

Characteristics of Ideal Ph.D. Advisors and Ph.D. Candidates

Although we all know that ideal advisors and ideal Ph.D. candidates do not exist, the idea itself can help you evaluate the relationship with your advisor. Using the questionnaires by Clyde A. Parker (1997: 44-47) below, you can check how far you and your advisor are from the mark 'ideal' and figure out what is missing. Read carefully the statements in the left column and evaluate them based on their relevance to your case.

Advisor	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree
1. The advisor is interested in the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	
2. The advisor is competent to advise on the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	
3. The advisor has a reasonable level of expectations regarding what a student can and should accomplish in a doctoral dissertation.	1	2	3	4	5	
4. The advisor reads and comments on dissertation documents within a reasonable time period.	1	2	3	4	5	
5. The advisor is consistent regarding requirements and advice and does not constantly add requirements or change advice already given.	1	2	3	4	5	
6. The advisor has personal integrity and views the advisor role as an important responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	
7. The advisor is interested in the candidate as a person and is interested in the candidate's welfare, both as a person and as a scholar.	1	2	3	4	5	

Candidate	Strongly disagree					strongly agree
1. The candidate does a good dissertation in a reasonable time that the committee are proud to sign.	1	2	3	4	5	
2. The candidate shows initiative, but accepts guidance and follows through on suggestions.	1	2	3	4	5	
3. The candidate is organized, uses the committees time effectively, and is also reasonable in the demands on their time.	1	2	3	4	5	
4. The candidate has personal integrity.	1	2	3	4	5	