

ISSN 2071 - 1964

**Revue interafricaine de littérature,
linguistique et philosophie**

Particip'Action

**Revue semestrielle. Volume 13, N°2 – Juillet 2021
Lomé – Togo**

ADMINISTRATION DE LA REVUE *PARTICIP'ACTION*

Directeur de publication	: Pr Komla Messan NUBUKPO
Coordinateurs de rédaction	: Pr Martin Dossou GBENOUGA : Pr Kodjo AFAGLA
Secrétariat	: Dr Ebony Kpalambo AGBOH : Dr Komi BAFANA : Dr Kokouvi M. d'ALMEIDA : Dr Isidore K. E. GUELLY

COMITE SCIENTIFIQUE ET DE RELECTURE

Président : Serge GLITHO, Professeur titulaire (Togo)

Membres :

Pr Augustin AÏNAMON (Bénin), Pr Kofi ANYIDOHO (Ghana), Pr Zadi GREKOU (Côte d'Ivoire), Pr Akanni Mamoud IGUE, (Bénin), Pr Mamadou KANDJI (Sénégal), Pr Taofiki KOUMAKPAÏ (Bénin), Pr Guy Ossito MIDIOHOUAN (Bénin), Pr Bernard NGANGA (Congo Brazzaville), Pr Norbert NIKIEMA (Burkina Faso), Pr Adjai Paulin OLOUKPONA-YINNON (Togo), Pr Issa TAKASSI (Togo), Pr Simon Agbéko AMEGBLEAME (Togo), Pr Marie-Laurence NGORAN-POAME (Côte d'Ivoire), Pr Kazaro TASSOU (Togo), Pr Ambroise C. MEDEGAN (Bénin), Pr Médard BADA (Bénin), Pr René Daniel AKENDENGUE (Gabon), Pr Konan AMANI (Côte d'Ivoire), Pr Léonard KOUSSOUHON (Bénin), Pr Sophie TANHOSOU-AKIBODE (Togo).

Relecture/Révision

- Pr Serge GLITHO
- Pr Ataféi PEWISSI
- Pr Komla Messan NUBUKPO

Contact : Revue *Particip'Action*, Faculté des Lettres, Langues et Arts de l'Université de Lomé – Togo.

01BP 4317 Lomé – Togo

Tél. : 00228 90 25 70 00/99 47 14 14

E-mail : participaction1@gmail.com

© Juillet 2021

ISSN 2071 – 1964

Tous droits réservés

LIGNE EDITORIALE DE PARTICIP'ACTION

Particip'Action est une revue scientifique. Les textes que nous acceptons en français, anglais, allemand ou en espagnol sont sélectionnés par le comité scientifique et de lecture en raison de leur originalité, des intérêts qu'ils présentent aux plans africain et international et de leur rigueur scientifique. Les articles que notre revue publie doivent respecter les normes éditoriales suivantes :

1.1 Soumission d'un article

La Revue *Particip'Action* reçoit les projets de publication par voie électronique. Ceci permet de réduire les coûts d'opération et d'accélérer le processus de réception, de traitement et de mise en ligne de la revue. Les articles doivent être soumis à l'adresse suivante (ou conjointement) : Participaction1@gmail.com

1.2 L'originalité des articles

La revue publie des articles qui ne sont pas encore publiés ou diffusés. Le contenu des articles ne doit pas porter atteinte à la vie privée d'une personne physique ou morale. Nous encourageons une démarche éthique et le professionnalisme chez les auteurs.

1.3 Recommandations aux auteurs

L'auteur d'un article est tenu de présenter son texte dans un seul document et en respectant les critères suivants :

Titre de l'article (obligatoire)

Un titre qui indique clairement le sujet de l'article, n'excédant pas 25 mots.

Nom de l'auteur (obligatoire)

Le prénom et le nom de ou des auteurs (es)

Présentation de l'auteur (obligatoire en notes de bas de page)

Une courte présentation en note de bas de page des auteurs (es) ne devant pas dépasser 100 mots par auteur. On doit y retrouver obligatoirement le nom de l'auteur, le nom de l'institution d'origine, le statut professionnel et l'organisation dont il relève, et enfin, les adresses de courrier électronique du ou des auteurs. L'auteur peut aussi énumérer ses principaux champs de recherche et ses principales publications. La revue ne s'engage toutefois pas à diffuser tous ces éléments.

Résumé de l'article (obligatoire)

Un résumé de l'article ne doit pas dépasser 160 mots. Le résumé doit être à la fois en français et en anglais (police Times new roman, taille 12, interligne 1,15).

Mots clés (obligatoire)

Une liste de cinq mots clés maximum décrivant l'objet de l'article.

Corpus de l'article

-La structure d'un article, doit être conforme aux règles de rédaction scientifique, selon que l'article est une contribution théorique ou résulte d'une recherche de terrain.

-La structure d'un article scientifique en lettres et sciences humaines se présente comme suit: - **Pour un article qui est une contribution théorique et fondamentale :**

Introduction (justification du sujet, problématique, hypothèses/objectifs scientifiques, approche), Développement articulé, Conclusion, Bibliographie.

- Pour un article qui résulte d'une recherche de terrain :

Titre,

Prénom et Nom de l'auteur,

Institution d'attache, adresse électronique (note de bas de page),

Résumé en français. Mots-clés, Abstract, Keywords,

Introduction, Méthodologie, Résultats et Discussion, Conclusion, Bibliographie.

Par exemple : Les articles conformes aux normes de présentation, doivent contenir les rubriques suivantes : introduction, problématique de l'étude, méthodologie adoptée, résultats de la recherche, perspectives pour recherche, conclusions, références bibliographiques.

Tout l'article ne doit dépasser 17 pages,

Police Times new roman, taille 12 et interligne 1,5 (maximum 30 000 mots). La revue *Particip'Action* permet l'usage de notes de bas de page pour ajouter des précisions au texte. Mais afin de ne pas alourdir la lecture et d'aller à l'essentiel, il est recommandé de **faire le moins possible usage des notes (10 notes de bas de page au maximum par article).**

- A l'exception de l'introduction, de la conclusion, de la bibliographie, les articulations d'un article doivent être titrées, et numérotées par des chiffres (**exemples : 1. ; 1.1. ; 1.2 ; 2. ; 2.2. ; 2.2.1 ; 2.2.2. ; 3. ; etc.).**

Les passages cités sont présentés en romain et entre guillemets. Lorsque la phrase citant et la citation dépassent trois lignes, il faut aller à la ligne, pour présenter la citation (interligne 1) en romain et en retrait, en diminuant la taille de police d'un point. Insérer la pagination et ne pas insérer d'information autre que le numéro de page dans l'en-tête et éviter les pieds de page.

Les figures et les tableaux doivent être intégrés au texte et présentés avec des marges d'au moins six centimètres à droite et à gauche. Les caractères dans ces figures et tableaux doivent aussi être en Times 12. Figures et tableaux doivent avoir chacun(e) un titre.

Les citations dans le corps du texte doivent être indiquées par un retrait avec tabulation 1 cm et le texte mis en taille 11.

Les références de citations sont intégrées au texte citant, selon les cas, de la façon suivante :

- (Initiale (s) du Prénom ou des Prénoms de l'auteur. Nom de l'Auteur, année de publication, pages citées) ; - Initiale (s) du Prénom ou des Prénoms de l'auteur. Nom de l'Auteur (année de publication, pages citées). Exemples :

- En effet, le but poursuivi par **M. Ascher (1998, p. 223)**, est « d'élargir l'histoire des mathématiques de telle sorte qu'elle acquière une perspective multiculturelle et globale (...), d'accroître le domaine des mathématiques : alors qu'elle s'est pour l'essentiel occupée du groupe professionnel occidental que l'on appelle les mathématiciens (...) ».

- Pour dire plus amplement ce qu'est cette capacité de la société civile, qui dans son déploiement effectif, atteste qu'elle peut porter le développement et l'histoire, S. B. Diagne (1991, p. 2) écrit :

Qu'on ne s'y trompe pas : de toute manière, les populations ont toujours su opposer à la philosophie de l'encadrement et à son volontarisme leurs propres stratégies de contournements. Celles-là, par exemple, sont lisibles dans le dynamisme, ou à tout le moins, dans la créativité dont sait preuve ce que l'on désigne sous le nom de secteur informel et à qui il faudra donner l'appellation positive d'économie populaire.

- Le philosophe ivoirien a raison, dans une certaine mesure, de lire, dans ce choc déstabilisateur, le processus du sous-développement. Ainsi qu'il le dit :

le processus du sous-développement résultant de ce choc est vécu concrètement par les populations concernées comme une crise globale : crise socio-économique (exploitation brutale, chômage permanent, exode accéléré et douloureux), mais aussi crise socio-culturelle et de civilisation traduisant une impréparation sociohistorique et une inadaptation des cultures et des comportements humains aux formes de vie imposées par les technologies étrangères. (S. Diakitè, 1985, p. 105).

Pour les articles de deux ou trois auteurs, noter les initiales des prénoms, les noms et suivis de l'année (J. Batee et D. Maate, 2004 ou K. Moote, A. Pooul et E. Polim, 2000). Pour les articles ou ouvrages collectifs de plus de trois auteurs noter les initiales des prénoms, le nom du premier auteur et la mention "et al" (F. Loom et al, 2003). Lorsque plusieurs références sont utilisées pour la même information, celles-ci doivent être mises en ordre chronologique (R.Gool, 1998 et M.Goti, 2006).

Les sources historiques, les références d'informations orales et les notes explicatives sont numérotées en série continue et présentées en bas de page.

Références bibliographiques (obligatoire)

Les divers éléments d'une référence bibliographique sont présentés comme suit : NOM et Prénom (s) de l'auteur, Année de publication, Zone titre, Lieu de publication, Zone Editeur, pages (p.) occupées par l'article dans la revue ou l'ouvrage collectif.

Dans la zone titre, le titre d'un article est présenté en romain et entre guillemets, celui d'un ouvrage, d'un mémoire ou d'une thèse, d'un rapport, d'une revue ou d'un journal est présenté en italique. Dans la zone Editeur, on indique la Maison d'édition (pour un ouvrage), le Nom et le numéro/volume de la revue (pour un article). Au cas où un ouvrage est une traduction et/ou une réédition, il faut préciser après le titre le nom du traducteur et/ou l'édition (ex : 2^{de} éd.).

Ne sont présentées dans les références bibliographiques que les références des documents cités. Les références bibliographiques sont présentées par ordre alphabétique des noms d'auteur. Il convient de prêter une attention particulière à la qualité de l'expression. Le Comité scientifique de la revue se réserve le droit de réviser les textes, de demander des modifications (mineures ou majeures) ou de rejeter l'article de manière définitive ou provisoire (si des corrections majeures doivent préalablement y être apportées). L'auteur est consulté préalablement à la diffusion de son article lorsque le Comité scientifique apporte des modifications. Si les corrections ne sont pas prises en compte par l'auteur, la direction de la revue *Particip'Action* se donne le droit de ne pas publier l'article.

AMIN Samir, 1996, *Les défis de la mondialisation*, Paris, Le Harmattan.

AUDARD Cathérine, 2009, *Qu'est-ce que le libéralisme ? Ethique, politique, société*, Paris, Gallimard.

BERGER Gaston, 1967, *L'homme moderne et son éducation*, Paris, PUF.

DIAGNE Souleymane Bachir, 2003, « Islam et philosophie. Leçons d'une rencontre », *Diogène*, 202, p. 145-151.

DIAKITE Sidiki, 1985, *Violence technologique et développement. La question africaine du développement*, Paris, Le Harmattan.

NB1 : Chaque auteur dont l'article est retenu pour publication dans la revue *Particip'Action* participe aux frais d'édition à raison de **50.000** francs CFA (soit **75 euros** ou **100** dollars US) par article et par numéro. Il reçoit, à titre gratuit, un tiré-à-part.

NB2 : La quête philosophique centrale de la revue *Particip'Action* reste: **Fluidité identitaire et construction du changement: approches pluri-et/ou transdisciplinaires.**

Les auteurs qui souhaitent se faire publier dans nos colonnes sont priés d'avoir cette philosophie comme fil directeur de leur réflexion.

La Rédaction

SOMMAIRE

LITTÉRATURE

1. Animaux pollinisateurs et antispécisme dans le roman francophone contemporain
Paul Kana NGUETSE.....9
2. Rethinking Female Identity and Cultural Identifiers in Kopano Matlwa's *Coconut*
Kouadio Lambert N'GUESSAN.....35
3. Representation of Research Supervision in Science-Fiction: A Reading of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*
Mabandine DJAGRI TEMOUKALE.....57
4. On Religious Fanaticism: Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Purple Hibiscus*
Kokouvi Mawulé d'ALMEIDA.....81
5. The Quest for Freedom in Selected Poems from Dennis Brutus's *A Simple Lust And Stubborn Hope*
Koboè K. YOVO.....97
6. Die Realität und Die Fiktion im Werke Des Deutschen Filmemachers Rainer Werner Fassbinder
Eckra Lath TOPPE.....119

PHILOSOPHIE ET SCIENCES SOCIALES

7. Los exiliados republicanos españoles en marruecos : entre identidad e interculturalidad
N'Guessan Estelle KOUAME.....141
8. Les études germaniques en Afrique et le développement durable
Mantahèwa LEBIKASSA.....159
9. Problématique de la refondation des droits de l'homme : de la nécessité d'une éthique conséquente
Yaovi Mathieu ACCROMBESSI.....175
10. Tourismus in der Germanistikabteilung unterrichten: eine Gelegenheit für Zukunftsperspektiven?
Assion AYIKOUE.....193

REPRESENTATION OF RESEARCH SUPERVISION IN SCIENCE-FICTION: A READING OF MARY SHELLEY'S *FRANKENSTEIN*

Mabandine DJAGRI TEMOUKALE*

Abstract

Though not systematically explored and studied in Mary Shelley's days, research supervision happens to be, according to new developments in the research pedagogy, a key factor in the successful completion of a research project and, above all, in the quality of research findings. Using Reader-response criticism as the theoretical approach, this paper attempts to reveal the main cause of the failure of Victor Frankenstein's research project by studying the pedagogy of research supervision at the University of Ingolstadt as portrayed by the English writer, Mary Shelley, in her novel *Frankenstein*. The analysis shows that most of the supervisory activities in the novel are in line with recent developments in the field of research supervision. However, it can be postulated that the lack of feedback between Victor Frankenstein and his research supervisor at some crucial moments of the research journey has led to unwanted results.

Keywords: scientific research, supervision, Victor Frankenstein, failure.

Résumé

Bien qu'il n'ait pas été systématiquement exploré et étudié à l'époque de Mary Shelley, l'encadrement de la recherche s'avère être, selon les nouveaux développements de la pédagogie de la recherche, un facteur-clé de la réussite d'un projet de recherche et, surtout, de la qualité des résultats de la recherche. En utilisant la théorie de la réception comme cadre théorique, cet article tente de révéler la cause principale de l'échec du projet de recherche de Victor Frankenstein, en étudiant la pédagogie de l'encadrement de la recherche à l'Université d'Ingolstadt telle que décrite par l'écrivaine anglaise Mary Shelley dans son roman *Frankenstein*. L'analyse montre que la plupart des activités d'encadrement dans le roman sont conformes aux développements récents dans le domaine de l'encadrement de la recherche. Toutefois, on peut penser que l'absence de rétro-information entre Victor Frankenstein et son directeur de recherche, à certains moments cruciaux du parcours de recherche, a conduit à des résultats non désirés.

* University of Kara (Togo); Email: josiasdjagri@yahoo.fr

Mots-clés : recherche scientifique, encadrement, Victor Frankenstein, échec.

Introduction

English literature saw the birth of science-fiction through Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, published in 1818 in London. Science-fiction is known as a literary work which, not only proposes visions of the future but also sets hypotheses about the future of science and technology with regard to the progress of human society (Y. Rumpala, 2010). It is very often presented as a utopia or a dystopia (Q. Pironnet, 2016). Thus, among promises made by science and technology, overcoming the vulnerability of the human body has, so far, been a central concern of experiments scientists carry out on human bodies (M. Freitag, 2005; Attias-Donfut, 2001). It is in this perspective that Mary Shelley wrote *Frankenstein* whereby curiosity about the origin of life has found bitter satisfaction.

The story in the novel is about a student by the name of Victor Frankenstein who, after a successful completion of his Secondary Education at Geneva, moves to Ingolstadt University in Germany for his Higher Education. After some years with his professors, he tries to pursue researches on the origin of life. He ends up creating a being whose gigantic morphology expresses fear, horror and terror. Unable to help his creature integrate human community, and refusing to create a mate for it to bear rejection that it undergoes daily, the young researcher reaps sorrow and anguish as the creature murders his loved ones. He also tragically ends his life in the attempt to revenge.

The protagonist, Victor Frankenstein, is introduced to the world of sciences and the community of scientists through the lectures of M. Krempe and M. Waldman among other professors at Ingolstadt University. The two named professors constitute a team of supervisors which is expected to deliver supervisory activities that can help Victor Frankenstein make

progress in his research project (T. Wubbels et al., 2009; A. Lee, 2012). Though not systematically explored and studied at Mary Shelley's epoch, research supervision happens to be, according to new developments in the research pedagogy, a key factor in the successful completion of a research project and, above all, in the quality of research findings or results (A. Tchagnaou et al., 2018, 2019). Research supervision becomes, in this respect, a field of study which cannot be reduced to a lecture or proofreading of research papers (C. Boughey & S. McKenna, 2018; J. Botha & J. Mouton, 2018; L. Frick, 2018; A. Lee, 2018).

Scientific researches are mainly carried out by a researcher or a research team, under a supervision. This tradition is in vogue in many universities, especially with doctoral students who are known as novice or young researchers. Supervision intends to lead a novice researcher to reach sound theoretical results or produce, in a laboratory, a useful technology because, as R. Descartes (1637) put, it is not enough to have the sound knowledge, but the important thing is to apply it well. In the case of Victor Frankenstein, the application is to impart life into inanimate bodies. This endeavour requires more than one single mind, not only for the complexity of human frame but also for the fact that "the scope and quality of the support a candidate is provided with have an influence on the candidate's success" (B. Carmesin et al., 2015, p.8). The support is then paramount in the pedagogy of scientific research where the young researcher and his research supervisor are trained as to their roles in research.

Critics like J. Johnston (2018) attribute the failure of Victor Frankenstein's research project on the origin of life, to many factors which range from the researcher's unchecked scientific curiosity and irresponsibility to the theory of complexity of human frame. Yet, this paper advocates that Victor Frankenstein would have been able to create a normal

human being or change his research project if he had been adequately supervised from the beginning to the end of his research journey.

Using reader-response as a theoretical approach, the paper attempts to reveal the main cause of the failure of Victor Frankenstein's research project by studying, examining and appreciating the pedagogy of research supervision at the University of Ingolstadt as portrayed by Mary Shelley in her novel. Reader-response criticism, also known as reception theory, originated from works of Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss. The two scholars “hold that the interpretation of texts depends to a great extent on the reader’s activity to excavate the hidden meaning. Thus, through *The Implied Reader* (1972) and *The Act of Reading* (1976), W. Iser advocates that the potential of a text admits other readings which represent other potentials” (M. Djagri T., 2017, p.4). The relationship between text and context on the one hand and text and reader on the other receives special attention from critics who engage in the interpretation of texts. The reader, who plays the role of interpreter, minds all referential fields outside the text. His own readings and experiences are brought in to shed light on other potentials of the text.

It can be admitted that Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* has been read and interpreted from many critical perspectives. Yet, the potentials of that text remain inexhaustible since each reader embodies a unique experience with which he interacts with the text. In the context of this paper, knowledge in research supervision pedagogy as developed recently helps revisit causes of Victor Frankenstein’s (the novice researcher) failure to create a normal human being in his research laboratory in the imagined world of the writer.

Thus, the analysis shows that most of the supervisory activities in the novel meet the demands of research supervision pedagogy as recently developed in many universities (E. Bitzer, 2016). However, the lack of

communication and feedback between Victor Frankenstein and M. Waldman, his research supervisor, after that the former has mastered the theory and practice in biochemistry, explains, to a large extent, the creation of a monstrous being which has brought desolation and sorrow to the novice researcher. The paper explores and examines, in the novel, the framing of the research topic, the choice of a research supervisor, the act of supervision, the research liminality, Victor Frankenstein's preferred supervisory style, and the feedback.

1. Victor Frankenstein and the Framing of His Research Topic

A scientific research project begins with the framing of the research topic and proposal (J. P. Fragnière, 2001; M. Guidère, 2004). This can be stimulating for some students but embarrassing for others because, before engaging in a research field, the young researcher is called to embody research qualities such as curiosity and commitment (R. Fry, 2012; D. Evans, P. Gruba & J. Zobel, 2014). Victor Frankenstein demonstrates such qualities in his quest for new knowledge as he puts: "I ardently desired the acquisition of knowledge" (Subsequent references to *Frankenstein* will be abbreviated as F, p.36). It is also noted that Frankenstein wants to engage in scientific researches "partly from curiosity" (F, p.38). His desire and curiosity help him to begin readings and studies in sciences as a "duty and resolution" (F, p.41), and shortly after, he becomes passionate as his commitment to science "became so ardent and eager" (F, p.41). All this causes him to be "engaged, heart and soul, in the pursuit of some discoveries" (F, p.42) with the hope to reach rewarding and outstanding results. In short, ardent desire and curiosity for scientific research need action and resolution in order to reach astonishing feats. It is from these mental, emotional and physical dispositions, coupled with readings and studies Victor Frankenstein begins to frame his research topic.

Like any young researcher at universities, Victor Frankenstein has received courses from different lecturers and comes up with the desire to carry out researches in natural philosophy by laying emphasis on chemistry because, for him, “Chemistry is that branch of natural philosophy in which the greatest improvements have been and may be made” (F, p.39). In a sense, Victor Frankenstein studies Chemistry and is about to conduct researches on what he thinks is a challenging topic in the field. With advances in modern chemistry, he wonders why the origin of life is still a mystery. From such worry and observation, he then boldly decides to find an answer to the question: “Whence did the principle of life proceed?” (F, p.42) Out of his critical thinking, Victor Frankenstein decides to explore the origin of life after having discussed with M. Krempe, professor of natural philosophy, and M. Waldman, professor of Chemistry. The influence of both professors has been considerable in the framing of Victor’s research topic.

For Victor Frankenstein’s research on the origin of life to gain credibility, he needs to clearly state the problematics or research objectives. It can then be noted, from the narrative, that the research proposal submitted by Frankenstein intends, in the first place, to remove mysteries and superstitions about the origin of life; and more practically, it intends to “banish disease from the human frame, and render man invulnerable to any but a violent death” (F, p.29-30). The statement of the research objectives as Frankenstein does, helps him get appropriate support from established researchers. He then proceeds with the choice of his research supervisor, which is crucial in a research journey.

2. Choosing a Research Supervisor in *Frankenstein*

One thing is to have a well framed research topic with its objectives clearly defined, but the other is to get a research supervisor who serves as a guide and counsellor throughout the execution of the research project (B.

Carmesin et al., 2015). At his arrival at Ingolstadt University, Victor Frankenstein states: “The next morning I delivered my letters of introduction, and paid a visit to some of the principal professors, and among others to M. Krempe, professor of natural philosophy. He received me with *politeness*, and *asked me several questions concerning my progress in the different branches of science appertaining to natural philosophy*” (F, p.36) (My italics). In this passage, the supervisor-supervisee relationship is about to be established. The openness and politeness of M. Krempe, who is an experienced researcher in the field in which Victor Frankenstein wants to conduct researches, are some of the qualities that potential supervisors can develop in order to efficiently carry out supervisory roles and activities (A. Tchagnao, 2016, 2018).

In an informal meeting with Victor Frankenstein, M. Krempe proceeds with questions in order to make sure the research student masters the fundamental knowledge required to engage in further studies in natural philosophy. These questions are part of strategies a supervisor can use to help his student see the adequacy or inadequacy between the research topic and its objectives within the selected discipline as B. Garmesin et al. (2015, p.13) put: “The required scope and suitable forms of support as well as the mutual rights and obligations that arise from the supervisor-supervisee relationship must be defined and described”. Thus, in the process of selecting the supervisor, the research student can discover compatibilities and incompatibilities that show up.

Unsatisfied with M. Krempe, Victor Frankenstein, like most research students, goes to see M. Waldman, another professor whose lecture he has followed. The latter happens to be admired by Victor Frankenstein who, after a visit to his house, states: “His *manners in private were even more mild and attractive than in public*; for there was a certain dignity in his mien during his lecture, which in his own house was replaced by the *greatest*

affability and kindness” (F, p.39) (My italics). It can be said that being mild, attractive, affable and kind are qualifications Victor Frankenstein wants to see in his potential research supervisor. M. Waldman becomes, therefore, the right supervisor for him.

Like in the case of M. Krempe, Victor Frankenstein discusses his research project and its main corpus (works by Cornelius Agrippa, and Paracelsus) with M. Waldman whose attitude, he relates: “He *heard with attention* my little narration concerning my studies, and smiled at the names of Cornelius Agrippa, and Paracelsus, *but without the contempt that M. Krempe had exhibited*” (F, p.39) (My italics). The choice of Victor Frankenstein can be explained through the binary opposition he puts between M. Krempe and M. Waldman. The former appreciates the research topic but mocks the corpus to be obsolete and that modern natural philosophy has known remarkable progress. Such comments can be discouraging for a young and novice researcher. The latter, M. Waldman, listens to the same research project but with a different attitude which makes all the difference in the course of events as he hears with attention and without contempt his student’s presentation of the research proposal.

In addition, M. Waldman acknowledges the names (Cornelius Agrippa and Paracelsus) mentioned by his student and their works as great contributions to the development of natural philosophy, though M. Krempe says they are useless and tells Victor Frankenstein: “My dear Sir, you must begin your studies entirely anew” (F, p.37). The selection of research supervisors from students’ point of views is greatly influenced by pastoral qualities, that is to be concerned with the research student’s whole life (T. Gatfield, 2005; A. Lee, 2008). M. Waldman’s lectures have removed Victor Frankenstein’s prejudices against modern chemists and given him an impetus to redirect his researches toward Chemistry instead of Natural Philosophy which is a larger field. It can be said that research students need

such lectures to readjust their research topics and research objectives as they exchange with their supervisors who are experienced in the fields.

When spoken to, M. Waldman accepts Victor Frankenstein as his research disciple in these terms: “‘I am happy’ said M. Waldman, ‘to have gained a disciple; and if your application equals your ability, I have no doubt of your success’” (F, p.39). When the student sees his supervisor as a role model and the latter is happy to have the former as a disciple, the research journey can be passionate and rewarding (Y. Waghid, 2006). After having selected his supervisor, Victor Frankenstein proceeds with what is expected from a young researcher: “and I, at the same time, requested his advice concerning the books I ought to procure” (F, p.39). Asking for books for literature review among others, is part of activities that bind the supervisor and supervisee. Literature review begins when the research topic is well framed and its objectives clearly stated. At this stage, supervisors can provide research students with appropriate books.

3. Research Supervision in *Frankenstein*

Research supervision is a concept that has recently gained importance with the increase in the demand of the doctorate in Higher Education (G. Turner, 2015; T. Vilkinas, 2002; A. Lee, 2018; D. F. Hyatt, 2005; V. Kumar & E. Stracke, 2007; C. Boughey & S. McKenna, 2018; L. Frick, 2018; J. Botha & J. Mouton, 2018). It is in this perspective that studies on research supervision at universities attempt to establish supervisory styles that can help the supervisor to successfully execute important roles and responsibilities such as feedback (D. F. Hyatt, 2005) and research project management (R. Katz, 2016; T. Vilkinas, 2002).

M. Waldman begins his role as Victor Frankenstein's research supervisor with pieces of advice and recommendation of books that his students ought to read. He introduces his student to interdisciplinarity when he admonishes: “A man would make but a very sorry chemist, if he attended

to that department of human knowledge alone. If your wish is to become really a man of science, and not merely a petty experimentalist, I should advise you to apply to every branch of natural philosophy, including mathematics” (F, p.39). It is worthy to note that interdisciplinarity is one of the most important qualities of a researcher. M. Waldman’s advice aims to develop a broader awareness of advances within his student’s research area in order for him to build core knowledge and basic understanding of key concepts in the domain of Chemistry. He also wants Victor Frankenstein to develop intellectual abilities and techniques to do research (M. Orellana et al., 2016). Thanks to M. Waldman’s remarks and comments, Victor Frankenstein becomes aware of the difference between the “experimentalist” and the real “man of science”, and can then make an informed choice of a research career through his commitment to conduct researches.

Thus, thanks to formal and informal meetings with M. Waldman, Victor Frankenstein states: “He then took me into his laboratory, and explained to me the uses of his various machines; instructing me as to what I ought to procure, and promising me the use of his own, when I should have advanced far enough in the science not to derange their mechanism” (F, p.40). In this statement, M. Waldman offers adequate conditions that can help Victor Frankenstein in the execution of his research project. This is part of research governance and organisation as he explains the use of all that is found in the laboratory and the required professional conduct his student ought to have before using some specific machines. Responsible research attitude (ethics) is, therefore, taught and the knowledge of the standards and other appropriate practices are disclosed to Victor Frankenstein. The way the supervisor-supervisee relationship is presented in the passage above, informs readers as to good practices of research supervision.

Though M. Waldman remains Victor Frankenstein's supervisor, M. Krempe is around as the second supervisor and colleague to the first. His supervisory style is different from M. Waldman's but he is part of the supervising team as Victor notes: "I found even in M. Krempe a great deal of sound sense and real information (F, p.41). He draws research skills from both of them, which is an interesting practice for modern research supervision (A. Lee, 2009; B. Croussard, 2008).

Victor Frankenstein is, as a young researcher, advised to take part in lectures and other scientific research activities organised at the University of Ingolstadt. During these meetings, his supervisor introduces him to men of science as he puts: "I attended the lectures, and cultivated the acquaintance, of the men of science of the university" (F, p.41). This aligns with the concern of B. Carmesin et al. (2015, p.14) when they write: "Supervisors are responsible for monitoring and ensuring compliance with the rules of good scientific practice. In addition to their own involvement, they should support candidates' participation in related training and events". It can be said that M. Waldman has played the role of a doctoral supervisor and that his relationship with his student has helped the latter to face research liminality which is a shared experience among research students (M. Guidère, 2004).

4. Victor Frankenstein and the Research Liminality

Research students experience liminality as they journey from the choice of their research topic to the completion of their research project (M. J. Deegan & M. R. Hill, 1991). Liminal moments are manifested through fear and other frustrating and embarrassing states that get students turn in circle. According to J. M. Keefer (2015, p.19), "liminality involves wavering between two worlds, after the separation from previous identity but before the point of incorporation into a new one". This change of identity is expressed by Victor Frankenstein in these terms: "I had hitherto

attended the schools of Geneva; but my father thought it necessary, for the completion of my education, that I should be made acquainted with other customs than those of my native country” (F, p.33). It is then conceivable that moving from Geneva schools to Ingolstadt university has played against Victor Frankenstein’s integration into a new academic world as he has to face research challenges and cope with new customs.

In liminal moments, students, as Margaret Kiley (2015, p.53) puts, “are likely to experience considerable intellectual challenge with feelings of ‘going round in circles’ and overall lack of progress”. This is true with Victor Frankenstein when he is challenged by M. Krempe on his knowledge about natural philosophy and its different branches in the following lines: “every instant that you have wasted on those books is *utterly and entirely lost*. You have *burdened* your memory with exploded systems, and *useless* names” (F, p.36) (My italics). These comments made by M. Krempe, who happens to be part of the research team, are discouraging enough to cause a research student go round in circles. It is not pedagogic to tell a student who struggles to read some books and study some thinkers in his discipline that his effort is “utterly and entirely lost”, and that the knowledge of names of precursors is “useless”.

Research liminality demands from the supervisor more skills and competence to adequately and efficiently help the student since many factors, ranging from conceptual thresholds to the state of supervision, can bring such moments about (A. Lee, 2008; M. Kiley, 2015; V. Trafford & S. Leshem, 2009; J. Wellington, 2013). Victor Frankenstein is going through a transition and needs to be guided and coached. He is not yet immersed in research pedagogy and can no more return to the state of a simple student at Geneva schools. H. Sigamporia & G. F. Kariotis (2016, p.20) observed, in this respect, that “liminality can be applied to someone going through a transition, being neither this or that, and therefore simultaneously being both and neither”. The knowledge of this double nature of research students

allows supervisors to adjust their supervisory styles in order to successfully manage liminal moments.

Another challenge Victor Frankenstein has encountered during his research journey is conceptual thresholds. He is introduced to “theory and practice of natural philosophy as depended on the lessons of any of the professors at Ingolstadt” (F, p.42). Research methods, as theoretical knowledge, and practical applications are central to scientific researches. M. Guidère (2004) underscored that every discipline, every domain of research possesses established theories and approved methods. He went further to note that it is the responsibility of every student researcher to know those theories and methods and appreciate their main ideas before engaging in their own researches. Theories and research methods or design are part of threshold concepts which constitute sources of liminality.

To become a real researcher, Victor Frankenstein has to understand relevant research theories, methodologies and techniques and their appropriate application within natural philosophy and specifically chemistry. Fortunately, he has “become acquainted with the theory and practice” (F, p.42), and this is thanks to his supervisor, as he says: “M. Waldman expressed the most heart-felt exultation in my progress” (F, p.42). It is then crucial to note that supervision practice also “relates to ways in which students transcend conceptual thresholds and negotiate liminality” (S. Maistry, 2015, p.209). For that reason, T. Vilkinas (2002, p.130), on doctoral research, observed that “supervisors, like business managers, must be able to assess which of these supervisory qualities is needed at any particular time; and during the student’s journey through the doctoral program the supervisor must deliver each of these qualities with expertise, ease and care”. Like Victor Frankenstein, research students need to cross threshold concepts in order to make a significant progress in their research project. They need motivation and confidence in the same way Victor Frankenstein gets from his M. Waldman, his supervisor.

5. What Supervisory Style for Victor Frankenstein?

From Victor Frankenstein's appreciation of M. Krempe and M. Waldman, it is possible to figure out the kind of supervisor he longs for. He sees M. Krempe directional and a bit arrogant when the former talks about thinkers of traditional natural philosophy as compared with modern thinkers. He is, for Frankenstein, part of the majority of research supervisors who are incline to impose their thoughts at the expense of critical thinking skills.

Unlike M. Krempe, M. Waldman pays attention to his students' standpoints. He cherishes human relationship as can be read in the following lines: "In M. Waldman I found a true friend. His gentleness was never tinged by dogmatism; and his instructions were given with an air of frankness and good nature, that banished every idea of pedantry" (F, p.41). The characterisation of M. Waldman, in this passage, reveals the lack of such kind of research supervisors at Mary Shelley's epoch where the demarcation line between dogma and science was not all that visible. M. Waldman becomes an ideal research supervisor whose qualities inform research institutions about the need of research pedagogy in order to produce real researchers.

Scientific research demands commitment and perseverance from research students. Because the journey to become a researcher is long, students want supervisors who can serve as guide, mentor, coach, father and friend. Sometimes, they opt for studies where they find their role model as Victor Frankenstein confesses: "It was, perhaps, the amiable character of this man that inclined me more to that branch of natural philosophy which he professed, than an intrinsic love for the science itself" (F, p.41). M. Waldman's character has influenced, to a great extent, his student's research orientation. This shows the importance of a supervisor's character in the successful completion of a research project (A. Lee, 2008; T. Gatfield, 2005).

M. Waldman can be qualified as a pastoral supervisor in that pastoral supervision encompasses a certain number of values and attitudes that are necessary for research students to face research liminality (T. Gatfield, 2005; A. Lee, 2008). Thus, the pastoral supervisor is expected to be proactive, sensitive to student's needs, a mentor, a guide, a moral raiser, able to motivate and encourage in order to build confidence; he inspires to persist and offers assistance when problems rise; gives positive feedback during the writing process; allows two-way commitment and interactivity; is ready to share his researches and hold informal meetings with the student (T. Gatfield, 2005; A. Lee, 2018). M. Waldman shares many of the above-mentioned qualities and his being chosen by Victor Frankenstein in the framework of a research project illustrates preferences of students in search for supervisors. Under pure academic relationship or contractual style of supervision, Victor Frankenstein, cannot call his supervisor "a true friend" (F, p.41). Friendship is rooted in human relationships and Mary Shelly, the writer, is mediating in favour of humankind as an end in itself. In other words, a research supervisor ought to produce established researchers that are concerned with human life and relationship.

Victor Frankenstein has successfully framed his research topic, has adequately stated his research objectives, has got a research supervisor and has, so far, being supervised by M. Waldman with the help of M. Krempe. However, the creation of a monster instead of a normal human being shows that the research findings do not flow from research objectives.

6. Challenge of Research Feedback in the Selected Novel

Students engaged in a research project are called to present their progress in order to get the feedback from their supervisors. Feedback, according to *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, stands for "advice, criticism or information about how good or useful something or somebody's work is (A. S. Hornby, 2005, p.429). In the context of a research

supervision, three functions are mainly known to be in vogue through analysis of supervisors' feedback comments (V. Kumar & E. Stracke, 2007). Feedback can then be referential, directive or expressive. Each function has its advantages and limits.

In the case of Victor Frankenstein, the research is mainly conducted in the laboratory through experiments. He then needs expressive comments from his supervision because such feedback worries about comments which indicate the supervisor's praise, criticism and opinion about the experiment (V. Kumar & E. Stracke, 2007).

According to V. Kumar and E. Stracke (2007, p.466), expressive function of feedback "turned out to be the most beneficial according to the supervisee". This advantageous side of expressive comments depends on the positive feedback and opinions which allow the supervisee to discover the way he should take and follow. A. Claire et al. (2012, p.442) can then argue that "inappropriate feedback especially when delivered inappropriately can cause humiliation and anger". In the attitudes and characteristics of the pastoral supervisor, it is observed that the latter offers positive feedback and encouragement in order to raise the candidate's morale and inspire him to persist in the writing endeavour (T. Gatfield, 2005). Because of his sensitivity to the candidate's needs and his willingness to keep him on track, the pastoralist supervisor's criticism is made in such a way that the supervisee interprets it as positive feedback (V. Kumar & E. Stracke, 2007). Thus, it can be said that M. Waldman is well placed to give appropriate support to Victor Frankenstein as to feedback.

Unfortunately, after crossing threshold concepts like theories and their applications, Victor Frankenstein confesses that "the more fully I entered into the science, the more exclusively I pursued it for its own sake" (F, p.41). In a sense, Frankenstein is no more working to achieve his research objective as he enters in science for science's research studies. He retreats to his personal laboratory in order to be freer to do what he craves

for. It means Victor Frankenstein is no longer presenting findings of his researches and experiments to his supervisor, M. Waldman. As such, he cannot receive adequate feedback that can guide him in his creation or invention.

Yet, Victor Frankenstein's isolation can be attributed to authorship challenges that many research students face. Finding the origin of life which has posed problems to established researchers in natural philosophy, is like to place its author above many others in the field. His fear of losing authorship after being committed "soul and body" in search of the origin of life, can explain Victor Frankenstein's isolation and need of autonomy. Like any research student, he wants to be recognised and praised for his contribution to the progress of scientific knowledge. He does not think this can be achieved if his supervisor has to supervise experiments. Another reason that can explain the absence of feedback at that crucial moment of the research is that Mary Shelley wrote at an epoch dominated by religious dogmas. Any research findings which challenged religious beliefs (Jewish and Christian faith among many others) could lead to censorship or the death of the researcher (S. J. Barnett, 2003)

However, what is called the progress in science and technology is nourished by secret activities of individuals in their private laboratories. Refusing to dwell under the umbrella of a research supervisor from the beginning to the end, Victor Frankenstein has failed to meet his research objectives which are to impart life, procure satisfaction for himself as an established scholar, and bring well-being to humankind. In a sense, Mary Shelley uses Victor Frankenstein's failure to mediate in favour of the pedagogy of scientific research supervision where a supervisor or team of supervisors at universities ought to procure adequate support to research students. The grotesque and monstrous form of the creature could have been avoided if Victor Frankenstein's supervisor has been consulted. More expertise, ingenuity and technicity design could have been employed in the

creation of the first specimen of human species. Unfortunately, the lack of communication and feedback between Victor Frankenstein and his supervisor at a crucial moment of the research journey leads to unexpected findings: the creation of a monster instead of a human being.

Conclusion

The paper has dealt with the representation of the research supervision in *Frankenstein* by trying to show that the lack of feedback between Victor Frankenstein and his research supervisor and other researchers has been the main cause of his failure to create a well-designed human frame in which he has imparted life. It has, however, pointed out some good practices in research supervision by examining Victor Frankenstein's choice of his research topic and supervisor. Supervisory activities have been explored through M. Waldman, and it has been underscored that M. Waldman has been more pastoral than directional; which has been Victor Frankenstein's best choice. The paper has revealed that both M. Waldman and Victor Frankenstein have successfully managed liminal moments thanks to formal and informal meetings that they have had. As such, Victor Frankenstein has mastered threshold concepts related to the theory and practice in biochemistry.

In short, a complete and efficient research supervision covers many areas of life of the research student. It demands from the research supervisor who plays the role of an expert to know the nature of the research project he is called to supervise. He also needs to know and understand the challenges of threshold concepts and liminal moments that students are called to face. He should be a guide during the whole research journey by offering the most desirable feedback. Today, the like of Victor Frankenstein needs to be integrated in a research team under a team of research supervisors so that the progress of their research projects can be controlled by experienced and established researchers. As such, research ethics can be respected so that

findings can, instead of being sources of sorrow, be profitable to human community in all sense of the word.

References

- ATTIAS-DONFUT Claudine, 2001, « Images de la vieillesse », *Retraite et société*, 3(3), p.6-9.
- BARNETT Samuel Jackson, 2003, *The Enlightenment and religion: The myths of modernity*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- BITZER Eli, 2016, « Research into Doctoral Education: A Survey of Institutional Research Projects in Southern Africa », in BOTHA Jan & MULLER Nicole (eds), 2016, *Institutional Research in South African Higher Education*, Stellenbosch, SUN PRESS, pp.277-297.
- BOTHA Jan & MOUTON Johann, 2018, « The preparation phase: selection, supervisor allocation, and supervising the doctoral proposal », Course material of Module5 of the DIES/CREST Training Course for Supervisors of Doctoral Candidates at African Universities, Stellenbosch University.
- BOTHA Jan, 2018, « The nature, purpose, standard and format of the doctoral degree », Course material of Module2 of the DIES/CREST Training Course for Supervisors of Doctoral Candidates at African Universities, Stellenbosch University.
- BOUGHEY Chrissie & MCKENNA Sioux, 2018, « Roles and responsibilities of the supervisor and student », Course material of Module3 of the DIES/CREST Training Course for Supervisors of Doctoral Candidates at African Universities, Stellenbosch University.
- BUI Hong T.M., 2014, « Student–Supervisor Expectations in the Doctoral Supervision Process for Business and Management Students », *Business and Management Education in HE*, 1(1), pp.12-27.
- CARMESIN Berit et al. eds., 2015, *Doctoral Supervision – Recommendations for universities and supervisors*, Jena, UniWiND Publications, Issue 4.
- CARTER Susan et al., 2017, « Doctoral Supervision Practice: What's the Problem and How Can We Help Academics? », *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice* 5 (1), pp.13–22.
- CLAIRE Aitchison et al., 2012, « 'Tough love and tears': learning doctoral writing in the sciences », *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31 (4), pp.435–447.

- CROSSOUARD Barbara, 2008, « Developing alternative models of doctoral supervision with online formative assessment », *Studies in Continuing Education*, 30:1, p.51-67.
- DEEGAN M. Jo & HILL Michael R., 1991, « Doctoral Dissertations as Liminal Journeys of the Self: Betwixt and Between in Graduate Sociology Programs », *Teaching Sociology* 19 (3), pp.322-332.
- DEVOS Christelle et al., 2015, « Doctoral supervision in the light of the three types of support promoted in self-determination theory », *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 10, pp.438-464.
- DJAGRI T. Mabandine, 2017, « Otherness in Buchi Emecheta's *The New Tribe* », *Baobab*, Revue des sciences de l'imaginaire, arts, lettres et sciences humaines de l'Université Felix Houphouët-Boigny et Université Alassane Ouattara, n°21, pp.63-71.
- DJAGRI T. Mabandine, 2017, « An Incomplete Shakespearean Hero: A Critique of Catharsis Construction in *A Man for All Seasons* », *YOUROU*, Revue de sémiotique, des études et de théories littéraires de l'Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, N° Varia, p.1-20.
- EVANS David, GRUBA Paul & ZOBEL Justin, 2014, *How to Write a Better Thesis*, Cham, Springer.
- FRAGNIÈRE Jean-Pierre, 2001, *Comment réussir un mémoire*, Paris, DUNOD.
- Freitag, Michel, 2005, « Totalitarismes : de la terreur au meilleur des mondes », *Revue du MAUSS*, 1(1), pp.143-184.
- FRICK Liezel, 2018, « Supervisory models and styles », Course material of Module4 of the DIES/CREST Training Course for Supervisors of Doctoral Candidates at African Universities, Stellenbosch University.
- FRY Ron, 2012, *How to Study*, Boston, Course Technology.
- GATFIELD Terry, 2005, « An Investigation into PhD Supervisory Management Styles: Development of a dynamic conceptual model and its managerial implications », *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27 (3), pp.311–325.
- GEDAMU Abate Demissie, 2018, « TEFL Graduate Supervisees' Views of their Supervisors' Supervisory Styles and Satisfaction with Thesis Supervision », *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research* 6(1), pp.63-74.
- GUIDERE Mathieu, 2004, *Méthodologie de la recherche*, Paris, Ellipses

- GÜRSIMSEK Isik & GÖREGENLI Melek, 2005, « Humanistic Attitudes, Values, System Justification, and Control Beliefs in a Turkish Sample », *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 34(7), pp.747-758.
- HORNBY Albert Sidney, 2005, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- HYATT David F., 2005, 'Yes, a very good point!': a critical genre analysis of a corpus of feedback commentaries on Master of Education assignments, *Teaching in Higher Education* 10(3), pp.339-353.
- JOHNSTON Josephine, 2018, « Traumatic Responsibility: Victor Frankenstein as Creator and Casualty », in *Frankenbook*, available at <https://www.frankenbook.org/pub/traumatic-responsibility>, accessed on 02/06/2021.
- KATZ Reuven, 2016, « Challenges in doctoral research project management: A comparative study », *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, pp.105-125.
- KEEFER Jeffrey M., 2015, « Experiencing doctoral liminality as a conceptual threshold and how supervisors can use it », *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, Vol.52, Issue1, pp.17-28.
- KILEY Margaret, 2009, « 'You don't want a smart Alec': selecting examiners to assess doctoral dissertations », *Studies in Higher Education*, 34 (8), pp.889-903.
- KUMAR Vijay & STRACKE Elke, 2007, « An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis », *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12 (4), pp.461-470.
- LEE Anne, 2018, « How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision », *Studies in Higher Education*, 33 (3), pp.267-281.
- LEE Anne, 2018, «How can we develop supervisors for the modern doctorate? », *Studies in Higher Education*, 43 (5), pp.878-890.
- FRICK Liezel, ALBERTYN Ruth & RUTGERS Linda, 2010, « The Socratic method: adult education theories », *Acta Academica Supplementum*, (1), pp.75-102.
- MAISTRY Suriamurthe, 2015, « Crossing Over to Education for Ph.D. Study: Liminality and Threshold Crossing », *Alter'nation Special Edition*, No 17, pp.209 – 225.
- MOUTON Johann & FRICK Liezel., 2018, « The need for the doctorate and the state of doctoral studies in Africa », Course material of Module1 of the DIES/CREST Training Course for Supervisors of

Doctoral Candidates at African Universities, Stellenbosch University.

NAJAH Nadiah Amran & ROZITA Ibrahim, 2012, « Academic rites of passage: reflection on a PhD journey », *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 59, pp.528 – 534.

ORELLANA Martha L. et al., 2016, « Improving doctoral success by matching PhD students with supervisors », *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, pp.87-103.

PIRONNET Quentin, 2016, « Droit et dystopies », *Revue interdisciplinaire d'études juridiques*, 2(2), pp.363-392.

RUMPALA Yannick, 2010, « Ce que la science-fiction pourrait apporter à la pensée politique », *Raisons politiques*, 4(4), pp.97-113.

SIGANPORIA Harmony & KARIORIS G. Frank, 2016, « Introduction: Rupture and Exile: Permanent Liminality in Spaces for Movement and Abandonment », *Culture Unbound*, 8, pp.20-25.

TEFERRA Damtew, 2015, « Manufacturing – and exporting – excellence and 'mediocrity': doctoral education in South Africa », *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 29 (5), pp.8-19.

TCHAGNAOU Akimou et al., 2019, « Elaboration d'une thèse : un casse-tête pour les étudiants de l'université de Lomé ? », *Revue Interafricaine de Philosophie et de Sciences Humaines*, N°23, pp.115-128.

TCHAGNAOU Akimou et al., 2018, « L'élaboration d'un mémoire de recherche : phase et catégories d'étudiants », *Transmettre*, Vol.1, N°6-7, pp.117-133.

TCHAGNAOU Akimou et al., 2018, « Encadrement des mémoires de recherche: la responsabilité du directeur dans l'état d'avancement des étudiants », *Revue DELLA/Afrique didactique et enseignement des langues et littérature en Afrique* (vol.1 no 4, tome 2) 3-1, pp.178-206.

TCHAGNAOU Akimou et al., 2019, « Le rôle de l'étudiant dans la réussite de son mémoire de recherche », *LES CAHIERS DE L'ACAREF/REVUE*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp.125-149.

TOMLINSON Stephen, 1997, « Edward Lee Thorndike and John Dewey on the Science of Education », *Oxford Review of Education*, 23(3), pp.365-383.

TRAFFORD Vernon & LESHEM Shosh, 2009, « Doctorateness as a threshold concept », *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46 (3), pp.305-316.

- TURNER Gill, 2015, « Learning to supervise: four journeys », *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52 (1), pp.86-98.
- VILKINAS Tricia, 2002, « The PhD process: the supervisor as manager », *Education + Training*, 44(3), pp.129-137.
- WAGHID Yusef, 2006, « Reclaiming freedom and friendship through postgraduate student supervision », *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), pp.427-439.
- WELLINGTON Jerry, 2013, « Searching for Doctorateness », *Studies in High Education*, Vol. 38, Issue10, pp.1490-1503.
- WUBBELS Theo et al., 2009, « A model for the supervisor–doctoral student relationship », *High Educ* 58, pp.359–373. ■■■■