especially through the Centre for Critical Thought. The challenges of secular and post-secular forms of politics remain one of the central themes of this group, especially as these are articulated in a post-liberal ideological environment.

The School Research Seminar (SPIRRS)

The School of Politics and International Relations runs a School research seminar series. The seminar meets every two weeks on Wednesdays, 15.30 to 17:00. Speakers from outside the School, as well as School members of staff present and discuss research that is complete or at the advanced stages. Research students are required to attend the research seminar presentations.

Politics Open Forum

The Open Forum is weekly meeting designed to facilitate debate and discussion on a wide range of issues related to the study and practice of Politics and International Relations. The Open Forum allows staff, students and visiting speakers to exchange ideas, opinions and questions. This interactive structure promotes a deep learning environment, providing a space for open discussion of political issues. The sessions cover a range of issues, relating to cutting edge research, contemporary issues, and the student experience in general. Each term a number of sessions will be organised by students, providing an opportunity for societies, groups or individual students to lead discussions on issues of interest. We hope that students in all stages of their degree programme will participate in the Politics Open Forum and in so doing will foster an open community that enriches the University experience for students and staff.

The Open Forum takes place every Monday 12.00-13.00 in Rutherford Lecture Theatre 1 (not including reading weeks) during the Autumn and Spring terms. Please check the website for a full timetable of events: http://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/openforum/index.html. Govinda
Clayton coordinates the Open Forum. If you have any questions or would like to suggest a session topic please contact Govinda (G.Clayton@kent.ac.uk).

The Public Speaker Programme (PSP)

The School runs a Public Speaker Programme. Throughout the academic year we invite prominent academics and practitioners from all over the world to give public lectures and present research papers. The guest presentations are announced on a special PSP noticeboard near the School Office in Rutherford College and through our webpages: www.kent.ac.uk/politics

Current research students will also receive emails with details of the events.

RESEARCH FUNDING

ESRC Funding

The University of Kent is proud to be a part of the Economic and Social Research Council’s Southeast Doctoral Training Centre (DTC), in partnership with the Universities of Reading, Royal Holloway and Surrey. As such, the University of Kent has been recognised as a centre of excellence for the training of postgraduate research students in the Social Sciences. Through the DTC, funding is made available to cover the fees and provide a living stipend for excellent PhD candidates. For an overview of the University of Kent’s involvement in the Southeast DTC, and details of available funding for postgraduate research students, see:

http://www.kent.ac.uk/scholarships/postgraduate/research_council/esrc.html

Details of the timetable for ESRC applications are at:

http://www.kent.ac.uk/graduateschool/esrc_dtc/index.html

University Scholarships

In preparation for the University’s 50th anniversary in 2015, Kent has established an additional 100 doctoral scholarships awarded annually from 2012. These are known as Kent’s 50th Anniversary Scholarships. These studentships include a maintenance grant of approx. £13.5k per annum and Home/EU tuition fees. Studentship holders are required to teach on our undergraduate courses. We will learn in the Spring of 2013 whether we will be able to offer Kent Studentships in Politics and International Relations starting in the academic year 2013/14. In addition, depending on the budget situation, the School normally offers a School scholarship also of £13.5k per annum plus Home/EU fees for highly qualified applicant, especially for applicants who can teach in areas where we have vacancies.

Teaching Opportunities

Many of our MPhil/PhD students boost their income by teaching for us. A full teaching load for a teaching assistant normally consists of four-five hours of seminar teaching and one office hour per week. There are vacancies almost every year as current teaching assistant finish their degrees and leave the University. If you are interested in teaching, you need to contact the
Director of the School’s Teaching Institute, Dr Edward Morgan-Jones, and submit a cover letter, which explains what courses you could teach on and why you are qualified to do so. A CV is also required. Priority will be given to students who have formally accepted a place on our PhD programme. Dr Morgan-Jones will also be able to give up-to-date information about the rate of pay for teaching assistants.

How much support we can offer research students depends on the budget situation in each year. Funding opportunities such as the Kent Studentship or teaching assistance will be advertised on the University webpages at: http://www.kent.ac.uk/studying/funding/postgraduate/index.html
Details of other funding schemes can also be found there. The Grants Register, published every year by Palgrave, may also be of interest.

RESEARCH ETHICS

Research is a social activity: it involves you, your readers, other researchers, whose work you rely on, and the researchers that they relied on, and so on. Clearly, we have responsibilities in this network of connections and relations. For example, we must not plagiarise or claim credit for the results of others; we must not misreport sources or invent results. We should never caricature or distort opposing views. We should not conceal objections that we cannot rebut, and we must not destroy or conceal sources and data that could be important to those who scrutinize our work. The respect science enjoys in our societies is based on the expectation that scientists subscribe to such ethical guidelines.

Ethical considerations come into play especially if our research involves human participants. In political science, human participants are involved e.g. in surveys and opinion polls, and also in studies that rely on interviewing politicians, decision-makers, employees of governmental and non-governmental organizations etc. These ‘participants’ require special protection. Any ethical assessment of research proposals would normally demand that the following basic principles are adhered to:

**Non-Maleficence:** The proposed research project involving human participants should not cause them harm.

**Beneficence:** In addition to not causing harm, research projects should endeavour positively to bring benefits. For example, research involving human participants which has no clear objectives, or is simply undertaken out of curiosity, would be difficult to support because it requires clear objectives in order to justify the time (and effort) that participants put into the study.

**Autonomy:** Human participants in research projects should be treated with respect and be properly informed about the study and their input. They should give their consent (to take part in the survey, to be interviewed etc.) voluntarily and without coercion. If requested, their confidentiality must be fully respected. All participants must be given an opportunity to withdraw from the study if they so wish.

**Justice:** All research projects should take into consideration the concerns of the whole of society and should pay special attention to minority groups that might be disadvantaged by the research.
The Economic and Social Research Council’s Research Ethics Framework stipulates six principles of ethical research:

- Research should be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure integrity and quality.
- Research staff and subjects must be informed fully about the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research, what their participation in the research entails and what risks, if any, are involved.
- The confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects and the anonymity of respondents must be respected.
- Research participants must participate in a voluntary way, free from any coercion.
- Harm to research participants must be avoided.
- The independence of the research must be clear; and any conflict of interest or partiality must be explicit.

If your research project involves human participants – e.g. because you use interviews with key decision makers or eye witnesses in order to gather data – and you want to ensure that your participants give ‘informed consent’ to their participation, you should consider a range of questions including the following: Have you told the participants who is conducting the study? Why was the particular person singled out for participation? What is the time commitment for the participants? Are there any benefits to be expected? Are there any potential risks for participants, and how have these been managed? Have your properly explained the study and have participants been given an opportunity to ask questions? How can I be sure that my subjects are willing to be involved? Am I exerting any subtle or unfair pressure on my subjects to take part? Do they know what to expect by taking part in the study? Do they have a clear statement of their rights and obligations? How much background information do I need to give them (and will this affect the quality of the data I obtain)? Do they have the opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason? Do my subjects expect to be paid for their participation? How can I ensure their confidentiality? Should I debrief my subjects after the completion of the research?

The following questions address the issue of ‘confidentiality’ Are my subjects happy for information about them to be made public? Will they be telling me things which would normally be kept private? Have my subjects the right to ask me not to use, and to destroy, particular pieces of information if they so wish? Will my subjects have a chance to confirm that the information I have recorded about them is factually correct?

If your participants requested ‘anonymity’ as a condition for their participation, you may have to address questions such as the following: Have I taken care to ensure that my sources of data are not identifiable as individuals to anyone outside the study team? Can any piece of circumstantial information uniquely identify one individual? Am I sure that the origin of individual items of data will not be externally traceable? Will the fact that subjects have been recruited to the study serve to identify them as belonging to a particular (social, medical, ethnic) group?

Research projects may also involve legal questions. For example, if you study the effect of international crime networks on global politics you may have to decide how you will treat information that appears to result from or reflect criminal activity. In this and other contexts it may also be necessary to explore whether the data you obtain could expose any of the
subjects to legal risks. It is also important to make sure that you comply with the ethical requirements of your department and university – for our ethical review procedures see below. You should also discuss the ethical dimension of your work with your supervisor.

A proper ethical review will also raise questions regarding the professionalism with which the study is conducted. Does the study really need to be done: am I sure that the data I want does not exist already? Is the study properly designed and have I got the analytical techniques I need? Am I prepared to treat my subjects with courtesy and respect, even if I find their views or habits personally objectionable? Have I arranged appropriate support if things go wrong? And if your work involves sampling techniques, you will need to ask whether your study will generate sufficient data to justify any conclusions: Have you got the right number of subjects? Do you perhaps involve more subjects than you require? And have you obtained adequate statistical advice?

All researchers in the School who wish to conduct research involving human participants are normally required to complete the ethical review form and submit it to the School’s representative on the University Research Ethics (Human Participants) Committee, Dr Philip Cunliffe (P.Cunliffe@kent.ac.uk). You can obtain an electronic copy of the form from Dr Cunliffe or from the Politics intranet site for postgraduate students (login required): https://www.kent.ac.uk/politics-local/pgresearch/index.html
The form asks you to explain your project and discuss the ethical issues that it raises.

We aim to review ethics forms within two weeks after submission; if the forms are submitted outside term time, the processing may take longer. Depending on the outcome of the review, we may ask you to change features of your project in order to comply with the above mentioned ethical principles. You may wish to discuss your ethical review form with your supervisor before submitting it to Dr Cunliffe.

You can find further details of the Working Principles of the University’s Research Ethics Committee at:
https://www.kent.ac.uk/res-local/committees/ethics/principles.htm
(intranet -- login required).

**Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is defined by the University as ‘reproducing in any work submitted for assessment or review (for example, examination answers, essays, project reports, dissertations or theses) any material derived from work authored by another without clearly acknowledging the source’.

As Booth, Colomb and Williams explain in *The Craft of Research*, ‘you plagiarise when, intentionally or not, you use someone else’s words or ideas but fail to credit that person, leading your readers to think that those words are yours’ (pp.201-202). Generally, you plagiarise ‘when you use a source’s words or ideas without citing that source’ (p.202). Please note that you also plagiarise when ‘you do credit the source but use its exact words without using quotation marks or block indentations’. You also plagiarise when you ‘paraphrase a source so closely that anyone putting your work next to it would see that you could not have written what you did without the source at your elbow’ (p.202).

Please note that you plagiarise when you use a source’s exact words without using quotation marks or block indentations EVEN WHEN YOU DO CITE THE SOURCE. In other words, if you copy a source VERBATIM but fail to acknowledge this by using quotation marks or block indentations, you
plagiarise. Similarly, cases of close paraphrase may count as plagiarism EVEN WHEN YOU CITE THE SOURCE.

Another type of plagiarism, perhaps more common than wholesale plagiarism is ‘mosaic plagiarism’. According to Gordon Harvey’s *Writing with Sources*, mosaic plagiarism occurs when a ‘student mixes words or ideas of a source (unacknowledged) in with his or her own words and ideas, or mixes together uncited words and ideas from several sources into a pastiche, or mixes together properly cited uses of a source with uncited uses’ (p.23). Please note that mosaic plagiarism is still plagiarism and will incur the same penalties as other, more obvious forms of plagiarism.

In general, you must refer to your source each time you use it in your text. For example, if you used two or more ideas from a book in a paragraph in your essay (dissertation, project, etc.), it will not be sufficient to acknowledge the source in only one footnote/endnote at the end of the paragraph. Unless this is explained in the text or the footnote/endnote, the latter will be taken to refer to the preceding sentence only, and not necessarily to the preceding paragraph.

It is easy to avoid plagiarism by properly citing your sources. As Gordon Harvey explains (pp. 15-16), you should cite on the following occasions:

- ‘Whenever you use factual information or data you found in a source, […];
- whenever you quote verbatim […];
- whenever you summarize, paraphrase, or otherwise use ideas, opinions, interpretations, or conclusions arrived at by another person, […];
- whenever you make use of a source passage’s distinctive structure, organising strategy, or method, […];
- whenever you mention in passing some aspect of another person’s work, […]’.

If in doubt, always cite your sources. And remember that if you quote verbatim, the words you take from a source need to put in quotation marks; it is not enough to cite. It must be absolutely clear to the reader whose words he or she is reading: your words or someone else’s. And please remember also that ‘unintentional plagiarism’ is still plagiarism and will incur the same penalties as deliberate plagiarism.

Further guidance on how to use and cite sources can be found in the following books:


Duplication of material means the inclusion in coursework (including extended essays, projects and dissertations) of a significant amount of material which is identical or substantially similar to other material which has been submitted for the same or any other course at this University or elsewhere.
A student must not reproduce in any work submitted for assessment any substantial amount of material used by that student in other work for assessment, either at this University or elsewhere, without acknowledging that such work has been so submitted. The University does not accept plagiarism or duplication of material and imposes severe penalties if it occurs in coursework, dissertations, projects, examinations and theses.

Which referencing system should I use to acknowledge my sources?

As a postgraduate research student you are expected to be familiar with at least one of the most widely used referencing systems, e.g. the Chicago Manual of Style (CMS), the MLA system, the ‘Harvard’ system, the APA system, etc. The School expects that you will use one of these popular systems in your dissertation but it does not prescribe a particular system. You can find further information about plagiarism, how to avoid plagiarism, and many referencing style guides at the Academic Integrity website of the University’s Unit for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching: http://www.kent.ac.uk/uelt/ai/

Even in successful dissertations, poor and inconsistent referencing is often one of the reasons why at least minor corrections are required. It is essential, therefore, that you choose your referencing system early and that you apply it consistently throughout your work. Keep all bibliographical details of your sources in a separate file in the format required by the referencing system you have chosen. You can also use special referencing software such as Endnote, which is available on public PCs on campus, in order to manage your references and footnotes/bibliographical entries. Once you have entered the relevant bibliographical details into the software, the programme can generate end/footnotes and references in a wide range of available formats. For further details on referencing management software available at the University of Kent, see: http://www.kent.ac.uk/library/online/reference-management/index.html

Michael Harvey’s The Nuts and Bolts of College Writing (see above) is a concise and inexpensive guide to referencing styles. Kate Turabian’s classic A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 7th ed. 2007), is very comprehensive and widely used.

THE SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMUNITY

Email lists

Our polir-research@kent.ac.uk email list is the ‘virtual’ equivalent of GRTS. Very important information, including updates on the GRTS programme, is disseminated via the polir-research list. During the first two weeks of the term, the Office staff will update the list and, if you are not yet on the list, add your Kent email address to it. It is absolutely essential that you are able to receive the emails sent to the list; if you are having difficulties receiving emails through the list, please let the Office staff know at your earliest convenience. It is also absolutely essential that you regularly check your Kent email account. Our research programmes are administered mainly by email. For example, all progress report forms will be sent out by email. You may miss important deadlines if you do not read your Kent emails at least several times
per week. You can also use the polir-research list in order to send emails to your fellow research students, e.g. in order to make them aware of interesting events or conferences.

**Student representation and the Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC)**

At the beginning of each new academic year, our research students will elect two student representatives, who will have the opportunity to attend School meetings and who will represent your interests on our Staff-Student Liaison Committee (SSLC). The SSLC is an ideal forum for students to raise issues and problems that directly concern them. If the SSLC is not able to resolve issues, the SSLC chairperson can bring them to the School meeting, which is the School’s main administrative structure. We take student representation very seriously and in the past student representatives have been able to influence decisions which directly affected their learning experience. If you run into problems but do not wish to talk to a member of the academic staff, you may wish to talk to your student representative first.

**Postgraduate research rooms**

The School has a designated postgraduate research room in Rutherford College W4.N1. The room has several PCs and a printer. In order to be able to access and use this room, you will need to ask Rutherford Reception to add the room on your KentOne card. The School also has the Vera Cameron Room (Rutherford College S4.5) as a study space for both taught and research postgraduate students. The back section of the room has several PCs and tables to use personal laptops on, and the front section has easy chairs for more informal conversation/meeting space. In order to be able to access and use this room, you will need to get the code number for the door lock from the Politics Office.

**The Current Affairs Society**

The Current Affairs Society is one of the largest intellectual student societies on campus. It is open to all students from all faculties. The Society organises a range of activities including guest lectures, film nights, and fortnightly ‘think tanks’ meetings, at which students talk about recent or on-going political events, trends and developments. The Society is entirely run by students; every year they look for volunteers who can help organise events and run the Society. If you are interested, you can ask the Politics Office for the contact details of the students who are currently running the Society.

**Feedback**

Once every year you will be asked to take part in the University’s postgraduate research student survey, which will ask you questions about the quality of the supervision you have received, the quality of the learning resources available on campus, and other aspects of your student experience at Kent. You can also use the progress reports forms (discussed earlier in this handbook) to give us feedback on your experience and to report any problems you are facing. In addition to these questionnaires and the student progress forms, there are numerous informal opportunities for you to tell us about your experience by talking to your supervisor, to your student representatives.
Complaints and Appeals

All departments are expected to have in place a clear complaints procedure to which research students may have recourse if they are dissatisfied with any aspect of their supervision or with facilities available for their research. Students should be encouraged to consult their supervisor(s) in the first instance, then the Director of Graduate Studies (PGR). If the complaint is not resolved promptly, the student should submit a formal written statement to the Head of School before the end of the period of registration. If the matter cannot be resolved at School level, students are advised to consult the Chair of the Faculty Research Committee or the Dean. Formal complaints should be made in writing and copies of all correspondence and decisions should be placed in the student’s file. An appeal against an adverse decision affecting a student’s progress (for example refusal to transfer from the provisional category or a recommendation to withdraw from study) must be made in accordance with the University’s appeal procedures.

A research candidate may appeal against e.g. the recommendations of the examiners, the recommendations made by an upgrading panel, and the decision to deny a period of intermission or an extension of a deadline. The grounds for such an appeal may include allegations of any of the following:

- That there are extenuating circumstances affecting the student’s performance of which the relevant examiners or staff members were not, for good reason, aware when their decision was taken.
- That there was administrative, procedural or clerical error in the conduct of the procedure of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the same decision would have been reached had this not occurred.
- That there is evidence of prejudice or of bias or of inadequate assessment on the part of one or more of the examiners or staff members concerned.

Any such appeal must be made in writing to the Social Science Faculty not later than 21 days after the date of the notification to the candidate of the recommended result or decision. A research candidate may not appeal against academic judgement or on the grounds of poor or inadequate research supervision. Poor supervision would be the subject of an academic complaint, which should have been raised and resolved at the earliest opportunity through the complaints procedure.

For full details of the University’s Appeals Procedures and Guidelines, please consult: http://www.kent.ac.uk/ulent/quality/regulations/research/phdres.html#appeals

LEARNING RESOURCES

The Subject Librarian and the Politics and International Relations Subject Guide

You can find a Guide to Library Resources in Politics and International Relations at: http://www.kent.ac.uk/library/subjects/politics/index.html

The Library organises induction courses and tours for new students at the beginning of the academic year. The Subject Librarian for Politics and International Relations, Mrs Anna Miller, will give an introduction to the Library specifically for research students in Politics and International Relations (normally in Week 3 of the Autumn term). You are strongly encouraged to attend the session. It covers both library holdings and online resources. The
session will also give you an opportunity to ask Anna questions about resources in your own specialist research area. If you have questions regarding the Library, you can contact Anna by phone at extension 7113 or by email at v.a.miller@kent.ac.uk

We recommend that you start exploring the Library holdings and resources in your research area as soon as possible after your arrival in order to be able to identify any gaps. If you identify gaps in the holdings or generally face difficulties finding and/or accessing material, please discuss the situation with your supervisor, with Anna or with the School Director of Learning Resources, Dr Matthew Loveless (M.Loveless@kent.ac.uk, extension 4910). Dr Loveless is in charge of the School’s library budget and all book orders have to be approved by him. If there are important books in your area that are not in the Library, we may be able to purchase them. You may suggest books for purchase through your supervisor, who will pass your suggestions on to Dr Loveless.

**Inter-library loans**

In some cases it may be more cost-effective to get hold of important books or articles through the Library’s Inter-Library Loan Service. Research students can apply for inter-library loans by completing the relevant forms for each item they wish to loan and by submitting these forms to their main supervisor. The supervisor will then assess how essential the requested items are and whether an interlibrary loan is indeed the most cost-efficient way of accessing them. If appropriate, the supervisor will countersign the form and return it to you. You will then need to submit it to the Library’s Document Delivery Service, see: http://www.kent.ac.uk/library/templeman/services/documentdelivery/index.html

The relevant forms can be downloaded from their website). If your supervisor happens to be away when you need the signature, Matt Loveless and Anna Miller can also sign the form for you. Inter-library loans are expensive, and the loans service will charge the School for each requested item. For that reason, it is often more cost-efficient to buy the book because the difference between its price and the interlibrary loan fees is sometimes quite small. For very expensive academic monographs, however, which are unlikely to be of general interest to the School, an inter-library loan may be justified.

**HEALTH & SAFETY MATTERS**

**Safety**

Safety is everyone’s concern. Please read carefully safety information for students on the Safety, Health and Environment Office webpages http://www.kent.ac.uk/safety/studentsafety/index.html and any instructions and notices on the School’s Health & Safety Noticeboard, and follow the instructions or advice given.

**No Smoking Policy**

Because of the known risk to health from passive smoking, the University has adopted a no smoking policy to limit the exposure of individuals to such smoke in the working environment. There is a complete ban on smoking in all University buildings since 1 July 2007 with the force of law.
Fire Action

Fire and its smoke and toxic combustion products can spread with great speed through buildings. It is vital that you:

- Learn the fire emergence procedures at the start of your studies here
- Look out for evacuation information which is in all University buildings on Fire Action notices, near to fire alarm call points
- Read the sections on fire safety on the University Safety Health and Environment office webpages [http://www.kent.ac.uk/safety/fire/index.html](http://www.kent.ac.uk/safety/fire/index.html) and follow the instructions or advice given.
- Leave the building when you hear the fire alarm at any time other than the weekly alarm test (Rutherford College’s alarm is normally tested at 8:50am each Wednesday) by the nearest safe route. The assembly point after evacuation of Rutherford College is the far end of the courseway.
- Do not use a lift during such an evacuation.
- Check to see that others near you, especially those who have impaired hearing or mobility or are partially sighted, have heard the alarm and are able to escape.

Insurance of Personal Property

You are asked to note that the University’s insurance will not cover your personal effects during your stay at the University (whether from fire, theft or any other cause). You should ensure that you have your own insurance coverage. The Students’ Union offers this service.

THE SCHOOL OF POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC STAFF

Research Interests

Politics and Government was one of the four founding disciplines in the Social Sciences Faculty at the University of Kent on its establishment in 1965 and has always been strong in staff and student numbers. The School presently has three broad research and teaching areas: Comparative and Regional Politics; International Relations, Conflict Analysis and Security Studies; and Political and Social Theory. Since the incorporation of the former European Studies section in 1996, the School has had a strong focus on Europe and the present development plan has, as a high priority, the consolidation of teaching and research in the field of European politics and IR. This took the form of the creation of our Global Europe Centre. The School has long had a special strength in political theory, and this continues to this day, notably in our new MA in the politics of resistance. On the IR side, the School is renowned for its work in the field of Conflict Analysis, developed through the Conflict Analysis Research Centre (CARC). The inaugural John Burton Lecture in conflict analysis was held last year, and will once again be held this year.

THE WORK OF THE SCHOOL

Academic staff in the School in Canterbury currently numbers thirty. There are at present six professors: Michael Burgess (Professor of Federal Studies); Feargal Cochrane (Professor of International Conflict Analysis); Elena Korosteleva (Professor of International Politics); Donna Lee
(Professor of International Relations); Richard Sakwa (Professor of Russian and European Politics and currently Head of School); and Richard Whitman (Professor in Politics and International Relations).

Approximately two hundred undergraduates are admitted as single honours students each year, many of whom follow four-year degrees with a year abroad. The School has a large cohort of postgraduate students. The School currently offers ten taught MA degrees (European and Global Governance, Human Rights, International Conflict Analysis, Peace and Conflict Studies, International Relations, International Relations with International Law, International Security and the Politics of Terror, Comparative Politics, Security and Terrorism, and Political Theory and Practices of Resistance). It also works closely with the Law School to provide an LLM in International Law and International Relations.

Staff in the School can supervise research degrees on a wide range of topics within Politics, International Relations, Conflict and Political Theory. The School is at the forefront of the University’s European and international activities and has particularly close ties with universities in France, Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Russia, Turkey, the USA and Japan.

The School is the home of a refereed International Relations journal *Global Society* (edited by Dr Andrea den Boer and published by Taylor & Francis), which has a national and international reputation. Professor Richard Sakwa is founding Series Editor for the British Association for Slavonic and East European Studies (BASEES) publications in partnership with Routledge (from 2001) and Professor Michael Burgess is the Series Editor of Federal Studies (since 2006) published by Routledge. Professor Richard Whitman was until recently Chair of the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES), the world’s largest European Studies association.

Members of the School play significant roles in national, European and international professional associations, including PSA, BISA, UACES, ECPR, APSA, EUSA, BASEES, the International Studies Association and the Conflict Research Society. The School hosted the first ECPR European Political Science and the fourth ECPR European International Relations Conferences in 2001. Several members of the School also teach in the Institut d’Etudes Politiques in Lille. Together with a regular Public Speaker Programme and a more specialist Research Seminar Series, these ties ensure that there is a continuous and lively traffic of visitors to Canterbury and create a vibrant and cosmopolitan atmosphere. Around fifty per cent of both the student body and the staff come from outside the United Kingdom.

**The Politics Team**

The Politics side of the School has always had a very broad range of interests. Professor Michael Burgess joined the School in January 2005 as the founding Director of our Centre for Federal Studies and to take the lead in the development of the teaching and research into federalism in our School and beyond. Professor Elena Korosteleva is a specialist in European international Politics. Professor Richard Sakwa has produced a large number of works on Soviet and East European affairs in general, and Russian politics in particular. He also has an interest in comparative post-Soviet Eurasian politics (Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, South Caucasus and Central Asia, focusing above all on regimes and
regime change), as well as in problems of comparative democratisation and comparative political development.

Dr Paolo Dardanelli specialises in European politics at both the state and the Union level and has published on federalism, regionalism and Europeanisation. Dr Jane O'Mahony specialises in European politics, with particular interests in policy-making and public administration. Dr Matt Loveless is an expert on Central and East European politics, dealing with problems of civic development, inequality and media environments.

Professor Richard Whitman works at the interface of Politics and International relations, and deals in particular with Europe’s place in the world and the normative bases of Europe’s engagement in world politics.

In world politics, Dr Sarah Hyde is a specialist of East Asian politics, with particular focus on political parties and democratisation. Dr Andrew Wroe is an Americanist who has particular interests in direct democracy, social inclusion/exclusion and the politics of race and immigration.

We have a very strong team working in an interdisciplinary manner between politics and comparative (area) studies. Dr Ersun Kurtulus is an expert on Middle Eastern Politics as well as on problems of state development, and the challenges posed to states by terrorism and political violence. Dr Pak Kuen Lee is an expert in Chinese political economy and Far Eastern and Central Asian international relations.

Dr Edward Morgan-Jones specialises in comparative politics; his research interests are in the area of comparative political institutions with a special interest in Russian politics.

**Political and Social Thought**

There is a strong team of political and social theorists working on the secularism and post-secularism and various contemporary critiques of liberal political thought. Dr Mackenzie has published on questions of political ideology, contemporary social and political theory, and maintains an interest in teaching and research on feminist theory and liberalism. Dr Luca Mavelli specialises in problems of the secular and post-secularism, Europe’s engagement with Islam, and general problems of international relations. Dr Adrian Pabst’s research is situated at the interface of international political economy, geo-politics and religion with a special interest in European and Russian politics. Dr Stefan Rossbach has published on western spirituality and politics, as well as on the work of Niklas Luhmann and Eric Voegelin. He is currently researching on the spirituality of Karol Wojtyla, better known as Pope John-Paul II. Dr Charles Devellennes’ research interests lie in the interdisciplinary area of the history of political thought. His primary research interest is eighteenth century political thought, particularly in the field of religion and politics.

**International Relations and Conflict Analysis at Kent**
International Relations is an important and distinctive part of the School’s activities. The field of International Relations, as conceived at Kent, is broadly defined, although there is a greater emphasis than in many other Universities on the conceptual and epistemological aspects of the subject and in research methods, all of which form an integral part of all undergraduate and postgraduate degree courses.

The main research interests of the staff include all aspects of International Relations theory. Professor Feargal Cochrane is our lead professor of International Conflict Analysis, and his work focuses on war and peace, conflict resolution, conflict prevention, and peaceful change. In recent years we have significantly strengthened our International Relations team. Professor Donna Lee has a distinguished research track record in the areas of global and regional trade policy making, economic and commercial diplomacy, small state international political economy and Africa in international trade negotiations and development. Dr Seán Molloy joined the School in May 2013. He is currently studying the potential of Realism to provide perspectives on the moral dilemmas that are inherent in the practice of power in global politics.

Dr Andrea den Boer leads our work on human rights and in general works in the area of normative theory. She is the co-author (with Valerie Hudson) of a groundbreaking study on sex ratios in Asia’s largest states. Dr Ruth Blakeley works on Latin America, US foreign policy, torture and human rights. Dr Anne Hammerstad works on regional conflict and security, with a focus on Africa. Dr Frank Grundig works on international regimes, international environmental politics and international political economy. Dr Toni Haastrup works on issues of international security focusing on EU-African relations.
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The conflict team in Canterbury includes Professor Feargal Cochrane, director of the Conflict Analysis Research Centre. Dr Govinda Clayton deals with questions of negotiation and mediation and includes high level quantitative methods. The work of Dr Neophytos Loizides covers a range of areas, but he specialises in the Cyprus conflict, nationality and ethnic politics, and peace-making issues. Dr Harmonie Toros works on issues of memory and historical interpretation in the genealogy of conflicts.
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The Brussels School of International Studies

The Brussels School is an integral part of the School of Politics and International Relations, and we currently have five staff members working there. The School is an integrated part of the various management committees of the School, but in Brussels the School operates through cooperation with partner universities, the Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), which provide campus facilities for BSIS students. Members of staff from partner institutions teach modules on the BSIS programmes and participate fully in the teaching aspects of the School.
BSIS was inaugurated in 1998 with the MA in International Relations and this remains the largest of the programmes. In 2001, BSIS began delivering the MA in International Conflict Analysis, and in that same year a joint LLM in International Law with International Relations was launched at BSIS with the Kent Law School. In 2004 the School launched the MA in International Political Economy and the LLM in International Economic Law. An MA in European Public Policy and MA in Political Strategy and Communication have been introduced more recently. In total there are normally some 150 graduate students at the School reading on these programmes as well as the MPhil/PhD programme.

**STAFF BIOGRAPHIES**

Information on teaching and research interests of individual members of staff are available on the School of Politics and International Relations webpages [https://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/about-us/staff/index.html](https://www.kent.ac.uk/politics/about-us/staff/index.html)
## LIST OF STAFF WITH ROOM, TELEPHON NUMBER AND EMAIL ADDRESSES

All offices are located in **Rutherford College**

### Head of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor R Sakwa</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.W2</td>
<td>(82)7409</td>
<td>rs11 or R.Sakwa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Support Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>N4.S5</th>
<th>(82)7854</th>
<th>sld or S.L.Witchell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Academic Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr R Blakeley</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.E2</td>
<td>(82)4504</td>
<td>rjb or R.J.Blakely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor M Burgess</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.7</td>
<td>(82)3463</td>
<td>mdb24or M.D.Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr G Clayton</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.E6</td>
<td>(82)4559</td>
<td>gc99 or G.Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor F Cochrane</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.1</td>
<td>(82)4734</td>
<td>fec or F.E.Cochrane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr P Cunliffe</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.N2</td>
<td>(82)4941</td>
<td>pc257 or P.Cunliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr P Dardanelli</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>W3.W1</td>
<td>(82)7417</td>
<td>pd or P.Dardanelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr A den Boer</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.E8</td>
<td>(82)3456</td>
<td>ad74 or A.Aden-Boer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Devellennes</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.E3</td>
<td>(82)7274</td>
<td>cd87 or C.Devellennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Frank Grundig</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.S6</td>
<td>(82)4100</td>
<td>fg38 or F.Grundig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr T Haastrup</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.N5</td>
<td>(82)4949</td>
<td>th354 or T.Haastrup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr A Hammerstad</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.E7</td>
<td>(82)3763</td>
<td>ah312 or A.A.Hammerstad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr S J Hyde</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.S4</td>
<td>(82)7233</td>
<td>sjh28 or S.J.Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor E Korosteleva</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.W2</td>
<td>(82)3147</td>
<td>eak8 or E.Korosteleva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr E Kurtulus</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.S6</td>
<td>(82)4841</td>
<td>enk or E.N.Kurtulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor D Lee</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>W4.S1</td>
<td>(82)3372</td>
<td>dl310 or D.Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr P K Lee</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.E3</td>
<td>(82)4505</td>
<td>pk16 or P.K.Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr N Loizides</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>S3.S1</td>
<td>(82)7457</td>
<td>nl202 or N.L.Loizides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr M Loveless</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>W4.E1</td>
<td>(82)4910</td>
<td>ml355 or M.Loveless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr I Mackenzie</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>S2.E1</td>
<td>(82)4507</td>
<td>im or I.Mackenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr L Mavelli</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.N4</td>
<td>(82)4943</td>
<td>lm454 or L.Mavelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr S Molloy</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>W3.W8</td>
<td>(82)4883</td>
<td>spm31 or S.P.Molloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr E Morgan-Jones</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.N3</td>
<td>(82)4942</td>
<td>em286 or E.Morgan-Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr G O’Dwyer</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.N6</td>
<td>(82)4948</td>
<td>gmo8 or G.M.O’Dwyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr J O’Mahony</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>E3.S1</td>
<td>(82)3306</td>
<td>jao22 or J.A.O’Mahony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr A Pabst</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.E6</td>
<td>(82)4826</td>
<td>ap432 or A.Pabst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr S Rossbach</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.E8</td>
<td>(82)7842</td>
<td>sr or S.Rossbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr B Seyd</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>W3.W6</td>
<td>(82)7584</td>
<td>bjs9 or B.J.Seyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr H Toros</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>S2.S1</td>
<td>(82)7252</td>
<td>ht223 or H.Toros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor R G Whitman</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.W5</td>
<td>(82)7888</td>
<td>rw2181 or R.Whitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr A Wroe</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N3.E5</td>
<td>(82)3586</td>
<td>ajw6 or A.J.Wroe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Administration Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Pritchard</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.S3</td>
<td>(82)3994</td>
<td>sfp or S.F.Pritchard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration team (School office)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Chapman</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.3</td>
<td>(82)3678</td>
<td>gac or G.A.Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicola Huxtable</td>
<td>(9.30am-2.30pm)</td>
<td>N4.3</td>
<td>(82)3318</td>
<td>nc12 or N.Huxtable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Shepheard</td>
<td>(Mon,Tue,Wed am)</td>
<td>N4.1</td>
<td>(82)7229</td>
<td>jh525 or J.Shepheard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzie Westhead</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.1</td>
<td>(82)4382</td>
<td>sr259 or S.Westhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Support and School Administration Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Chapman</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.S8</td>
<td>(82)7523</td>
<td>rdc or R.D.Chapman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recruitment & Marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Room No</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare Rudland</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.S4</td>
<td>(82)7307</td>
<td>clr27 or C.L.Rudland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Dumphy</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>N4.S8</td>
<td>(82)7122</td>
<td>sd295 or S.Dumphy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>